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Faculty Senate Minutes 1975 - 1976

Missouri University of Science and Technology Faculty Senate
TO: UMR FACULTY
RE: AGENDA for the Academic Council Meeting, Thursday, August 22, 1974 at 1:30 p.m. in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building.

I. Approval of the minutes of the May 2, 1974 meeting.

II. Unfinished Business - None

III. Reports of Administrative Responses to Actions Approved by the Academic Council.
   A. Ad Hoc Learning Resources Committee (Jim Pogue)
      1. Report on Cost and Need for KUMR - March 7, 1974, III, 8.9
   *B. Revised Draft of a Promotion and Tenure Procedure and Policy (Jim Pogue)

IV. Reports of Standing or Special Committees
   A. 4.511 Academic Freedom (Bob Gerson)
      1. Investigation of alleged unauthorized activities of the UMR Police - May 2, 1974, III, 11.11
   B. 4.514 Budgetary Affairs (S. Grigoropoulos)
      1. Cost for University Police - March 7, 1974, III, 8.9
   C. 4.519 Personnel (Chuck Johnson)
      1. Faculty Work Load Guidelines - October 18, 1974, III, 3.9
   D. 4.521 Rules, Procedures and Agenda (Ralph Schowalter)
      *2. Approval of Academic Council Meeting dates
      3. Referrals
         a. Early Final Grades for Graduating Seniors
         b. Revision of Freshman Admission Policy
         c. Summer School Scheduling of Classes
   *4. Resolution on Committee Reports
   E. 4.533 Security and Traffic Safety
      1. Report on recent changes to the Regulations

V. Report From the Incoming Academic Council Chairman (Ken Robertson)

VI. New Business - None

VII. Announcements
   A. In Memoriam: Rolfe M. Rankin
   B. In Memoriam: Burr R. Van Nostrand
   C. In Memoriam: William A. Frad
   D. In Memoriam: John S. Pazdera, Jr.
TO: UMR Faculty

RE: AGENDA for the Academic Council Meeting, Thursday, September 4, 1975, at 1:30 p.m. in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building.

I. Approval of the minutes of the May 1, 1975 meeting.

II. Unfinished business - None.

III. Reports of Administrative Responses to actions approved by the Academic Council.

A. Promotion and Tenure Policy -- March 6, 1975, IV, 9.6 (Jim Pogue)

B. Recommendations concerning the Cost and Need for KUMR -- May 1, 1975, IV, 11.4 (Jim Pogue)

IV. Reports of Standing or Special Committees.

A. 4.511 Academic Freedom (Bob Gerson)

1. Student Council Faculty Evaluation -- April 10, 1975, IV, 10.7

B. 4.516 Curriculum (Jim Pogue)

1. Recommendation for approval of Degree in Computer Science.

(A copy of the complete proposal for the Ph.D. in Computer Science will be available for review by faculty members in the office of the Provost and Dean of Faculties.)

C. 4.521 Rules, Procedures, and Agenda (Ralph Schowalter)

1. Election of a faculty member to replace Fred Swift on the Student Scholastic Appeals Committee; and a faculty member to replace Eddie Fowler on the Rules, Procedures, and Agenda Committee.

*2. Election of a faculty member to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Coordinating Board of Higher Education.

3. Referral to the Personnel Committee -- Retirement and Staff Benefits.

*4. Approval of Academic Council Meeting Dates.

D. 4.533 Security and Traffic Safety (Jim Pogue)

*1. Recommendation for Approval of Changes in the UMR Parking Regulations.

V. New Business.

*1. Revision of Policy Memorandum Number 16 (Jim Pogue)

VI. Announcements.

*Indicates supplementary material sent to Academic Council members.

Chancellor Caudle, B/C meeting
Chairman Jim Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, September 4, 1975, in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building.

After introducing the members of the Academic Council for 1975-76, its officers, and the office secretary, Johnson announced the opening of the Academic Council office in 105 Parker Hall. (Telephone: 341-4871) He also announced that the secretary, Mrs. Marian Smith, would be available mornings for work pertaining to the Council. Johnson expressed appreciation for secretarial work done in the past by various departments and by the Dean of Faculties office.

The Chairman gave a brief summary of rules and procedures for conducting Academic Council meetings, as follows:

1. The Council has both voting and non-voting members; the status of each can be determined by referring to the Council By-laws.
2. Meetings are open to all faculty members.
3. Meetings are open to representatives of the student news media; however, no verbatim recording is allowed nor may any information be released prior to the official minutes.
4. Meetings may not be adjourned before 3:30 p.m. unless there is no remaining business, and normally will continue only until 4:00 p.m.
5. Committee reports must be submitted in writing ten days prior to a meeting for action to be taken.
6. Objections to agenda items should be made to the Chairman or to the person responsible for the item prior to the meeting, if possible.
7. Any motion not pertaining to matters included on the agenda may be ruled out of order by the Chairman.
8. Motions of an extensive nature should be presented to the secretary in writing prior to the meeting.
9. Any member who cannot attend a meeting should designate another member of his department to serve as his proxy. A written note naming the proxy must be submitted to the secretary prior to the meeting.

Members are referred to the General and Procedural Resolutions of the Council for further information concerning these operating procedures.

The Chairman called for approval of the minutes of the May 1, 1975, meeting. Gabe Skitek so moved; Herb Harvey seconded; the motion carried.

PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY: Jim Pogue reported that the Chancellor had given no response yet to the Promotion and Tenure Policy approved by the Council. (March 6, 1975 IV, 9.6)

COST AND NEED FOR KUMR: Jim Pogue read his letter addressed to Dr. James Johnson endorsing the two recommendations passed by the Academic Council on May 1, 1975 (IV, 11.4):

1. The Academic Council should recommend no expansion in UMR resources allocated to KUMR for facilities and staff.

2. The Academic Council should support released time for faculty members who petition to become involved in the development of educational and/or informational programs using existing KUMR facilities (main channel and SCA).
Ralph Schowalter made a motion that the Academic Council accept this administrative response and remove the item from the agenda; the motion was seconded by Ken Robertson, and passed.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM: In response to an Academic Council request (April 10, 1975, IV, 10.7) that the Academic Freedom Committee consider the Student Council faculty evaluations, Bob Gerson referred to a written report from that committee distributed to members of the Council containing, in paraphrase, the following four points:

I. The posting of teaching evaluations last year by the Student Council was a violation of faculty privacy.

II. Future teaching evaluations should be stored in the departmental offices and should be available to students only to assist them in choosing courses.

III. The evaluation form should be reviewed by the Personnel Committee to ensure that it is appropriate to the nature of various types of courses.

IV. A professor's contributions to teaching should receive full consideration, not just a computerized rating.

Gerson presented two resolutions to the Council for its consideration:

1. Resolved: In conducting faculty evaluations by students, the Student Council should conform to the principle of privacy in reporting these evaluations, as contained in parts I and II of the report of the Academic Freedom Committee, dated Sept. 2, 1975.


The Chairman ruled that the resolutions would be placed on the agenda of the next meeting for Council action.

CURRICULUM: Referring to his memorandum addressed to the Chairman of the Academic Council, Jim Pogue commented on the proposed Ph.D. in Computer Science, a degree which was studied and endorsed by the Curricula Committee. He then made the motion that the Academic Council recommend to the Chancellor campus approval of the proposed Ph.D. in Computer Science. The motion was seconded by Tom Baird. After the Chairman expressed appreciation for the Academic Council's having the opportunity to approve new programs, discussion followed.

Several questions relating to funding the degree were raised: Summers asked whether or not the new degree would require eliminating present programs; Rhea wondered about a rise in costs in the Computer Science Department; Baird replied that there is often confusion in the costs of the Computer Science Department and the Computer Center, and that the proposed degree would require the addition of only one senior professor and some additional E & E. Pogue announced that the Academic Council would be approving only the concept of the degree at this time; that after approval by the Board of Curators the proposed degree would still be subject to fiscal arrangements and campus priorities. Ruhland asked why the Ph.D. in Computer Science was
advanced from the Curricula Committee ahead of other proposals, such as the Bachelor's degree in Sociology. Pogue replied that there had been, apparently, a more positive response to the Computer Science degree. Some comments supporting the degree in Computer Science followed: the technological nature of this campus; the fact that a doctor's degree with emphasis work in Computer Science is already being given in the Mathematics Department; the schedule of offering the degree for the fall of 1976 in the last five-and ten-year plans of the department; the fact that no other state campus offers a Ph.D. in Computer Science. At this point, Ken Robertson recommended that the Academic Council establish the precedent of reviewing the academic credentials of a proposed degree and not the political or financial implications. Pogue announced that the degree had been reviewed by three faculty members for the Graduate office. The question was called; the motion to recommend to the Chancellor campus approval of the proposed Ph.D. in Computer Science carried.

RULES, PROCEDURES, AND AGENDA: Ralph Schowalter, for the RP&A Committee, placed in nomination for committee vacancies the following names:

J. M. Taylor for the Rules, Procedures, and Agenda Committee
S. K. Grant for the Student Scholastic Appeals Committee.

The Chairman asked for additional nominations. Gabe Skitek moved that the nominations close; Dave Summers seconded the motion; the motion carried and the nominees were elected by acclamation.

V, 1 Schowalter then placed in nomination the name of B. K. Robertson for the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education. Chairman Johnson explained that the Coordinating Board has become important in recommending appropriations for all state-supported colleges in Missouri and will become more directly involved in many aspects of higher education. The Chairman asked for additional nominations; Tom Baird moved that the nominations cease and Robertson be elected by acclamation. Patterson seconded the motion and the motion carried. Ken Robertson requested that the Academic Council aid him with advice and input as he brings before it various issues from this advisory committee.

V, 1 Schowalter announced the referral of a proposal from the faculty of UMC on retirement and staff benefits to the Personnel Committee. Wayne Cogell asked the purpose of the referral, and Jim Pogue requested information on the content of the proposal. Chairman Johnson explained that the UMC faculty would like the other campuses to endorse its proposal and then briefly identified the content as requests to the Board of Curators for certain improvements in retirement and benefits. The Chairman also announced that Cogell has a copy of the proposal. Jim Pogue reported that he and Bill Brooks, the UMR representatives on the U-wide committee for retirement and staff benefits, would assist in any way and also refer matters to the U-wide committee. A request was made that the meeting date for the Personnel Committee's consideration of this issue be published. To conclude this matter, Chairman Johnson stated that there would be a report from the Personnel Committee included as an agenda item at a later meeting of the Academic Council.

V, 1 Schowalter made a motion that the eight dates for Academic Council meetings be approved, requesting that the April 29, 1976, meeting substitute for the May meeting since a May meeting would conflict with the end of the semester. The motion was seconded by Bassem Armaly, and it carried.
SECURITY AND TRAFFIC SAFETY: Since no member of the Security and Traffic Safety Committee was present, Jim Pogue commented on a report to the Academic Council members from that committee. He explained that the committee had approved two changes in parking for implementation this fall and had proposed a third change as follows: Change 1 was designed to restrict Lots 1 and 2 (Parker Hall and Mining Building) to faculty and staff; Change 2 restricts use of handicapped parking places by others; and proposed Change 3 was designed to allow parking in the lot by the Buehler Building by special permit only, since last year that small lot was used by persons shopping and conducting personal business downtown.

Since the changes came up from the committee in July and the first two were to be implemented this fall, the two were administratively approved so they could be forwarded to the Board of Curators. This approval was granted after consultation with the Chairman of the Academic Council and after written approval for Change 1 had been received from the Student Council. Since the third change would restrict parking for faculty and staff, it was neither approved nor forwarded. Pogue then moved approval of the first two changes; Summers seconded. Summers moved amendment of the motion to include the third change; the amendment was seconded by Cogell but did not carry. Discussion followed. A student representative expressed opposition to Change 1 restricting students from a parking lot; several members cited other student complaints. A request for the rationale behind Change 1 was made. Tom Baird made a motion to separate Changes 1 and 2; this motion was seconded by Ralph Schowalter and carried. Dave Summers moved to table the motion for approval of the first change; Troy Hicks seconded, and the motion carried. The motion for approval of Change 2 carried.

Pogue then moved approval of the proposed Change 3 and Summers seconded. Schowalter expressed an opinion that someone other than the director of the adjoining building, perhaps Traffic Safety, should issue the special permits. Ken Robertson moved to table the motion; Schowalter seconded, motion carried.

POLICY MEMORANDUM NUMBER 16: In reference to a copy of revisions to Policy Memorandum No. 16 circulated to members of the Academic Council, Jim Pogue asked the Council (full memorandum) to review the revisions which were originally recommendations by the department chairmen to the Chancellor, and then either to endorse the revisions or to express concern about them. Chuck Johnson moved to refer the revisions to the Personnel Committee; Ruhland seconded. As a point of information, Pogue briefly indicated the substantive changes in Policy Memorandum No. 16: first, for promotion to Associate Professor the teaching qualifications had been removed from an absolute requirement to one of three qualifications; second, the years of experience required for promotion to Associate Professor had been reduced from 3-5 years to 3 years, and for promotion to Professor from 5-10 years to 3 years. The question was called, and the motion carried. Wayne Cogell asked the members for written input on the revisions. Prior to the meeting, Lyman Francis had requested to speak regarding the revisions. He was asked to pursue this matter further with the Personnel Committee.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Ken Robertson stated that a summer meeting should be held since many issues arise and need attention during the summer months. Ralph Schowalter requested that all committees elect chairmen and report the names to him, along with any mistakes on the committee listing. He also reminded members to encourage their department colleagues to vote on the By-law changes. Several suggestions were offered that a member of each committee with business on the agenda be present at the Academic Council meeting to answer questions from the floor.
Chairman Johnson made several announcements: 1) The next Faculty Handbook will re-number the By-laws to correspond with the numbering system of the Board of Curators. 2) The Chairman of the Academic Council attends meetings of the Board of Curators as an observer. 3) The Chairman is a member of the Chancellor's Council; thus, members of the Council can give him input pertinent to the Chancellor.

The Chairman then presented a summary of the UMR budget as discussed in the Chancellor's Council, showing a deficit for 1975-76. In conclusion, Chairman Johnson reported that, if income does not increase for 1976-77, it will be necessary to eliminate entire programs or services. He said that the Chancellor has requested input on the budget problem from the Budgetary Affairs Committee, from the Academic Council, or from any individual faculty member.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Pogue
Marilyn Pogue, Secretary

*Complete document filed with the smooth copy.

Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of the actions approved.
MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. James Johnson

FROM: J. C. Pogue

SUBJECT: Academic Council Recommendations Concerning the Cost and Need for KUMR

At its meeting on Thursday, May 1, 1975, the Academic Council passed a recommendation proposed by the Budgetary Affairs Committee. The recommendation was in two parts:

1. The Academic Council should recommend no expansion in UMR resources allocated to KUMR for facilities and staff.

2. The Academic Council should support released time for faculty members who petition to become involved in the development of educational and/or informational programs using the existing KUMR facilities (main channel and SCA).

The motion by the Budgetary Affairs Committee included the statement that their recommendations (as stated above) should be forwarded to the appropriate administrators.

Although I have not received any special notation of this action from the Academic Council, I am taking the liberty of responding to the motion so that you can clear this item from your agenda. I am not sure what is requested by the motion, but I can assure the Academic Council that there are no plans to expand the UMR resources allocated to KUMR. The KUMR operation has achieved a viable level of activities, and unless there are substantive changes not now contemplated, should continue a good operation at their present level of funding. I might note that KUMR received a reduction in their E & E this year as part of the campus budget problem.

Without question, my office will support the concept of released time for faculty members who wish to become involved in the development of educational and/or informational programs using the existing KUMR facilities. It should be noted, however, that basic prerogatives for the assignment
September 3, 1975
James Johnson
Academic Council Recommendations Concerning the Cost and
Need for KUMR

of released time, and the evaluation of the need to develop educational
and/or informational programs, lie first with the department and college/
school concerned. However, I will be pleased to assist any unit or individ­
ual in any way possible to accomplish an educational and/or informational
program for KUMR.

J. C. Pogue
Provost and Dean of Faculties

JCP/kjg

cc Chancellor
Memo To: Academic Council Members

From: Robert Gerson, Chairman
Academic Freedom Committee

Subject: Teaching Evaluation and Privacy

The Academic Freedom Committee has met and considered the posting of teaching evaluations, and submits the following report:

I. The procedure used last year in posting teaching evaluations constituted an undesirable breach of privacy for faculty members.

We do not know of any occupational group in which individual efficiency ratings are publicly advertised to an entire community, and it is hard to see why university faculties should be singled out for this dubious distinction. The fact that student grades are no longer posted, even though the posting was primarily for the students' convenience, is a result of the need for some privacy in a world where much of our life has become public. The faculty has at least as great a need for privacy as the students.

II. It is suggested that future teaching evaluations be made freely available only to students considering a particular course or instructor, and only for the purpose of assisting them in their choice. The logical site for storing this information is the departmental office.

III. Since student teaching evaluation at UMR has now become one of the factors sometimes used in tenure, promotion, and salary raise decisions, the procedure now being used should be reviewed by the Personnel Committee.

An effort should be made to ensure, (1) that the questionnaire used is appropriate to the method of instruction (it is ridiculous to use the same questionnaire for labs, Keller classes, lecture and recitation sections), (2) that the students are clearly aware of the importance of these evaluations to the future of their professors, (3) that, where the professor is not responsible for the course content, as in many required courses, he not be evaluated on the basis of the subject matter, and (4) that, to the extent possible, the students evaluate on the basis of some acceptable and recognized teaching standard for the course.

IV. Some procedure should also be developed to ensure that a professor's contributions to the departmental teaching program, other than his classroom behavior, receive full recognition.
Academic Council Members  
September 2, 1975  
Page 2  

This is normally the department chairman's function, but there is now a danger that the student questionnaire, which yields a convenient computerized rating, will be given greater consideration than other non-computerized, and presumably inferior, subjective evaluations.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Gerson

Robert Gerson

db
TO: UMR Faculty

RE: AGENDA for the Academic Council Meeting, Thursday, October 2, 1975, at 1:30 p.m. in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building.

I. Approval of the minutes of the September 4, 1975, meeting.

II. Unfinished business.
   A. Tabled items:
      **1. Recommendation for Approval of Changes in the UMR Parking Regulations. (Curt Adams)

III. Reports of Administrative Responses to actions approved by the Academic Council.
   A. Promotion and Tenure Policy - March 6, 1975, IV, 9.6 (Jim Pogue)

IV. Reports of Standing or Special Committees.
   A. 4.511 Academic Freedom (Bob Gerson)
      ***1. Student Council Faculty Evaluation - April 10, 1975, IV, 10.7.
   B. 4.514 Budgetary Affairs (Harold Fuller)
      1. Budget discussion.
   C. 4.516 Curriculum (Don Modesitt)
      *1. Committee Report #1 (75-76)
   D. 4.519 Personnel (Wayne Cogell)
      1. Retirement and Staff Benefits - September 4, 1975, V, 1.7.
      *2. Revision of Policy Memorandum No. 16 - September 4, 1975, V, 1.10.

V. New Business

VI. Announcements

*Supplementary material sent to academic council members.
**Supplementary material sent to academic council members with September 4, 1975, agenda.
***Supplementary material handed out at the September 4, 1975, meeting of the academic council, and resolutions that appear in the minutes of that meeting (V, 1.3).
To: Academic Council

For: Meeting of October 2, 1975

RESOLVED: In conducting faculty evaluations by students, the student council should conform to the principle of privacy in reporting these evaluations, as contained in parts I and II of the report of the Academic Freedom Committee, dated Sept. 2, 1975.

RESOLVED: Parts III and IV of the report of the Academic Freedom Committee, dated Sept. 2, 1975, is referred to the Personnel Committee for Action.

Signed/ Robert Gerson
MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Jim Johnson, Chairman
academic Council

FROM: Dr. J. C. Pogue

SUBJECT: Proposal for Ph.D in Computer Science

July 29, 1975

Jim, as you know the campus has had under consideration a proposal by the Department of Computer Science for a Ph.D degree in Computer Science. This proposal has made the rounds of the several specified individuals and committees for their comments, and has been rewritten in light of those comments and evaluations. The proposal has been prepared in final form for submission to U-Wide. However, the proposal has not yet been considered by the Academic Council.

The Curricula Committee has reviewed this proposal and endorses the proposed Ph.D program in Computer Science. The Curricula Committee considers the course offering in Computer Science to be essentially adequate for a Ph.D program. The Committee noted that the Computer Science Department already offers a substantial number of 300 and 400 level courses which are applicable to the proposed program. The Curricula Committee is prepared to assist the Computer Science Department in adding a small number of courses that the Department has indicated as being desirable.

Jim, is it possible to enter a consideration of this Ph.D proposal as an agenda item for the first meeting of the Academic Council this fall? I am sure that the Chancellor would appreciate the recommendation of the Academic Council in regard to the proposed Ph.D in Computer Science.

J. C. Pogue

JCP/blh

an equal opportunity institution
August 21, 1975

To: Members of the Academic Council

From: Professor Ralph E. Schowalter, Chairman
Rules, Procedures, and Agenda Committee

Re: Academic Council Elections

At the September 4, 1975, meeting of the Academic Council, the following names will be placed in nomination for the respective committees:

1. 4.521 Rules, Procedures, and Agenda
   Taylor, J. M.

4.524 Student Scholastic Appeals
   Grant, S. K.

2. Faculty Advisory Committee to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education.
   Robertson, B. K.
ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETINGS
(1:30 p.m. in G-5 H & SS)

September 4, 1975: January 29, 1976
October 2, 1975: February 26, 1976
November 6, 1975: March 25, 1976
December 4, 1975: April 29, 1976

ACADEMIC COUNCIL AGENDA DEADLINES

August 20, 1975: January 14, 1976
September 17, 1975: February 11, 1976
October 22, 1975: March 10, 1976
November 19, 1975: April 14, 1976

GENERAL FACULTY MEETINGS
(4:00 p.m. in 104 M.E. Building)

August 26, 1975: February 10, 1976
December 9, 1975: April 27, 1976

GENERAL FACULTY AGENDA DEADLINES

August 18, 1975: February 2, 1976
December 1, 1975: April 19, 1976

R. P.&A. MEETINGS
(1:30 p.m. in 210 ME Bldg.)

August 19 & 21, 1975: January 13 & 15, 1976
September 16 & 18, 1975: February 3, 10, & 12, 1976
October 21 & 23, 1975: March 9 & 11, 1976
November 18 & 20, 1975: April 13, 15, & 20, 1976
December 2, 1975
August 20, 1975

MEMO TO: ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: DR. CURTIS ADAMS, CHAIRMAN
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

RE: CHANGES AND PROPOSED CHANGES IN
UMR TRAFFIC REGULATIONS

After operating under the present parking system for a period of one year it is apparent that the system had provided a degree of flexibility and convenience which was not possible under the previous system. It was also apparent as some of you have pointed out, that certain problems inhere in the new system. The Committee has taken action on two problems and is requesting input from the Academic Council on a third. Two changes (additions) to the regulations which are effective with the Fall, 1975 semester are quoted below:

.10 Parking Violations
.1002 (ADD)
No motor vehicle on the UMR campus shall be parked in a lot designated for use only by Faculty and Staff unless the parking permit affixed to the vehicle has been issued to a Faculty or Staff member.

.1003 (ADD)
No motor vehicle on the UMR campus shall be parked in a parking space designated and marked for use by handicapped persons unless the operator of the vehicle is handicapped and the special handicapped decal is affixed to the left rear bumper of the vehicle along with a current, valid permit for the lot.

Rationale for these changes are:

.1002 This addition gives the Committee the option of designating certain lots for staff and faculty parking. The Committee voted last Spring, 1975, semester to designate the two lots in the center of the main campus (Lots #1 and #2) as staff and faculty lots. This designation will be effective on September 1, 1975.

.1003 This addition simply implements provisions made earlier for handicap parking. To date ten spaces have been allocated for use by handicapped persons.
In addition to the changes cited above, the Traffic Safety Committee proposes the following change(addition) to the regulations:

"No motor vehicle on the UMR campus shall be parked in a lot designated and marked for special permit unless the special permit decal is attached to the left side of the rear bumper."

This addition is designed to give the Committee the option of establishing special purpose parking lots. In creating this option the Committee was reacting to a problem caused by the paucity of parking spaces at the University Lot adjacent to the Buehler Building. During the Spring, 1975, semester persons with Gold and Silver lots were using the Buehler lot for parking during shopping exercises and other personal business visits to downtown Rolla. The proposed special parking lot designation should alleviate this problem. Before proceeding further with this change the Committee will consider comment from the Academic Council.

Sincerely,

Dr. Curtis Adams, Chairman
Traffic Safety Committee

CA:vac
DIRECT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO UMR ROTC CADETS, 1 SEP 75-31 AUG 76

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ARMY</th>
<th>AIR FORCE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ROTC SCHOLARSHIPS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Number of Students with ROTC Scholarships</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Yearly Value of Scholarships &amp; $1661 Each for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Students, $2741 for Out-of-State Students</td>
<td>$42,024</td>
<td>$41,443</td>
<td>$83,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subsistence Payments for Non-Scholarship Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Number of Non-Scholarship Advanced ROTC Cadets</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Yearly Subsistence Payments &amp; $850 Each</td>
<td>$11,050</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
<td>$16,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advanced Camp Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Number of Students in 1st Year Advanced ROTC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Yearly Advanced Camp Pay &amp; $480 Each</td>
<td>$5,280</td>
<td>$5,760</td>
<td>$11,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total Direct Financial Assistance this School Year</td>
<td>$58,354</td>
<td>$52,303</td>
<td>$110,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Members of the Academic Council  

From: Dr. Donald E. Modesitt, A/C Representative, UMR Curricula Committee  

Re: Committee Actions through September 15, 1975

The Committee has recommended the following:

A. Curriculum change approval:
   1. Civil Engineering.
   2. Mining Engineering.

B. Course Addition Approval:
   2. English 10.
   3. English 11.

Other Committee activities have included initial discussion of the request from the Committee of Deans in regard to the introduction/revision of the course numbering system.

Actions are progressing toward a 'near future' recommendation for the proposed undergraduate degree plans for Life Science and Sociology.

Respectfully submitted for the Committee,

S/Donald E. Modesitt
September 23, 1975

MEMORANDUM TO: ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEMBERS
FROM: WAYNE COGELL, CHAIRMAN, FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
SUBJECT: PROPOSED REVISION OF POLICY MEMORANDUM NO. 16

The response of the Faculty Personnel Committee to the Proposed Revision of Policy Memorandum No. 16 is expressed in the following concerns:

First, the second page is confusing, ambiguous, and contradictory. Mixed together are an assumption about the right to promotion, a vague statement about quality prerequisite for promotion, and definitions.

Second, the section on exceptions is not clear in its directives or lines of responsibility.

Third, the editorial style is not consistent.

The Faculty Personnel Committee reworked the "Proposed Revision" to eliminate the above difficulties.

The Committee recommends that "The New Revised Edition" along with the concerns that prompted the new revision be sent immediately to the Chancellor for his consideration.
PROPOSED REVISION OF POLICY MEMORANDUM NO. 16
Endorsed by the Academic Council

QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROFESSORIAL ACADEMIC RANKS: The objective of this Policy Memorandum is to establish uniform, campus-wide, minimum qualifications for full-time professorial academic ranks. It is to be understood that fulfillment of these minimum professional qualifications and minimum years of experience does not make promotion automatic.

I. Minimum Professional Qualifications as indicated for appropriate rank:

A. Assistant Professor (ap): Appropriate doctorate from a reputable institution, or, in unusual cases, an outstanding publication record or professional experience; and promise of excellent teaching ability.

B. Associate Professor (AP): ap qualifications and a distinguished record in at least two of the following three areas of responsibility.
   1. Proven teaching ability: In the classroom or in the supervision of independent study.
   2. Proven research ability: By publication of significant research results; or proven capability of attracting research support; or publication of textbooks; or other scholarly or creative attainments recognized in the field.
   3. Effective participation in professional activities; Departmental and University functions (short courses, conferences, seminars, curricular development, academic advising, etc.), or professional organizations; or professional service in the community.

C. Professor (P): AP qualifications and continued distinguished performance in two of the areas listed in I-B.

II. Minimum Years of Experience as indicated for appropriate rank:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>3 years in AP rank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>(AP)</td>
<td>3 years in ap rank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>(ap)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Exceptions: Recommendations for exceptions to any of the above guidelines should be proposed by the department chairman to his dean.
IV. Definitions:

A. **Experience**: Full-time professional activities that enhance the faculty member's ability to function in one or more of the areas of responsibility under I-B.

B. **Professional Activities**: Service performed before or after the doctorate; to include academic, industrial, or government service, with qualification that industrial or government service alone will not suffice for appointment to the rank of Professor (P).
MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Jim Johnson, Chairman of the Academic Council

FROM: J. C. Pogue

SUBJECT: Promotion and Tenure Recommendation

October 1, 1975

Jim, the Chancellor asked that I convey to you his decisions regarding the Academic Council recommendation to him concerning Policies and Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure. I have accomplished his request by rewriting the Academic Council recommendation. A copy of that rewrite is attached. Let me indicate the basic stipulations given by the Chancellor:

1. The line responsibility for initiating and processing recommendations for either promotion or tenure is from the department chairperson, to the dean, to the Chancellor, to the President. Each administrative head is also responsible for insuring that all department, school/college, campus and U-Wide guidelines for promotion and tenure are adhered to.

2. At each step in the process, provision should be made for an appeal by a given individual to the next higher level, that is, for example, from a department to a school.

3. Although the department chairperson, dean, and Chancellor have the responsibility for promotion and tenure recommendations, they should make use of some advisory system involving faculty. There should be no absolute method by which faculty participation in the process is achieved in order that differences in unit operations may be allowed and necessary flexibility introduced at any step in the process. Therefore, the manner of participation is a function of the unit head and the unit. But there should be the involvement of faculty in the process of making the recommendations for promotion and tenure.

4. Executive Guideline No. 7, dated March 22, 1973, states that one activity of the departmental chairman at the University of Missouri is to "prepare recommendations for reappointments, promotions, changes of status, salary changes, leaves of absence, tenure..."

Jim, I believe you know that the Chancellor feels that the promotion and tenure process and policy on campus is of the greatest importance. His efforts last year were in large part to insure an improved process. The attached statement is basically the process used last year, and, hopefully,
insures both a clear process and an open line of appeal to any negative decision. I trust that a second year under this procedure will be even more effective.

Jim, I apologize for not having this information available to you in sufficient time for its distribution with the agenda prior to the meeting of the Academic Council on Thursday, October 2, 1975. I will be present at the meeting to discuss the Chancellor's decision and to answer any questions which the Council may have. I will provide copies of both this letter and the Chancellor's statement to all members present on Thursday.

J. C. Pogue
Provost and Dean of Faculties

JCP/kjg

Attachments

cc Chancellor Raymond L. Bisplinghoff
   Vice-Chancellor Dudley Thompson
   Dean A. H. Daane
   Dean J. S. Johnson
   Dean G. E. Lorey
   Dean R. H. McFarland
   Dean T. J. Planje
   Dean P. E. Ponder
   Members of the Academic Council
MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. James W. Johnson, Chairman, Academic Council
FROM: Wayne Cogell, Chairman, Personnel Committee
RE: UMC Retirement Plan Report

The Personnel Committee makes the following recommendations:

1. that a special meeting of the Academic Council be held on October 23, at 1:30 in Room G-5 to review the UMC Report;

2. that Dr. Jim Pogue and Dr. William Brooks, UMR representatives to the U-Wide Staff Benefits Committee, and Dr. Donald Holm, Chairman of the U-Wide Staff Benefits Committee, be invited to answer questions about the UMC Report; and

3. that, because of the complexity of the UMC Report, all questions be submitted to Dr. James Johnson in writing by October 16.
Chairman Jim Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, October 2, 1975, in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building.

After welcoming the members and guests, the Chairman reported that Tommie Wilson, D. R. Cunningham, and Gordon Weiss were attending as proxies for Dave Summers, Gabe Skitek, and Stuart Johnson, respectively.

The Chairman called for approval of the minutes of the September 4, 1975, meeting. The motion was made by Adrian Daane, seconded by Troy Hicks, and carried.

In order for Lt. Col. Stroh to be present for discussion, the Chairman requested that an item of new business be advanced in the agenda. The motion for advancement was made by Harold Fuller, and seconded by Ralph Schowalter. The motion carried.

Colonel Crowley reported to the Council that both the Army and Air Force officer training programs at UMR have been placed on evaluation status by the Army and Air Force because of low enrollments in these programs. He gave a slide presentation showing the enrollments in ROTC and AFROTC for the last several years. In brief, Colonel Crowley's report illustrated the following reduction in enrollment:

1) AFROTC cadet enrollment is down from 69 in 1971-72 to 57 in 1975-76; 2) Army ROTC cadet enrollment is down from 451 in 1970-71 to 82 in 1975-76. Colonel Crowley stressed that the minimum of 17 AFROTC students at the AS III level has never been reached (12 this year), and that the number of Army ROTC students at the MS III level, with a minimum of 25, has dropped from 60 in 1970-71 to 11 this year. He further stressed that the minimum of 15 for officer production has never been reached in AFROTC (7 last year), and that officer production in Army ROTC has dropped from 113 in 1970 to 14 last year. As a result of low enrollments and officer production, the officer training programs face possible elimination at UMR. Colonel Crowley stressed the value of these programs for UMR, since ROTC and AFROTC scholarships have brought 47 quality students to UMR this year, with a total financial assistance of over $100,000 (full report*).

Colonel Crowley and Lt. Col. Stroh then answered several questions involving the enrollment in officer training programs: whether other college programs are also on evaluation status; whether the negative attitude toward military service is partly responsible; whether the low enrollment corresponds with the enrollment at UMR. Colonel Crowley replied that 41 college programs, including UMR, are on evaluation and that the low enrollment at UMR, as well as the existence of both Army and Air Force programs at UMR, have been factors. Lt. Col. Stroh reported that nation-wide there has been a reduction from 180 Air Force detachments to 172, and that the UMR detachment has dropped from position 108 to 161. The next question concerned delays in cadets' receiving commissions. Colonel Crowley reported that Army graduates have an option for six months of active duty plus reserve or two years of active duty; he announced that during the last two years all of the graduates at UMR have been given their options and been placed immediately.
Lt. Col. Stroh reported that all Air Force graduates have active duty, and that there have been some delays because of budget cuts. However, according to Lt. Col. Stroh, graduates can resign in case of a delay. Then asked whether delays actually cause some resignations, he replied that very few cadets resign after reaching the sophomore or junior years, and that the real problem is getting a large enough base in the freshman year.

Chairman Johnson, announcing that Colonel Crowley and Lt. Col. Stroh had given their presentation to the Chancellor's Council, explained that the Chancellor wished to know the attitude of the faculty before actively endorsing support of the officer training programs. As a result, the Chairman asked members of the Council to take questionnaires to their departments to be answered and returned to the Academic Council office Monday, October 6. Two questions followed. First, since the problem lies in a low freshman enrollment in ROTC, should not the freshman advisers be asked to encourage students to enroll in ROTC? Chairman Johnson replied that the freshman advisers have already been notified. Second, in what form could UMR aid the ROTC programs. The Chairman replied with three possibilities: to make greater use of military courses as free electives; to add greater incentive to potential cadets by enlarging scholarship money available; and to emphasize the ROTC programs more during advisement of students.

SECURITY AND TRAFFIC SAFETY: The Chairman reminded the Council that two motions concerning changes in parking regulations had been tabled at the September meeting, in order to have a member of the Traffic Committee present for discussion. Gary Patterson made a motion to untable the two items, and Herbert Harvey seconded it. The motion carried.

Richard Johnson, representing the Traffic Committee, reviewed changes 1 and 3, which had been passed by the committee last spring (change 2 concerning parking spaces for the handicapped was approved at the September 4 meeting of the Council). He prefaced his remarks by saying that last year the committee had been faced with overcrowding in several lots. Thus, it had taken the following action to alleviate the problems for this year:

Change 1: Lots 1 and 2 (gold) would be restricted to faculty and staff until 2:30 p.m.

Change 3: The Buehler lot (green) would be a special permit lot to avoid parking by persons on downtown business and shopping trips.

Richard Johnson made two additional explanations: the regulations were written in a general way (full memorandum filed with smooth copy of the September 4, 1975, minutes) for flexibility in case such restrictions were needed in other lots; and the changes were intended for one year only while the committee tried to find another solution. Richard Johnson then responded to several concerns or questions. Lyle Pursell suggested that, since lots 1 and 2 have a new designation, the price should be raised. Johnson replied that raising the price requires U-wide approval, which would take six to nine months.
Lyle Rhea expressed concern that gold lots are all the same price but that students with gold stickers cannot now park in lots 1 and 2. Johnson responded that the students were carefully advised of the restriction before purchasing the gold stickers this year and, when necessary, allowed to exchange their stickers. Chairman Johnson added several comments from his discussion with Curt Adams, Chairman of the Security and Traffic Safety Committee: the Board of Curators has established priorities for parking privileges in this order--faculty, staff, students; lots for student parking at UMR are closer to all parts of the campus than on many other campuses; the special permits for the Buehler lot would be administered by the Traffic Committee, not the director of the building. Lyle Pursell suggested that a permanent solution based on a correlation between price and demand be found.

Reminding the Council that it makes only recommendations on parking regulations, Chairman Johnson called for a vote on the two tabled motions. The motion on change 1 (designating lots for faculty and staff only) passed; the motion on change 3 (the designation of certain lots for special permits) passed.

PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY: Chairman Johnson announced that the Academic Council had just received copies from the Chancellor of Policies and Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations (full copy*) and that Jim Pogue would answer inquiries about it. Chuck Johnson inquired what changes had been made. Pogue prefaced his remarks by saying that the description of the campus level procedures (II. C.) was the exact procedure used by the Chancellor last spring. Then, in reference to his cover memorandum to Dr. Jim Johnson (full memorandum*), he identified the major change from the procedure statement passed by the Academic Council (March 6, 1975, IV, 9.6) as greater responsibility for the department chairman in initiating and making recommendations for promotion and tenure. He again referred Council members to his cover memorandum, which quotes part of Executive Guideline No. 7 on the role of the department chairman. He noted that, although the Council's procedure statement had described a departmental review committee, the Chancellor's document requires the department chairman to make use of advisory assistance from the faculty. Dr. Pogue also noted that the Chancellor's document still has an appeal process at each level. In the discussion that followed, two major concerns were expressed: faculty participation in departmental recommendations (II, A.2) and the availability of a candidate's files to him (II. A.4). Specifically, it was asked why the departmental committee was omitted. The Chancellor, Dr. Pogue replied, intends that the chairman be in the line of responsibility and that the nature of faculty participation remain flexible. There was concern expressed that in some departments there might be little or no faculty participation. In that regard, Lyle Pursell questioned the phrasing of the section on faculty participation (II, A.2). According to Dr. Pogue, the intent was that the chairman must provide for faculty participation. The concern about the candidate's files being available to him centered on confidential material that might be included. Dr. Pogue replied that the deans had been notified that materials could not be withheld from faculty, but that this opinion would be double-checked.
Chairman Johnson reminded the Council that any decision on the administrative response to the Council's Promotion and Tenure Policy would normally be postponed until the next meeting because of the requirement that written reports be submitted ten days prior to a meeting. Lyle Rhea made a motion to delay consideration of the Chancellor's Policies and Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations until the next meeting; the motion was seconded by Chuck Johnson. Jim Pogue announced that the Chancellor's document is now in effect, and that he would check further into the matters of faculty participation and confidentiality of files. Gary Patterson suggested that the matter of faculty participation might be clarified editorially by adding an explicit phrase indicating that the chairman had considered faculty recommendations in reaching his conclusions. The motion to delay consideration carried.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM: Bob Gerson briefly reviewed the Academic Council request that the Academic Freedom Committee consider the Student Council faculty evaluations (April 10, 1975, IV, 10.7). He made a motion that the committee's first resolution, asking the Student Council to conform to the principle of privacy in reporting the evaluations, be approved by the Academic Council. Bassem Armaly seconded the motion; it carried.

Then Dr. Gerson moved that the second resolution, requesting the Student Personnel Committee to examine the nature of the evaluation form (full copy of both resolutions in September 4, 1975, minutes), be approved. Ralph Schowalter seconded. Discussion brought out the following ideas: a single form would not work for all departments; each department should conduct its own evaluation for promotion or tenure purposes; the Student Council should have a faculty representative; the students should present criteria to the faculty for inclusion on a form; there may be two different forms for students and administration-faculty; the students should be allowed to get the information they want for themselves. Wayne Cogell reported that the Personnel Committee had suggested the possibility of rejecting student evaluation forms totally. The Chairman asked Gerson whether the Academic Freedom Committee is requesting the Personnel Committee to devise an evaluation form; Gerson stated that the Personnel Committee is requested to examine the Student Council form before it is used for evaluation. The motion to refer the Student Council evaluation form to the Personnel Committee carried.

BUDGETARY AFFAIRS: As requested by Harold Puller, Jim Pogue gave a summary of UMR's budget situation, showing a probable deficit for 1975-76 of $100,000. If the governor withholds 3% next spring, the campus must provide an additional $327,000. As a result, Dr. Pogue explained, a moratorium on all hiring was initiated on September 18. A question whether the moratorium included TA's was answered positively. Dr. Pogue then presented the prognosis for the 1976-77 budget, based on a figure of 10 million dollars, though 8.8 million, as recommended by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education, may be more realistic. But, on the basis of 10 million with a 6% S&W increase, an 8% E&E increase, and increases in mandatory expenditures, the deficit for 1976-77 would be $437,000, assuming the present operation of the campus. The proposal for a $30 a semester fee increase would reduce that deficit to $127,000.
Harold Fuller reported that the Chancellor had requested from the Budgetary Affairs Committee suggestions for budget cuts for this year and next year. He reported the results of a comparison of the UMR budget this year and ten years ago, when the enrollment was approximately the same. Ten years ago S&W made up 72% of the budget; this year S&W is slightly over 80%. Dr. Fuller commented that UMR has one of the higher percentages for S&W for the four campuses. He also noted that the teaching faculty and staff is 20-25% higher now. Finally, he reported that the budget for radio, ITV, police, Business Office, and Extension is approximately double that of ten years ago. In conclusion, Fuller announced that the Budgetary Affairs Committee would forward its recommended budget cuts to the Chancellor shortly, with the recommendations based on the rationale of cutting elements that contribute least to the educational program of the campus. It was also announced that Dr. Fuller serves on an ad hoc committee for the 1976-77 budget.

CURRICULUM: Jim Pogue presented Don Modesitt's report from the Curricula Committee (full memorandum*). Dr. Pogue made a motion for approval of a curriculum change in Civil and Mining Engineering—the reduction of required hours in Humanities and Social Sciences from 18 to 15. Adrian Daane seconded the motion, and it carried. Pogue then moved approval of four course additions: Engineering Management 320, English 10 and 11, and Petroleum Engineering I. The motion was seconded by Darrel Ownby. Discussion included a brief identification of the courses: Engineering Management 320 dealing with small businesses and English 10 and 11 as English for foreign students. In regard to the number of Petroleum Engineering, Patterson asked whether UMR has a standard numbering system. Dr. Pogue replied that the Curricula Committee is presently working on a standard system. It was suggested that the report for the Council on curriculum changes be more detailed in the future. The motion to approve the four courses carried.

RETIREMENT AND STAFF BENEFITS: Wayne Cogell gave a report from the Personnel Committee on the Council's previous referral of a UMC proposal for changes in retirement and staff benefits (September 4, 1975, V, 1.7). The report (full memorandum*) recommended a special meeting of the Academic Council on October 23, 1975, at 1:30 p.m. in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building. A panel composed of Jim Pogue and Bill Brooks, the UMR representatives to the U-wide Staff Benefits Committee, and Dr. Donald Holm, Chairman of the U-wide Staff Benefits Committee, would answer questions from faculty. The questions, according to Dr. Cogell, could be general ones on retirement and benefits or specific ones on the UMC proposal, and should be submitted to Dr. Jim Johnson by October 20. Dr. Cogell made a motion that this report calling for the special meeting be approved; Chuck Johnson seconded it. Jim Pogue recommended that the questions should be submitted by October 16. It was agreed to change that date in the motion. The function of the special meeting was questioned. Dr. Cogell responded that it would raise questions about the UMC report to serve as a response to the UMC faculty. Council members were also informed that copies of the UMC proposal would be sent to them for circulation in their departments and that the special meeting would be open to all faculty. The motion carried.
POLICY MEMORANDUM NUMBER 16: Wayne Cogell announced that the Personnel Committee, with input from the faculty, had studied the Proposed Revision of Policy Memorandum No. 16, as approved by the Chancellor (September 4, 1975, V, 1.10). In reference to the committee's response to the Academic Council (full memorandum), he summarized the three concerns of the committee: 1) lack of organization and clarity on page 2 of the Proposed Revision; 2) lack of clarity in the section on exceptions; 3) lack of consistent editorial style. After informing the Council that the Personnel Committee had rewritten the Proposed Revision, Dr. Cogell moved approval of the committee's report—that the three concerns and the new revision (full copy) be forwarded to the Chancellor for his consideration. The motion was seconded by Larry Josey. Discussion followed. Ralph Schowalter suggested that non-degree granting departments would be handicapped in hiring faculty under the committee's revision. Chairman Johnson read a memorandum from Lyman Francis objecting to part of the Personnel Committee revision. The memorandum called for the addition of special training as a qualification for hiring at the rank of assistant professor since teachers in Engineering Graphics come from technological schools, without doctorates, publications, or professional experience. Dr. Cogell responded that the regulations cover the normal situations and cannot list all exceptions; furthermore, speaking for the Personnel Committee, he stated that the section on exceptions (III of the revision) is flexible enough to cover unusual situations. Ralph Schowalter moved that the motion be amended to add the phrase "and/or special training" after "professional experience" in the qualifications for assistant professor. Lyle Pursell seconded the amendment. Bob Gerson spoke against the amendment, saying that the regulations cannot cover all exceptions and that "special training" could cover a very broad area. The amendment failed to pass. Chuck Johnson questioned the section of the revision on exceptions, in that the department chairman recommends exceptions to his dean and no further process is described. Dr. Cogell explained that each exception goes a different route; thus the dean would have to pursue each exception with the proper administrative officer.

Several Council members inquired whether other campuses of the University have a similar policy memorandum and, if so, whether the content is uniform. Dr. Cogell announced that the Personnel Committee had requested copies of such documents from other campuses; Chairman Johnson proposed that the matter be referred to the UMR UMIFAC representative. The motion to approve the Personnel Committee's recommendations to the Chancellor for the Proposed Revision of Policy Memorandum No. 16 carried.

A question was asked about the justification for the reduction of required hours in Humanities and Social Sciences by two engineering departments. Dr. Pogue replied that the engineering departments informed the Curricula Committee that the reason was a desire to gain additional elective hours. He further commented that the committee had referred the request for reduction to the Committee of Deans for comment; both the Committee of Deans and the Curricula Committee felt that each department and school has the prerogative over its curriculum. However, the Curricula Committee, he continued, had cautioned the engineering departments to be concerned about their accreditation.
ANNOUNCEMENTS: Ralph Schowalter announced that all the changes in the By-laws had passed except the one changing the officers of the Academic Council to members-at-large. He noted that the approved changes had been forwarded to the Board of Curators.

Glen Haddock announced that National Merit Day has been postponed to December 5 because the list of finalists and semi-finalists might not be available by November 7.

Chairman Johnson closed with two brief reports: first, the actions of the Board of Curators at its last meeting; second, the budget status of the Academic Council.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Pogue
Marilyn Pogue, Secretary

*Complete document filed with the smooth copy.

Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of the actions approved.
October 16, 1975

TO: UMR Faculty

RE: AGENDA for the Special Academic Council Meeting, Thursday, October 23, 1975, at 1:30 p.m. in G-5 of the Humanities & Social Sciences Building.

I. The Retirement Plan Report prepared by the UMC Faculty, March, 1975, will be discussed at a Special Meeting of the Academic Council. Drs. Jim Pogue and William Brooks, UMR representatives to the U-Wide Staff Benefits Committee, and Dr. Donald Holm, Chairman of the Committee, will be invited to attend and answer questions regarding the report and staff benefits in general.

Due to the complexity of the report, attendee's are encouraged to submit questions in writing to the Academic Council Office, 105 Parker Hall, by October 16. The questions will be passed on to our representatives for study.

One copy of the report will be sent to each Academic Council member for circulation to the faculty members in his department.

All faculty and staff are encouraged to attend this Special Meeting.
Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Academic Council, October 23, 1975.

Chairman Jim Johnson called the special meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on October 23, 1975, in G-5, Humanities-Social Sciences Building.

After reminding Council members and visitors that the special meeting had been requested by the Personnel Committee to answer questions on the UMC retirement proposal, as well as general questions on retirement and benefits, he announced that Jim Pogue and Bill Brooks, the UMR representatives to the U-wide Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee, would answer questions, and that Dr. Donald Holm, the Chairman of the U-wide committee, had been consulted by telephone. Chairman Johnson also remarked that the Council would not be making recommendations at this meeting but raising questions and concerns to serve as a response to the UMC faculty. He then turned the meeting over to Wayne Cogell, Chairman of the Personnel Committee.

Cogell announced that Pogue and Brooks would interpret the first eight recommendations in the UMC report.*

1. Recommendation D: Retiree/Spouse Income Adjustment Provision.

Pogue explained this recommendation as calling for an individual's retirement figure to be raised or lowered the same percentage that the average salary/wage figure for all employed persons in the same category (e.g., the average salary for all full professors) is raised or lowered from the preceding year. The purpose would be to provide an adjustment for inflation.

Pogue commented that this type of adjustment would not necessarily correspond to inflationary increases, for the raise in the salaries of full professors could be less or greater than the cost of living. Furthermore, salary increases might be based on merit rather than inflation.

A concern about the cost of living raises in retirement benefits came from the floor. Brooks stated that the cost of living index is a major consideration of the U-wide Retirement Committee. Pogue said that the Board of Curators, however, will probably not institute automatic inflationary raises in retirement benefits. Instead, the Board will consider separate recommendations on an ad hoc basis. He reported that in August, 1975, a recommendation from the U-wide Retirement Committee for an inflationary increase in retirement benefits was approved by the Board.


This recommendation calls for elimination of the limit of 35 years of service for computing retirement; this limit actually imposed a penalty on persons working longer (penalty in the form of smaller retirement for a person with the same salary base).
Discussion followed on the ratio of actual length of service to potential length of service in relation to the retirement formula. At the request of a member of the Council, Brooks wrote the current formula on the board: \( (1\% \text{ of the average regular annual salary of the member for the 5 consecutive years in the last 10 full years in which the average regular annual salary is the highest} + 0.6\% \text{ of the excess of the average salary above $4800}) \times \text{years of service} \) multiplied by 12 for the monthly benefit.

Pogue reported that Recommendation E was accomplished by the Board of Curators at its August, 1975, meeting; thus, the actual years of service will now be counted rather than the limit of 35.


This recommendation calls for crediting part-time service on a ratio with full-time service.

Pogue reported that the actuary is already working on a cost study of part-time service.

4. Recommendation H: Regular Salary, Summer Term.

This recommendation calls for computing one's retirement by including summer salary as part of a person's regular salary for a year.

Pogue reported that the actuary is already preparing a cost study for including summer salary.

A question from the floor was whether summer grants would be included, as well as teaching salary. Pogue said that grants should be included.

Finally, he identified some problems in including summer salary: the limited teaching positions during the summer would mean that some faculty would not be able to work; the lack of past service funding for those teaching in the summer during the last five high years.


Brooks announced that the U-wide committee is interested in improved communication with the University family, but that efforts in the past have brought little participation, especially on the other campuses. He suggested that specific information is always available to an individual at the Personnel Office and that both he and Jim Pogue are always willing to obtain answers upon request.

Pogue, referring to a request that each faculty and staff member be advised yearly of his retirement status, reported Dr. Holm's statement that the committee would pursue the possibility, but that such a program would be very costly.

6. Recommendation C: Adjustment of Funding Percentages.

Brooks reported that the actuarial recommendation of 74\% funding rather than
the present 8% academic and 4% non-academic funding has already been made by the University to the Board of Curators.

He commented that the intent of all in the University system is to fulfill the actuarial recommendation but that the limited budget poses a problem.

7. Recommendation I: Retirement Committee Appointment.

This recommendation calls for the President of the University to consult with UMIFAC on appointments to the U-wide committee.

Brooks reported that recommendations are submitted to the President from the campuses; Pogue added that the President has not turned down a Chancellor's recommendations.

Brooks also commented that the U-wide committee should have a low turnover because of the long learning period necessary for a new committee member.


This recommendation presents the objective of a basic retiree income of 50% of the average of the high five out of the last ten years with 30 years of service (present retirement of 43.68% for average salary of $20,000, page 6 of UMC report).

Brooks commented that the U-wide committee has worked toward improving the formula, but that past service liability must be funded before benefits can be increased. Pogue added that the change in contribution to 7½% is an attempt to speed up the funding of past service liability.

Discussion brought out several questions and comments about the current retirement formula and the funding:

a. There were suggestions that the word consecutive be omitted from the stipulation of the average salary for the highest five consecutive years, or that those five years not include a year's leave of absence; otherwise, a faculty member would avoid a leave or be penalized on his retirement by having taken a leave during the last ten years.

b. It was suggested that the stipulation of five consecutive years also prohibits a person teaching only part-time during his last years of active work. Pogue brought up another problem with part-time teaching, i.e., the loss of other benefits.

c. It was suggested that the 50% objective should be raised, since even that retirement figure is inadequate. Brooks commented that the problem is actuarial, for a sound base is necessary first; then the formula could be improved. He also suggested that no retirement system is intended to be completely adequate, because of the prohibitive cost of funding an adequate program. It was also reported that out of the Big Ten and Big Eight universities, Missouri University ranks fourth in its retirement benefits.
d. One suggestion was to raise the 50% figure by allowing faculty to contribute in addition to the University's funding. Pogue suggested that the individual faculty member may, in effect, do that now through the tax-sheltered annuity.

e. Several questions concerned the investment of the retirement fund: who can borrow at the rate of 4½%; what is the current rate; is the retirement fund sound; and what are the types of investments?

Brooks reported that the 4½% is only an actuarial assumption for a 40-year period and that it is very difficult to make a short term analysis. He further reported that a complete report of investments and the status of the retirement fund is always available in the Provost's office to any faculty or staff member.

Cogell then read the questions and comments that had been submitted. Responses were given by Brooks and Pogue.

1. The plan should be returned to non-vesting since there is no current shortage of teachers to warrant costly rewarding of transients.

Answer. Brooks responded that non-vesting downgrades a retirement plan conceptually and is usually considered undesirable. Pogue suggested that the question of non-vesting should be determined on its own merit instead of being used as a tool for faculty turnover.

2. Place all on a 9-month income basis instead of allowing administrative personnel to count 12 months.

Answer. Dr. Holm, as reported by Pogue, said that 9-month people receive the same year's credit as 11-month people. Holm also advised that, instead of reducing benefits by cutting the applicable salary of administrators from 11 to 9 months, the possibility of increasing faculty on 9-month appointment to salary encompassing 11 months should be explored.

Pogue reported again that the actuary is already preparing a cost study for including summer salary.

A suggestion from the floor was that all faculty have their 9-month salaries converted to 11-month equivalences for purposes of the retirement formula.

3. Return the plan to the 50% average of all full professors' annual salaries as a maximum retirement benefit.

Answer. This method, in contrast to the present use of the average of the individual's salary for five years, would reduce the retirement benefits of the individuals who have a higher average than that of the entire rank. The concern expressed was that salaries that had been based on merit would thus not have a corresponding retirement benefit. Brooks reported that the U-wide committee has not been favorable toward pulling down the upper average of individuals.
Discussion from the floor included the following point: since high salaries rob the retirement fund, a maximum limit for retirement benefits should be imposed.

4. Is any part of summer session S & W money included in the annual budget which incorporates the 8% sum allocated for retirement?

Answer. No.

5. Why are there no representatives of skilled and unskilled workers on the U-wide committee?

Answer. Brooks responded that the size of the U-wide committee is already large and that the plan calls for the faculty to be the majority on the committee. Furthermore, he reported that Lee Belcher represents the unions and Bill Poore, the non-academic personnel.

6. Will the University find it necessary to raise the 8% figure because of the decline in people leaving before attaining the 10-year vestment plateau?

Answer. Since the original assumption was based on a turnover and the 40-year maturation period calls for it, the answer is yes.

Additional comments included the following: 1) if the University has non-vesting, the policy should be contributory; 2) a faculty member should not be penalized for only eight years of service; 3) many faculty now want tenure but cannot achieve it; thus, they will receive no credit for retirement; 4) could not each person have a fund and the University add 8%.

7. When do staff benefits for a new staff member begin—with his contract date of September 1 or with his teaching duties in August?

Answer. New contracts are dated at August registration to ensure benefits coverage.

8. When do retirement benefits begin—June 1 or September?

Answer. After the receipt of the last pay check. The last pay check would be received the end of August, retirement benefits would begin September 1, and the first retirement check would be received the end of September.

9. When does mandatory retirement begin in terms of the 70th birth date?

Answer. The date used is September 1; a person who reaches 70 before September 1 could not teach that year.

10. Do staff on 12-month appointments receive credit for their total salary or do they receive credit for 9/12ths of their annual salary?

Answer. Their annual salary.
11. Should summer time count toward years of service as additional pro-rated service?

Answer. On the basis of the 9-month appointment, the year of service is counted in the formula. The concern seems to center in the adjustment of the salary in the formula.

12. Do the UM figures assume vesting after 10 years or vesting after 20 years?

Answer. After 10 years.

13. In comparing the UM program with TIAA/CREF, was an adjustment made for the fact that TIAA/CREF provides immediate vesting but the UM program does not?

Answer. The benefits in the other plans are lower.

From the floor came an additional question about the difference in the plans.

Answer. TIAA is the usual standard. In comparison to it the MU plan is better for the following reasons: 1) it has a benefits formula that is more favorable; 2) it has a lower overhead; 3) the immediate vesting of TIAA is a large financial burden. Moreover, CREF has the problem of benefits going down with a drop in securities.

14. Is the University considering a vesting schedule change; if so, what is being proposed and when would it be effective?

Answer. The University meets present federal legislation with its ten-year vesting. If federal legislation changed, then the University would, of course, consider a change. At present no change is being considered. Lowering the period to five years would cost over a million dollars.

15. Should the University join the state employee retirement plan?

Answer. Chairman Johnson reported that benefits are higher in the University plan.

16. Would it be possible or advisable to set up a two-track retirement system, with an option between the University plan and a TIAA plan of equal cost to the University with the probability of requiring a contribution by the individual? The rationale given in the question and from the floor was that the University plan encourages a static faculty and limits an individual's mobility.

A similar question came from the floor: has the University considered an alternative of the 5% TIAA plan or the 8% UM plan?

Answer. The latter alternative has not been considered. The problem with a two-track system is that insurance functions on numbers; thus, splitting the base would make both plans more costly. At the present an individual can have the contributory option in addition to the non-contributory University plan by using the tax-sheltered annuities. Finally, Cogell reported from Holm that a non-contributory plan will kill a contributory plan.
17. The investment of the retirement fund does not appear good.

   Answer. Compared to the investment of other funds, like TIAA and CREF, the University investment is superior.

The following questions came from the floor.

1. Is the investment committed to the present trustee?

   Answer. Investment of retirement funds is usually on long term. Brooks responded that he did not know the term of the investment arrangement.

2. Is all money under one trusteeship?

   Answer. Yes, because it is an agent relationship, with the trustee acting in the investor's best behalf. Competition would be undesirable, for trustees would then take more undue risks.

3. Does the Board of Curators make a contract with the trust company?

   Answer. The trusteeship is usually ongoing, but can be terminated.

4. Could the annual status of the retirement fund be reported to the individual faculty member?

   Answer. The report is available now in the Provost's office.

5. Could each individual be sent an annual report of his retirement status?

   Answer. Cogell reminded the Council of the cost problem, as cited earlier.

6. Could the report made to the Board of Curators be made to the faculty yearly?

   Answer. Chairman Johnson reported that he will try to obtain it.

   At the conclusion of the questions and comments, Cogell requested that further comments be addressed to him for use by the Personnel Committee.

   The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Pogue, Secretary

*Complete document filed with the smooth copy.

Minutes are considered official notification and documentation of the actions approved by the Academic Council.
TO: UMR Faculty

RE: AGENDA for the Academic Council meeting, Thursday, November 6, 1975, at 1:30 p.m. in G-5 of the Humanities and Social Sciences Building.

I. Approval of the minutes of the October 2, 1975, meeting.

II. Unfinished business.

III. Reports of Administrative Responses to actions approved by the Academic Council.

A. Promotion and Tenure Policy - (March 6, 1975, IV,9.6)

   **(October 2, 1975, V,2.2) (Jim Pogue)

IV. Reports of standing or special committees.

A. 4.513 Public Occasions

   *1. 1977-78 Calendar of Events (Tommie Wilson)

B. 4.516 Curricula

   1. Committee Report #2 (1975-76) (Don Modesitt)

   2. Recommendation for approval of the Ph.D. degree in Engineering Mechanics

      (A copy of the complete proposal for the degree will be available for review by the faculty members in the office of the Provost and Dean of Faculties.)

C. 4.518 Library

   1. Report (Michael Patrick)

D. 4.519 Personnel (Wayne Cogell)

   1. Retirement and Staff Benefits - (September 4, 1975, V,1.7)

   *2. Review of Student Council Faculty Evaluation Form - (October 2, 1975, V,2.3)


An equal employment and educational opportunity institution
E. 4.522 Student Affairs (Gary Patterson)
\  *1. Student Organization Constitutions.

F. Ad Hoc Committee on Policy for International Student Admissions. (Tom Baird)
\  *1. Recommendation for approval.

V. New Business.

IV. Announcements.

A. In memoriam - Professor Alexander Manson Munro.

*Supplementary material sent to Academic Council members.

**Supplementary material handed out at the October 2, 1975 meeting of the Academic Council.
University of Missouri - Rolla

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
November 26, 1975

To: UMR Faculty

Re: AGENDA for the Academic Council meeting Thursday, December 4, 1975, at 1:30 p.m. in G-5 of the Humanities - Social Sciences Building.

I. Approval of the minutes of the October 23, 1975, Special Meeting, and the minutes of the November 6, 1975, meeting.

II. Unfinished business.

III. Reports of Administrative Responses to actions approved by the Academic Council.

IV. Reports of standing or special committees.

A. 4.513 Public Occasions

*1 Dates for 1976-77.

B. 4.516 Curricula


*2. Report #3 (1975-76).

3. Recommendation for approval of the B.S. degree in Life Science.

4. Recommendation for approval of the B.A./B.S. degree in Sociology.

(Copies of the complete proposals for the degrees will be available for review by the faculty members in the office of the Provost and Dean of Faculties).

C. 4.518 Library

*1. Circulation procedures for the library.

D. 4.519 Personnel

*1. Retirement and Staff Benefits - September 4, 1975, V, 1.7.

V. New business.

VI. Announcements.

*Supplementary material sent to Academic Council members.

**Supplementary material handed out at the November 6, 1975 meeting of the Academic Council.

An equal employment and educational opportunity institution.
I. General
A. Guidelines for all policies and procedures affecting recommendations for promotion and/or tenure shall fall within the principles, policies, and procedures set forth in Policy Memorandum Number 16 (revised April 22, 1975), or its equivalent, and the University Academic Tenure Regulations, dated March 17, 1972.
B. Any additional University and/or campus-wide guidelines not covered in I.A shall be made available to the faculty at the beginning of each academic year.

II. Procedure
A. Department Level
1. Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure for persons holding rank in an academic department will be initiated in that department.
2. Each department chairperson will prepare a departmental review procedure which shall provide for faculty participation in the promotion and tenure review process. The department chairperson will attach to each dossier a copy of the departmental procedures with specific references to faculty participation. The department may establish special criteria for recommending promotion and/or tenure, providing that such special criteria conform to the general guidelines listed in Section I. The department chairperson shall make the procedures and criteria available to the faculty.
3. All evidence relevant to a recommendation for promotion and/or tenure shall be directed to the department chairperson.
4. The files on candidates as assembled by the department chairperson shall at all times be available to the candidate (with the exception of confidential matter) and to the appropriate review committees at the school/college and campus levels. At least one week in advance of his/her action on the recommendations, the department chairperson will advise all candidates so that the candidate may insure the currency of information made available to the department chairperson. For promotion recommendations, the files shall normally be considered complete at the time of the chairperson's action.
5. The department chairperson shall then review all data submitted or received in regard to the proposed recommendation, including the recommendations of participating faculty.
6. After reaching his/her conclusions, whether favorable or unfavorable, the department chairperson shall in writing advise all candidates of the action taken with respect to their candidacy. Further, the department chairperson will discuss with the candidate involved any decision not to recommend promotion or tenure.
7. Any requests for promotion and/or tenure consideration not endorsed by the department chairperson will be advanced as an appeal to the school/college upon request.
8. All favorable recommendations by the department chairperson along with all documentation and attachments shall be forwarded to the dean of the school/college.

B. School/College Level
1. Each school/college dean will prepare a review procedure which shall provide for faculty participation in the promotion and tenure review process. The school/college may establish special criteria for recommending promotion and/or tenure, providing that such special criteria conform to the general guidelines listed in Section I.
The dean shall make the procedures and criteria available to the faculty in the school/college.

2. After receipt by the dean of the recommendations from the department chairperson, the dean shall allow one week to receive appeals by a candidate from an unfavorable departmental action.

3. After reaching his/her conclusions, whether favorable or unfavorable, the dean shall in writing advise all candidates of the action taken with respect to their candidacy. Further, the dean will discuss with the candidate involved any decision not to recommend promotion or tenure.

4. Any requests for promotion and/or tenure consideration not recommended by the dean will be advanced as an appeal to the Chancellor upon request.

5. All favorable recommendations of the dean of the school or college along with the appropriate forms and all support files shall be forwarded to the Chancellor through the Office of the Provost and Dean of Faculties.

C. Campus Level

1. There shall be a campus review committee consisting of the Chancellor as Chairperson, the Vice-Chancellor, the Provost and Dean of Faculties, the Dean of each School/College, the Dean of Graduate School, the Dean of Extension, one faculty member elected from and by each School/College, and the Chairperson of the Faculty Personnel Committee.

2. The campus committee shall establish procedures for reviewing recommendations brought to it by a dean of a school/college.

3. After receipt by the campus committee of the recommendations from the dean of the school/college, the campus committee shall allow one week to receive appeals by any candidate from an unfavorable action by a school/college. After receiving all appeals, the campus committee shall proceed to review all recommendations and appeals.

4. The campus committee shall first ascertain that all procedures and criteria used within the respective school/college conform to the general guidelines listed in Section I.
   a. If the procedures and criteria used within the respective school/college do not conform to the general guidelines, the campus committee shall require that they do so. The campus committee must indicate in writing specifically what action the school/college must take and shall return all recommendations from the school/college without prejudice to any individual's recommendation or appeal. The campus committee shall then allow at least one week for compliance with or appeal to its decision.
   b. When the procedures and criteria used within the respective school/college conform to the general guidelines, the campus committee shall review each recommendation and appeal request.

5. After considering all findings and recommendations of the campus committee, the Chancellor will determine the promotion and tenure recommendations to be made to the President. All candidates will be advised in writing through the dean of the school/college of the action taken by the Chancellor with respect to their candidacy. Further, the Chancellor will be available to discuss with the candidate involved any decision not to recommend promotion or tenure.

6. An appeal to the President of the Chancellor's action should be made only after consultation with the Chancellor concerning his determination.
Alexander Manson Munro
Assistant Professor of English
Department of Humanities

Vita

Alexander Manson Munro was born in Cuba, Missouri, on October 10, 1904. He graduated from Cuba High School, in 1923; graduated with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Education in 1930 from Southwest Missouri State Teachers College (now Southwest Missouri State University) at Springfield, Missouri.

He received his appointment as Instructor at the University of Missouri, School of Mines and Metallurgy, on September 1, 1959; and reached the rank of Assistant Professor in September, 1965, after the official title of the University became the University of Missouri-Rolla. Retiring in August 1970, he lived at his farm in Cuba, Missouri, until his death, August 6, 1975, at 5:15 p.m. at Missouri Baptist Hospital, St. Louis, Missouri.

Academic Service

Professor Munro's Teaching experience spanned eighteen years prior to his work at UMR. He taught at Cuba, Missouri, and the surrounding towns of Slater, Bland, and Cherryville. He was grade school principal and high school teacher at Bourbon, Missouri.

During his years at UMR Professor Munro taught English, speech, and technical writing, bringing a wealth of business background and attention-gaining anecdotes to his classes.

His informal manner and his optimism led many students to seek his advice after class. In phrasing of his own he would say, "I wish I had the communicative skills to be a counselor par excellence." He was active as an informal counselor several years before the organization of our present Counseling Center.

He was a member of the Athletic Committee; he administered the Advanced Placement Tests for Freshmen during the years 1967 to 1969; and assisted in giving the annual Graduate Records Examinations during the same period.
Community Service

Mr. Munro owned, edited, and published a newspaper, The Cuba News, for thirteen years. He was extremely proud of his Press Card issued by the Missouri Press Association, and used it often during and after his newspaper years as publisher.

His impelling interest in local and national affairs began when he was working his way through college at SMSTC.

For many years Mr. Munro belonged to the Cuba Business Men's Club; the Crawford County Fair Board; and, until his death, he belonged to the United Methodist Church of Cuba, where he attended church regularly.

Believing in the American work ethic, he directed his widely ranging activities toward providing a stable, prosperous, and pleasant land.

Resolution

Now, therefore, be it resolved:

That the Faculty of the University of Missouri-Rolla hereby express sorrow at the loss of Professor Munro and appreciation for his eleven years of dedicated and loyal service, as a faculty member, to the institution;

That this resolution be made a part of the minutes of this meeting of the Faculty, Thursday, November 6, 1975;

That copies be sent to his widow, Mrs. Hazel Munro; his daughter, Mrs. Mary Jane Bogoger; and his son, Mr. Andrew Munro.

Respectfully submitted
by the Committee

[Signatures]
Professor John M. Brewer, Chairman
Professor Melvin L. Garner
Professor Richard H. Kerr
Professor William J. Murphy
Minutes of the Academic Council meeting, November 6, 1975.

Chairman Jim Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on November 6, 1975, in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building. After announcing that no notification of proxies had been received, he noted an editorial change in the minutes of the October 2 meeting—the deletion of Student in V, 2.3, paragraph 2, line 1. Jim Pogue made a motion to approve the minutes as amended; Wayne Cogell seconded the motion, and it carried.

Ken Robertson made a motion to move forward in the agenda the in memoriam for Professor Manson Munro. The motion was seconded and approved. John Brewer read the memorial, which was signed by John M. Brewer, Melvin L. Garner, R. H. Kerr, and W. J. Murphy.

Alexander Manson Munro
Assistant Professor of English
Department of Humanities

Vita

Alexander Manson Munro was born in Cuba, Missouri, on October 10, 1904. He graduated from Cuba High School, in 1923; graduated with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Education in 1930 from Southwest Missouri State Teachers College (now Southwest Missouri State University) at Springfield, Missouri.

He received his appointment as Instructor at the University of Missouri, School of Mines and Metallurgy, on September 1, 1959; and reached the rank of Assistant Professor in September, 1965, after the official title of the University became the University of Missouri-Rolla. Retiring in August, 1970, he lived at his farm in Cuba, Missouri, until his death, August 6, 1975, at 5:15 p.m. at Missouri Baptist Hospital, St. Louis, Missouri.

Academic Service

Professor Munro's teaching experience spanned eighteen years prior to his work at UMR. He taught at Cuba, Missouri, and the surrounding towns of Slater, Bland, and Cherryville. He was grade school principal and high school teacher at Bourbon, Missouri.

During his years at UMR Professor Munro taught English, speech, and technical writing, bringing a wealth of business background and attention-gaining anecdotes to his classes.

His informal manner and his optimism led many students to seek his advice after class. In phrasing of his own he would say, "I wish I had the communicative skills to be a counselor par excellence."
He was active as an informal counselor several years before the organization of our present Counseling Center.

He was a member of the Athletic Committee; he administered the Advanced Placement Tests for Freshmen during the years 1967 to 1969; and assisted in giving the annual Graduate Records Examinations during the same period.

Community Service

Mr. Munro owned, edited, and published a newspaper, The Cuba News, for thirteen years. He was extremely proud of his Press Card issued by the Missouri Press Association, and used it often during and after his newspaper years as publisher.

His impelling interest in local and national affairs began when he was working his way through college at SMSTC.

For many years Mr. Munro belonged to the Cuba Business Men's Club; the Crawford County Fair Board; and, until his death, he belonged to the United Methodist Church of Cuba, where he attended church regularly.

Believing in the American work ethic, he directed his widely ranging activities toward providing a stable, prosperous, and pleasant land.

Resolution

Now, therefore, be it resolved:

That the Faculty of the University of Missouri-Rolla hereby express sorrow at the loss of Professor Munro and appreciation for his eleven years of dedicated and loyal service, as a faculty member, to the institution;

That this resolution be made a part of the minutes of this meeting of the Faculty, Thursday, November 6, 1975;

That copies be sent to his widow, Mrs. Hazel Munro; his daughter, Mrs. Mary Jane Bogoger; and his son, Mr. Andrew Munro.

Respectfully submitted,

by the Committee

S/ John M. Brewer
S/ Melvin L. Garner
S/ R. H. Kerr
S/ William J. Murphy

Following the reading of the memorial, Darrel Ownby made a motion to approve the resolution. The motion was seconded by Adrian Daane, and approved by the Council. Chairman Johnson reported that copies of the memorial would be sent to the members of the family as listed in the resolution.
PROMOTION AND TENURE. After reminding the Council that considera-
tion of Policies and Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure Recom-
mandations from the Chancellor (full copy filed with October 2, 1975,
minutes) had been delayed until the November meeting (October 2,
1975, V, 2.2), Chairman Johnson called on Jim Pogue for any further
comments on the document. Pogue addressed his comments to the two
major concerns expressed during the October meeting: the avail-
ability of confidential material to the candidate; and the desire
for faculty participation in departmental recommendations. He
noted that the following statement in the present Policies and
Procedures document is in error: "The files on candidates as
assembled by the department chairperson shall at all times be
available to the candidate . . ." (II.A.4). He explained that
confidential material may be withheld from the candidate. On
the other hand, he continued, the candidate, if he asks, must be
informed of the presence of confidential material, its general
nature, and its source. Pogue concluded by saying that at a
later time he would offer a change of reading to guarantee the
confidentiality of materials. In regard to faculty participation,
Pogue reported that the following statement would be added (II.A.2.):
"The department chairperson will attach to each dossier a copy of
the departmental procedures with specific references to faculty
participation." Pogue also reported that an editorial change
suggested by Gary Patterson would be incorporated (as new II.A.5.):
"The department chairperson shall then review all data submitted
or received in regard to the proposed recommendation, including
the recommendations of participating faculty."

Ralph Schowalter made a motion that the Council approve the
Policies and Procedures document from the Chancellor in lieu of
the document approved by the Academic Council on March 6, 1975
(IV, 9.6). The motion was seconded by Gabe Skitek.

Purse1l asked whether confidentiality would prohibit a candidate
from being informed of criticism in confidential material. Pogue
responded that a chairman should be free to advise a faculty
member of criticism, and Cogell suggested that the Policies and
Procedures document requires the chairman to discuss a negative
decision with the candidate (II.A.5.), which should include the
reasons for the negative decision. Pogue also suggested that a
faculty member might contest his case; then the confidential
material would become public.

The motion to approve the Policies and Procedures document carried.

PUBLIC OCCASIONS. Gabe Skitek took the floor to introduce Tommie
Wilson, who presented the proposed calendar for 1977-78 (full
copy*). Wilson reported only two changes: the addition of
Washington's birthday as a holiday and the change from Easter
break to spring break. Cogell requested the rationale for two
vacations during the spring semester. Wilson replied that the Student Council, when consulted last year as an official representative body for the students, favored both breaks. An opposing comment from the floor was that all students should be consulted, not just the Student Council. But additional comments were as follows: it is proper to consult just the groups of students concerned with activities, like the St. Pat's Board or the Student Council; and the student representatives on the Academic Council are the ones to consult. Several specific requests were made for a poll of all students. To a comment from the floor that many faculty do not favor two breaks, a suggestion came from the floor that, since there is objection to the two breaks during the spring semester, perhaps there should be only the one for St. Pat's. However, several members of the Council mentioned the need of faculty and students for a rest during the middle of the semester. Several requests were presented for a poll of faculty as well as students.

Wilson reminded the Council that it could reject the present calendar, but several members indicated that polling students and faculty would serve as the basis for a possible change only in the future, for this proposed calendar needed to be approved now. Patterson moved approval of the proposed UMR calendar for 1977-78, and the motion was seconded by Skitek. The motion was approved.

Cogell then made a motion requesting the Student Council to conduct a referendum to get student opinion on the spring breaks. The motion was seconded by George Hagner. Summers stated that the wording of the referendum should be carefully considered to avoid a pre-determined response. The motion carried.

Cogell then made a motion calling for the Academic Council to poll the faculty about the spring breaks. The motion was seconded by Patterson and approved.

CURRICULA. Chairman Johnson announced that, since Curricula Committee Report No. 2 (full copy*) was not distributed with the agenda, action would be delayed on it until the next meeting of the Council.

Then Don Modesitt made a motion for approval of the Ph.D. degree in Engineering Mechanics; the motion was seconded by Gabe Skitek. Ruhland expressed concern that, since the Curricula Committee has already advanced two Ph.D. degrees (Computer Science and Engineering Mechanics), it might not be possible to budget the two remaining proposals, the Bachelor's in Sociology and Life Science. He thus asked whether early advancement of some degree programs from the Committee was based on certain priorities. Pogue replied that all proposed degrees go through a review process by several groups and committees, and that there has been
no special priority basis for advancing proposed degrees to the 
Academic Council. He further stated that the Chancellor is 
aware of all four degrees under consideration. Additional dis­
cussion focused on the nature of Council approval. Some members 
felt that the Council should approve proposed degrees only on 
the basis of academic merit. Ruhland responded that it is im­
possible to separate merit from financial priorities. Fuller, 
after announcing that the Budgetary Affairs Committee had recom­
mended to the Chancellor that no new programs be approved without 
a reallocation of funds, made a motion to table approval of the 
Ph.D. in Engineering Mechanics until the Council could obtain 
information on reallocation of funds. Barr seconded the motion 
to table. Two points of information were requested: whether 
information would be available by the next meeting and whether 
reallocation of funds is limited to UMR or is University-wide. 
Chairman Johnson announced that he would ask the Chancellor for 
comment. Since the vote on the tabled motion was a tie, the 
Chair cast a vote. The tabling motion was defeated.

As a result, discussion continued on the motion to approve the 
Ph.D. degree in Engineering Mechanics. Epstein asked whether 
Council approval is based on academic merit only or on financial 
contingency also. Several members of the Council again advocated 
approval on merit only. Others thought the Council should also 
consider budget priorities for new degrees. Pogue said that the 
Council can approve degrees on whichever basis it wants to. How­
ever, he suggested that the Council not reject a new degree just 
because of budget, for the whole process of evaluation would then 
have to be reinitiated later, and the Chancellor would not be 
able to act on a new program when funds were available. He sug­
gested that, instead, the Council approve on the basis of merit, 
adding, if it so desires, a recommendation against implementation 
until budget priorities are worked out or until knowledge of the 
budget is certain. Stuart Johnson suggested that Council appro­
val is only one of several steps necessary before implementation 
can take place; he also said that programs of merit should be 
approved so that the Chancellor can act on them when implementa­
tion is possible.

After a statement by Patterson that the Ph.D. in Engineering 
Mechanics has both merit and demand, the question was called. 
The motion to grant approval to the proposed degree carried.

As a point of information, Epstein asked whether the Council 
approval implies budget approval. Pogue said that the only impli­
cation of budget approval would be in the vote of individual mem­
ers of the Council who may have examined the budget report 
attached to the complete proposal for the degree. Chairman 
Johnson stated that the Council vote itself does not place any 
priority on implementation of the degree.
brought to the attention of the Council several problems with circulation: faculty members fail to return overdue books, sometimes disregarding several requests for return; faculty have had books out for years; faculty sometimes leave the campus without returning books; periodicals are being removed from the library.

Patrick introduced Tom Gremmer, who gave a statistical report on circulation problems: faculty now have $74,340 in overdue books out; students another $15,120; by November 20 the figure for student overdues will be an additional $57,960. Gremmer also commented that keeping records of students checking out books is difficult because of incorrect computer printouts.

Two questions were asked by Council members. Pursell asked the meaning of overdue; Patrick explained that for faculty it has meant failure to return a book upon request. Ownby asked why fines are not charged for overdue books; Patrick replied that the national trend is opposed to fines in order to encourage use of the library, and that the procedure of collecting fines would be difficult. He also said that cooperation is a better solution. He did add, however, that students, after two notices, are charged for the book and the cost of collecting for it.

Some suggestions in regard to periodicals were given: that the faculty be required to leave their ID cards in order to remove periodicals for xeroxing; that the library lower its cost for xeroxing from ten to five cents to keep the periodicals in the library.

Patrick announced that the Library Committee would request approval of new circulation regulations at the next meeting of the Academic Council, including the following recommendations for faculty: 1) Check out time for books will be 30 days with renewal possible until the book is requested; 2) After two overdue notices are ignored, the department chairman will be notified; 3) Periodicals will not be circulated. Patrick asked members of the Council to determine the reaction in their departments to these recommendations.

Chairman Johnson stated that further suggestions might be made to Mike Patrick personally after the meeting.

PERSONNEL. Wayne Cogell, Chairman of the Personnel Committee reported on three agenda items. In regard to the first item, he announced that the Personnel Committee is still considering a response to the UMC proposal on retirement and staff benefits, as based on the discussion at the special meeting, October 23, 1975, and would have a report ready by the next meeting of the Council. Chairman Johnson announced that the minutes of the special meeting are being circulated and suggested that Council members would find them very informative.
In regard to the second item, Cogell brought to the Council the report of the Personnel Committee (full copy on review of the Student Council faculty evaluation form (October 2, 1975, V, 2.3). He made a motion that the first recommendation in the report be approved: "That each department chairperson and his faculty should decide whether they want teaching evaluations." Gerson seconded the motion. Pogue asked a question about the recommendation: whether it assumed that an individual is bound to the majority decision of the department. Cogell responded that that was the assumption. From the floor came the opinion that some faculty are under pressure to use evaluation forms. Chairman Johnson stated that at this point an individual can decide whether he will participate in the Student Council evaluation or not. Ruhland commented that in his department an individual does not have to participate, but that it is beneficial as evidence for promotion and tenure cases. An editorial suggestion came from the floor: to change his to correspond with chairperson. The motion on the first recommendation carried.

Cogell then made a motion for approval of the second recommendation: "That each department chairperson and his faculty should develop their own appropriate teaching evaluation, if they have decided that they want them." Armaely seconded the motion. Pogue stated that the rights of an individual faculty should be retained. Calling for a clarification, Robertson asked whether the recommendation totally rejects the Student Council evaluations in favor of departmental forms. Cogell explained that the department could decide on the form to be used—whether its own or the Student Council form, or, indeed, any form. A question came from a student representative: does the recommendation refer to evaluation in general or just to the student evaluation form. Cogell replied that the committee had studied many forms for evaluation and discovered that there is diversity of opinion on the effectiveness of practically every question on them. Therefore, any department would have to judge what type of evaluation it would use. The motion carried.

Cogell next made a motion for approval of the third recommendation: "That the present 'Student Council Teaching Evaluations' should not be used by the department chairperson, dean, or Chancellor in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions." Summers seconded the motion. In the discussion which followed Ruhland thought the individual should have the right to use the Student Council form if he wants to, and Stuart Johnson said that the department form might not be better. Other members voiced the opinion that use of the Student Council form should not be prohibited. In support of the recommendation, Gerson said that the Student Council form was designed by the students as a poop sheet and had come to be used accidentally for decisions of promotion, etc.; he concluded that the recommendation of the Personnel Committee was merely asking that the Student Council forms not be used until
the departments review the merit of the forms.

Robertson proposed an amendment to the third recommendation—the addition of a final phrase: "unless it is the choice of the individual faculty member." Patterson seconded the amendment, and it carried.

Discussion resumed on the original motion to approve the third recommendation. A student representative said that, since the Student Council form evaluates teaching performance from the viewpoint of those who learn, a lot of the value of the evaluation would be lost if the third recommendation is approved. Chairman Johnson suggested that another way of obtaining student evaluation is through letters. Adrian Daane suggested that the third recommendation is not necessary since the second one gives the departments the right to use whatever form they want. The motion carried.

Cogell announced that he has information on teaching evaluation available for anyone to review.

Cogell next reported on the third agenda item from the Personnel Committee—the promotion and tenure procedures on the other UM campuses. After announcing that he now has documents from the other campuses, which are available for the faculty to read, he gave a brief summary of procedures on the other campuses compared to procedures at UMR:

1. UMC. He said that UMC did not send him a document equivalent to Policy Memorandum No. 16. In addition, one difference was that an annual report on the professional progress of a faculty member must be added to his file, but the rest of the procedures were the same as UMR's.

2. UMKC. Cogell reported that the review committees from the department to campus levels were identified more definitely, but that Memo No. 16 was mostly identical to UMR's.

3. UMSL. Cogell cited the strong statement on faculty input and on minimum criteria for promotion, but he found the document similar to UMR's otherwise.

Cogell concluded that, in general, the promotion and tenure procedures on the other campuses were quite similar to UMR's.

STUDENT AFFAIRS. Gary Patterson brought to the Council for approval two constitutions for student organizations (full copy).

He made a motion for approval of the constitution of The Sisters of Alpha Epsilon Pi. The motion was seconded by Robertson; it carried.

Patterson then made a motion for approval of the constitution of the Trap and Skeet Club, with one editorial deletion recommended.
by the Student Affairs Committee (Article 3. Section 1.):
"because of personal status" deleted from "Active membership 
will be available to any student enrolled at the University of 
Missouri-Rolla undergraduate or graduate, who because of personal 
status is eligible to participate in co-curricular activities 
on the campus." The motion was seconded by Schaefer, and it 
carried.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ADMISSIONS. Chairman Johnson announced 
that members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Policy for International 
Students were present to answer questions about the committee's 
report on policy guidelines for international student admissions, 
dated May 5, 1975 (full report*). Johnson introduced Paul Ponder, 
who commented on the background of the ad hoc committee and its 
purpose. Ponder reported that last year the Chancellor had re­
quested that a committee propose recommendations for limiting 
the number of international students. As a result, Ponder indi­
cated that he had appointed a committee, which was approved by 
the Chancellor. He referred to the members of the committee, as 
listed on the report: James H. Tracey, chairman, Thomas B. Baird, 
J. Beverly Clark, Ronald L. Johnston, and Louis Moss. Ponder 
concluded by saying that the ad hoc committee completed its report 
last May, which was too late for consideration by the Council.

George Hagner requested the floor so that Emilia Carcheri, chair­
person of a committee of graduate students, could give a report 
on the attitude of the graduate students toward the recommended 
guidelines for admission of international students. Mrs. Carcheri 
reporting that 60% of the graduate students had been contacted for 
responses, read the following points based on the poll:

1. The basis for admission of any student (foreign or otherwise) 
should be the student's communication skills and academic 
preparation and ability.

2. If, for any reason, the number of foreign students is to be 
kept at a low level, this could be achieved by increasing 
their requirements for admission and not by establishing 
quotas. A good English test (other than the TOEFL) and a 
college entrance examination could be administered to all 
foreign applicants. Failure to pass one of these tests 
would make the applicant not eligible for admission as a 
regular student. Furthermore, some foreign students have 
suggested that, once admitted, the University could require 
each foreign student to maintain a specified grade point 
average while attending this institution. Failure to do so 
would result in the student's removal from the institution 
(uncertain of legality).

3. Although it is true that foreign students require increased 
administration services (e.g., foreign student advisor),
it is also true that they pay more. If income from foreign students is not enough to cover the cost of their education, their tuition could be raised. Also, penalties could be implemented for delayed payments (e.g., charging interest on delayed payments).

A question from the floor concerned the intent of point 8 in the ad hoc report (trend toward an increase in applications from oil-producing countries). Lou Moss responded that point 8 is an observation, not a recommendation.

Bernie Sarchet reported on the reaction of the Committee of Department Chairmen to the recommendations for admitting international students, as follows:

1. The guidelines are unadministrable.
2. The number of international students who actually arrive is relatively small compared to the number who apply.
3. If the cost of administration for international students is greater, then their fees should be increased. Three levels of fee structure should be implemented.
4. There was doubt that the number of international students would be greater than the 10% of the student body (recommendation 1 in the report); if so, an upper limit could be imposed for the following semester.
5. The number of international students on the campus does not influence the quality of the University.
6. In general, the chairmen could not agree with the tenor of the report.
7. There should be an evaluation of English competency. Every international student should take an entrance examination; if his competency in English is low, he should be required to enroll in special courses, which should be provided by the University but paid for extra by the student.

Patterson asked whether the examinations taken by the students in their own countries are good. Sarchet replied that they are useless; he reiterated that a certain level of English skill must be reached before international students are admitted to courses, but that students in technical areas may not need as much language skill as those taking non-technical courses. He concluded that, if the students are properly equipped, there is no need for quotas.

Robertson cited the recommended quotas and the actual enrollment of international students in the Fall, 1974, as found in the report of the ad hoc committee:

1. Maximum enrollment of 10% of total student body; it was 7.1% in Fall, 1974.
2. Maximum enrollment of 25% of graduate student body; it was 28.8% in Fall, 1974.
3. Maximum of 5% of undergraduate student body; it was 3.9% in Fall, 1974.
4. No more than 1% of total enrollment from a single country (41 students); in 1974 all countries were under except Iran with 44.

Robertson concluded that, since UMR essentially has the quotas in practice, quotas should not be imposed because of the difficulties that they would cause.

Moss responded by citing current enrollment statistics of 46 Iranians and 54 Venezuelans; he also referred to the possibility of much larger groups from single countries in the near future. Elaborating on observation #1 in the ad hoc report (inadequate housing and need for balance between American and international students in the community), he made the following points: that the limitation of housing in Rolla for international students is already a problem this year; that some international students are leaving because of inadequate housing; that inadequate housing is unfair for these students; that Rolla is not large enough to absorb large numbers of international students; and that problems are already arising in the community, for example, in the public schools. Moss commented further that other colleges do limit the number of international students.

Skitek inquired whether there might be concern from the government over the setting of quotas for admission. Ponder responded with two points: 1) no federal law requires all students to be admitted; 2) restrictions on international students can take place only during admission, for, after admitted, the students have all rights. He added that UMR can expect to have a tremendous increase in students applying from oil countries.

An additional comment and question came from the floor: English requirements for admission should be tighter; and would graduate levels of enrollment decline even more if quotas are imposed?

Schowalter made a motion to deny approval of the recommended policy guidelines for international student admissions, as found in the report of the ad hoc committee. The motion was seconded by Patterson. Discussion continued with Patterson inquiring about the enrollment of international students, for he felt that the higher tuition (out-of-state fees) had already limited the enrollment. Moss responded that in the past international enrollment had reached about 400 (compared to 290 in Fall, 1974, in the report) but with a total enrollment of about 5200 (compared to 4064 in Fall, 1974, in the report); he added that the enrollment this semester is 333. He noted that much housing has been demolished and that the housing problem is aggravated by the fact that international students often make no effort to arrange for housing before they arrive on campus. Wollard noted that the opposite occurs, too: many international students sign a contract and then do not honor it. Wollard also brought up the political
problem a few years ago when the legislature objected to state funds supporting international students; he suggested that the solution might be an out-of-country fee.

After another comment from the floor that quotas treat the symptoms and not the problems, the question was called. The motion carried. Chairman Johnson announced that he would relay to the Chancellor the vote of the Council denying approval of the ad hoc committee's recommended guidelines for international student admissions.

ANNOUNCEMENTS. Jim Pogue suggested that faculty who plan to go on leave from UMR, check first on their University benefits, especially the medical benefits, to avoid any interruption in their coverage.

Chairman Johnson announced that the Council By-law changes had been approved by the Board of Curators and are now in effect.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Pogue, Secretary

* Complete document filed with the smooth copy.

Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of the actions approved.
Memorandum to: UMR Academic Council

From: UMR Curricula Committee

RE Committee Report No. 2 (1975-76)

The following items have been received and considered by the committee and are recommended for approval.

I. Changes

A. Course title, catalog description, credit hours, and prerequisites

1. Geophysics 386
   a. Title change from Seismic Prospecting II to Modern Analysis of Geophysical Data.
   b. Course description changed to reflect change in course name, credit hours, and prerequisites.
   c. Credit hours changed from Lectures 3 to Lectures 2 and Laboratory 1.
   d. Prerequisites changed from Geophysics 283 to Geophysics 385 or 387 and Math 351 or 383, or permission of instructor.

B. Curriculum change

1. Chemical Engineering

   Delete 3 credit hours of Humanities-Social Sciences and add 3 credit hours of Technical Elective selected primarily from ChE 300-level courses. Computer Science 218 or advanced mathematics courses may be substituted for 3 credit hours of technical electives with the approval of the student's advisor.

C. Course number


D. Catalog description

1. Ceramic Engineering 260 - Ceramic Engineering Design change offering from Fall to either semester.
II. Additions

A. Civil Engineering 413 - Dynamics of Earth Materials

This course is a study of the characteristics of geotechnical structures subjected to dynamic loadings. Included is a study of the characteristics of forces generated by vibratory machinery as well as earthquake induced forces.

Credit hours: Lectures 3
Prerequisites: Consent of instructor

III. Deletions

A. Geological Engineering 53 - Elements of Geological Engineering

Credit hours: Lecture 2, Laboratory 1

IV. Other Business

1. Course Galley Editing for Catalog

A letter from the department chairman will be accepted to verify an editorial change for the course galley.

Respectfully submitted by,

Donald E. Modesitt
Academic Council member to
UMR Curricula Committee

DEM:ac
November 24, 1975

Memorandum to: UMR Academic Council
From: UMR Curricula Committee
Re: Committee Report No. 3 (1975-76)

The following items have been received and considered by the Committee, and are recommended for approval:

I. Changes

A. Prerequisites


B. Credit Hours, Course Title, and Catalog Description.

   a. Change credit hours from Lect. 2 to Lect. 3.
   c. Change catalog description.

   Present: Legal and business aspects of engineering contracts and specifications in the construction industry. Analysis, study of precedents, and application of the more important contract clauses, including changes, changed conditions, termination, disputes, payments, risk and insurance, inspection, liquidated damages, and technical requirements. Either semester. (CE 243).

   Proposed: Legal and business aspects of contracts and contracting procedure in the construction industry to include contracts for engineering services and for construction. Analyses, study of precedents, and application of the more important provisions, including changes, differing site conditions, liability, arbitration, termination, disputes, appeal procedure, payments, insurance, inspection, liquidated damages and Technical Provisions. Either semester.

   Justification: Recent trends in: (1) increased professional liability of engineers; (2) increased usage of arbitration in settling disputes; and (3) standardization of Technical Provisions format indicate a need to include these elements in course material. The attitude of courts and quasi judicial bodies is hardening relative to demanding a higher level of professionalism. Approximately 40% of CE graduates enter the construction management field. They require an expanded course coverage to meet current needs.

   This change is strongly supported by the UMR consultant on the legal aspects of engineering.
II. Additions

A. New course.

   Lecture 2, Laboratory 1 credit hour.
   Prerequisites: Ge.E. 50 or equivalent.

   Catalog description: Evaluation of existing data and derivation of new data for analyzing the engineering properties of terrain. Planning for and design of site selection procedures.

   Justification: This course, planned as a required fall semester junior offering, will deal with basic terrain properties upon which several upper-division Ge.E. courses build. Ge.E. 246, 343, and 341 as well as other elective Ge.E. courses require prior knowledge of terrain characteristics for efficient presentation.

III. Deletions

A. Metallurgy 364 - Electro-Metallurgy
   Laboratory 2, to accompany Met. 363.

IV. Other Business.

A. Prerequisite discrepancies between UMR course, catalog galley, and UMR General Catalog.

1. Prerequisites for E.M. 100 - Statics and Dynamics and E.M. 120 - Materials Testing, do not appear in the galley but are listed in the general catalog and should appear.

   a. E.M. 100 - Preceded or accompany Math 22.
   b. E.M. 120 - Preceded or accompany E.M. 110.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald E. Modesitt, A/C Representative
to the UMR Curricula Committee
FALL SEMESTER 1977

Freshman orientation ........................................ Aug. 16, Tues.
Freshman and Transfer student orientation .................. Aug. 17, Wed.
Student registration 8:15 a.m. - 4:30 p.m. ................. Aug. 18, Thurs.
Registration ends 3:00 p.m. .................................. Aug. 19, Fri.
Classwork begins 7:30 a.m. .................................. Sept. 5, Mon.
Labor Day Holiday .............................................. Sept. 5, Mon.
Mid-Semester ..................................................... Oct. 15, Sat.
Thanksgiving vacation begins 7:30 a.m. ....................... Nov. 23, Wed.
Thanksgiving vacation ends 7:30 a.m. ........................ Nov. 28, Mon.
Last Class day .................................................. Dec. 9, Fri.
Reading Day ..................................................... Dec. 10, Sat.
Final examinations begin 8:00 a.m. .......................... Dec. 12, Mon.
Final examinations end 5:30 p.m. ............................ Dec. 17, Sat.
Fall semester closes 5:30 p.m. ............................... Dec. 17, Sat.
Fall commencement ............................................ Dec. 18, Sun.

SPRING SEMESTER 1978

Student Registration 8:15 a.m. - 4:30 p.m. ................. Jan. 9, Mon.
Registration ends 3:00 p.m. .................................. Jan. 10, Tues.
Classwork begins 7:30 a.m. .................................. Jan. 12, Thurs.
Washington's Birthday Holiday ................................ Feb. 20, Mon.
Mid-semester ..................................................... Mar. 4, Sat.
Spring recess begins 7:30 a.m. ............................... Mar. 16, Thurs.
Spring recess ends 7:30 a.m. ................................ Mar. 20, Mon.
Spring Break begins 5:30 p.m. ............................... Apr. 1, Sat.
Spring Break ends 7:30 a.m. ................................ Apr. 10, Mon.
Last class day .................................................. May 5, Fri.
Reading day ..................................................... May 6, Sat.
Final examinations begin 8:00 a.m. .......................... May 8, Mon.
Final examinations end 5:30 p.m. ............................ May 13, Sat.
Spring semester closes 5:30 p.m. ............................ May 13, Sat.
Annual commencement ....................................... May 14, Sun.

SUMMER SESSION 1978

Registration ..................................................... June 5, Mon.
Classwork begins 7:00 a.m. .................................. June 6, Tues.
Independence holiday .......................................... July 4, Tues.
Summer session closes 12:00 noon .......................... July 29, Sat.

CLASS SESSIONS
(Excluding examinations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For the St. Louis Graduate Center, all class sessions/holidays/examinations commence at 4:00 p.m. and end at 10:00 p.m. in lieu of the 7:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. above. Registration times and dates to be announced later.
Memorandum to: Dr. Jim Johnson, Chairman of the Academic Council

From: Wayne Cogell, Personnel Committee

Re: Teaching Evaluation

Since the purposes, the resources, the types of classes, and methods of instruction in individual departments vary, and since the committees and individuals charged with teaching evaluation in particular departments will want their evaluation techniques to reflect their unique programs, the Faculty Personnel Committee makes the following three recommendations:

1. That each department chairperson and his faculty should decide whether they want teaching evaluations.

2. That each department chairperson and his faculty should develop their own appropriate teaching evaluation, if they have decided that they want them.

3. That the present "Student Council Teaching Evaluations" should not be used by the department chairperson, dean, or Chancellor in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions.
MEMORANDUM TO: Chancellor Bisplinghoff
FROM: AD HOC Committee on Policy for International Students
RE: Recommended Policy Guidelines for International Student Admissions

In response to your request for recommended guidelines on International student affairs at UMR, the Committee hereby submits its recommendations. This report consists of observations, recommendations and discussion of the reasons for and impact of these recommendations. In the process of preparing this report, the Committee reviewed national statistics, appraised the community and campus environment, studied the effect of International students on the quality of the UMR academic program and solicited inputs from a variety of sources both within and outside of UMR. Following are our observations:

1. The most critical limiting factor on the number of International students that can be enrolled by UMR is the Rolla community. Adequate housing on or off campus is difficult to obtain and the community would like to see a reasonable balance between American and International students in the City of Rolla. This limiting factor is followed closely by the need to keep a reasonable balance between American and International students on campus in order to assure a quality academic program for American students.

2. Academic programs can be adversely affected by excessively large numbers of students from a single foreign country. This problem can be further aggravated if the bulk of these students enroll in just one or two departments.

3. International students require increased administration services. Administrative services (e.g., admissions and advising) are already strained to support the present size of the International student body.
4. No single administrative office coordinates International student recruitment, admissions and records.

5. It is suspected that present income from International students does not cover the full cost of their education (including extra services required).

6. Although the present quality of our International student population is good, the level of their communication skills is too low.

7. International students are or will be available on either an individual or block-contract basis.

8. The trend is toward a marked increase in the number of applications from International students, particularly from oil producing countries.

9. Once the International student obtains a degree at UMR, he frequently attempts to remain in the U.S. rather than return home. This can effect the employment picture for American students and can contribute to a "brain drain" from other countries.

10. Delayed payments from foreign countries to on-campus International students has caused an excessive strain on funds available for student loan. In some instances, over 90% of student loan monies for American and International students has been on loan to International students from a single country.

The committee makes the following recommendations. They are listed in order of decreasing priority.

1. No more than 10% of the total UMR student body shall be composed of International students.

2. A maximum of approximately 25% of the graduate student body shall be International students.

3. A maximum of approximately 5% of the undergraduate student body shall be International students.

4. International students from a single country shall compose no more than 1% of the total UMR enrollment.
5. Consideration should be given to the addition of an administrative assistant in the Admissions Office to coordinate International student quotas, admissions and records.

6. International students shall qualify for admission on an individual basis and not as a block or contractual group.

7. All International students shall be required to take a communication skills placement test at the beginning of their first semester on campus. Students with serious deficiencies in this area will be enrolled in a remedial, communication skills, non-credit university course, which shall commence after the testing process is complete.

8. The three School Deans, the Graduate Dean, the Director of Admissions and the Foreign Student Advisor should be charged with developing and coordinating a definitive set of procedures for administering the above policies.

One purpose of Recommendation §8 is to allow uneven distributions of International students among schools and departments. For example, national statistics indicate that engineering is a much more popular area for study by International students than science or liberal arts areas.

Attached is a set of summary statistics showing the effect of the above ceiling recommendations on UMR enrollment. The purpose of the ceiling recommendations is to establish guidelines. Obviously, recommendations §2 and §3 will not always balance against recommendation §1.

Respectfully submitted,

James H. Tracey
Committee Chairman

JHT:jcw

cc: Prof. T. B. Baird
    Dr. J. B. Clark
    Mr. R. Johnston
    Mr. L. Moss
    Mr. P. Ponder

Attachment
UMR ENROLLMENT STATISTICS-FALL '74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Additional students allowed under</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Total UMR on-campus enrollment</td>
<td>4064</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional students allowed under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Total UMR on-campus graduate enrollment</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International graduate student enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional students allowed under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Total UMR on-campus undergraduate enrollment</td>
<td>3537</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International undergraduate enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional students allowed under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Total UMR on-campus enrollment</td>
<td>4064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum allowable International students from single country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student numbers from all countries supplying over 20 students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMO TO: Academic Council

FROM: G. G. Skitek, Chairman, Academic Council Committee
4.513 Committee on Assemblies, Programs and Public Events

RE: Public Events Dates for School Year 1976-77

The following list of Public Events is presented to the Academic Council for approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents Day</td>
<td>Oct. 9, 1976</td>
<td>Lincoln U. (here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homecoming</td>
<td>Oct. 22-23, 1976</td>
<td>Springfield (here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Merit Day</td>
<td>Nov. 5, 1976</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Day</td>
<td>Nov. 6, 1976</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge 77</td>
<td>March 5, 1977</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engr. Fair</td>
<td>April 1-2, 1977</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Commencement</td>
<td>December 19, 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Commencement</td>
<td>May 15, 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Approved in the 1976-77 Calendar.

G. G. Skitek

GGS:mjc
1. UMC. **Recommendation D**: Retiree/Spouse Income Adjustment Provision.

   Our Retirement Plan should be modified so as to include a retiree/spouse income adjustment provision which is keyed to a University of Missouri pre-retirement salary/wages index. (See appendix II for specific details and implementation suggestions.) The Task Force unanimously selected this recommendation as the one of greatest current concern and urges immediate affirmative action upon it.

   **UMR. Recommendation**: That there be annual adjustments for inflation to the extent possible; the manner and amount of adjustment to be determined by the actuary.

2. UMC. **Recommendation E**: Optional retirement provision (Section 8 (c))

   The Retirement Committee, The President and The Board of Curators should immediately take the necessary action to remove this penalty provision from our Retirement Plan. They should also act to provide restitution with respect to those retiree/spouse income payments that have been affected by the present interpretation of this amendment. If prudent management of our Retirement Plan makes the above recommendation ill-advised then the Retirement Committee should, no later than 1 Dec. 1975, prepare a statement to be published in "The President's Bulletin" explaining the necessity of retaining this provision.

   **UMR. Recommendation**: That we support the Board's action of August, 1975, which implemented recommendation E.

3. UMC. **Recommendation G**: Part-time Service.

   (a) Creditable years of service should be granted in accordance with the ratio that the part-time service, but excluding undergraduate and
graduate student employment, bears to full-time service. The consulting actuary should be authorized to prepare a comprehensive cost study of this recommendation. If additional funding is indicated his study include implementation suggestions.

(b) The present policy excluding additional salary for special services or projects, intersession, or in lieu of vacations and any compensation received above the regular basis of pay for over-time should be continued. (Sec. 6 (b) pp. 6-7).

UMR Recommendation: That the present cost study results should be reported to the general faculty.

4. UMC. Recommendation H: Regular Salary, Summer Term.

In determining "Salary Year - Regular Salary...." (Sec. 6 (b) p. 6 Retirement Plan as amended Aug. 4, 1972) the additional salary for summer term should be included. The consulting actuary should be authorized to prepare a cost study of the above change including funding and implementation suggestions.

UMR Recommendation: That all summer employment should be given equitable credit toward retirement.

Recommendation #7 should be considered at this point, since it suggests that a UMR Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee be formed, which is referred to in Recommendation #5.

5. UMC. Recommendation F: Retirement Plan communication.

The Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee should develop a multifaceted program designed to communicate to its members both personalized and general information regarding our Retirement Plan. (See appendix III for specific details and implementation suggestions.)
UMR Recommendation: That an annual report from the UMR Retirement Committee on the status of the retirement plan be given to the general Faculty.

6. UMC. **Recommendation C: Adjustment of funding percentages.**

The University of Missouri should continue regularly to utilize the services of a Consulting Actuary before making retirement plan decisions. When the Consulting Actuary, as he did in 1972 recommends an upward adjustment in the funding percentages, the Task Force believes that it must be implemented without undue delay. We therefore strongly recommend the adoption of the funding percentages as recommended by the consulting actuary on 1972 or any updated recommendation that he has presented.

UMR Recommendation: That Recommendation C be supported.

7. UMC. **Recommendation I: Retirement Committee appointment.**

The President of the University should annually and prior to making The Retirement Committee appointments discuss such appointments with the Inter-Campus Faculty Advisory Council.

The Faculty Council/Faculty Senate on each campus should consider the advisability of appointing a sub-committee/s /Task Force/s on their individual campuses to give regular and continuing thought to the Retirement Plan and other staff benefit programs (see appendix IV for specific details and implementation suggestions.)

UMR Recommendation: That UMR Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee be formed: the committee will include the University wide staff Benefits representatives, Mrs. Walls and an other faculty member; the committee will gather information about the operation of the retirement plan and make recommendations to the Chancellor and University wide Staff Benefits Committee representatives.
8. UMC. **Recommendation A**: Formula for basic retiree income.

The Task Force believes that the original concept of a basic retiree income of 50% of the average of the high five out of the last ten years with 30 years of service was and continues to be a valid objective. Detailed suggestions as to one method of achieving this objective are presented in Appendix I. We recommend that the consulting actuary be authorized to prepare a cost study of this basic formula adjustment to determine the cost of the adjustment and the funding percentages required to make this objective a reality. (See Appendix I for specific details).

UMR Recommendation: That Recommendation A be supported.

9. UMC. **Recommendation B**: Continuation of our present self-administered Retirement Plan along the same basic concepts as when it was implemented on 15 June 1956.

UMR. Recommendation: 1) That Recommendation B be supported. 2) That present faculty members should consider the advantages of individual tax sheltered plans, especially in view of the statement given on page 10 of the UMC report, "In fact 95 professors (full) receiving University of Missouri retiree incomes for the year ending 30 June 1974 received an average of $5486."

Final Comment

The Faculty Personnel Committee agrees that inflation adjustments are the most important aspect of UMR recommendations.
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES-DECEMBER 16, 1975

The members of the Traffic Safety Committee met for a special meeting on December 16, 1975 at 1:00 p.m. at the University Police Department. Those members present were:

Chairman Curtis Adams  Roger Clifford
Mr. Richard Boulware  Dottie Hargis
Ken Dunipace  Bob Marlow
Frank Walters  Frederick Rambow
Richard Johnson  Jeff Rose
Ernest Spokes  Marion Arnold
Bill Miehe  Ernest Goggin
Burns Hegler

This meeting was called for the purpose of discussion on the proposed changes in parking regulations. (Submitted by Frank Walters) Each numbered regulation was discussed individually and voted on by the full committee. The following regulations will reflect the changes made by the committee.

.0804 Parking lots other than the special purpose spaces of section .0802 shall be of seven categories.

.01 "Red" lots shall include those lots closest to the main campus, that is the area bounded by State, Pine, 11th and 14th streets. (Lots #1 & #2).

.02 "Red Special Permit" lots shall include the lot by the Buehler Building (Lot #10).

.03 "Gold" lots shall include those lots outside the boundaries defined in section .0804.01 and inside the area bounded by State, Park, Pine, 10th, 11th and 16th Streets. (Lots #4, 5, 6, 8, 18 and 36)

.04 "Silver" lots shall include those lots outside the boundaries defined in sections .0804.01 and .0804.03 which are on the campus periphery. (Lots #7, 13, 17, 19, 22, 11, and 26). This does not include special parking for Stuart Apartment Residence in Lot 11.

.05 "Green lots shall include those lots remote from the campus proper. (Lots 9, 12, 15, 20A, 20B, and 20C)

.06 "Special Purpose" lots shall be those lots, whatever
their locations, which are open to parking by those without campus parking permits. They include the married students parking at Nagogammi Terrace and Stuart Apartments and the UMR Gold Course Parking Lot. (Lots 16 and 33) As a general practice, responsibility for upkeep and operation of these lots shall be delegated by the Committee to another University operation. The parking lots west of the Multi-Purpose Building (Lots 203 and 20C), though designated "Green" lots, shall be open as free parking for students with registered vehicles and for campus visitors.

.07 The visitors' lot (Lot 21) located south of the University Center, is reserved for visitors. Employees and members of their families and students, including those who hold parking permits, shall not park in the visitors' lot unless they park at the parking meters and activate them with coins. Any visitor receiving a traffic violation should return this to the University Police Department for cancellation.

.0901 Change "paragraph .04" to "paragraph .06".

.0903 Commencing with the Fall Semester 1976, the following fee schedule shall apply for parking permits.

.01 Permits for "Red" and "Red Special Permit" lots shall be $25.00 for the calendar year.

.02 Permits for "Gold" lots shall be $18.00 for the calendar year.

.03 Permits for "Silver" lots shall be $12.00 for the calendar year.

.04 Permits for "Green" lots shall be $6.00 for the calendar year.

.05 Permits for motorcycle spaces shall be $6.00 for the calendar year. They shall park in any space specifically designated for motorcycle parking.

.06 Change for refund
"Red" and "Red Special Permit" permits -- Spring and Summer, $15.00
"Gold" permits -- Spring and Summer $10.00
"Silver" permits -- Spring and Summer $7.00
"Green" and Motorcycle permits -- Spring and Summer, $3.00
"Red" and "Red Special Permit" permits -- Summer only, $4.00

"Gold" permit -- Summer only, $3.00

"Silver" permit -- Summer only, $2.00

"Green" and Motorcycle permits -- Summer only, $1.00

.07 When a person or a car pool wishes to use a single UMR parking space for alternate vehicles at different times, additional permits may be obtained for a one dollar service charge. Such vehicles shall be consistently identified on pertinent permit application as vehicle #1, vehicle #2, etc.

.0904 Only holders of "Red Special Permits" shall be permitted to park in "Red Special Permit" lots. Holders of "Red" and "Red Special Permit" permits shall be permitted to park in any "red", "Gold", "Silver", or "green" lots. Holders of "Gold" permits shall be permitted to park in any "Gold", "Silver" or "Green" Lot. Holders of "Silver" permits shall be permitted to park in any "Silver" or "Green" lots. Holders of "Green" permits shall be permitted to park only in "Green" lots.

.1004 If multiple vehicle permits have been issued under the provisions of section .0903.07 and more than one of the vehicles is parked on any permitted lot, the lowest numbered vehicle shall be considered to be parked legally. A fee of five dollars shall be payable by the registrant of each additional vehicle. In addition, violations of this rule may be considered cause for revocation of the multiple vehicle parking privilege. The University Police may grant exception to this rule for limited occasional use upon prior request.

.1102 A fee of five dollars shall be payable by any student or employee who violates the provisions of this section.

The next item of discussion was registration of student vehicles. Frank Walters made a motion that it would be optional to have either a parking permit or a registration decal. Ken Dunipace seconded the motion and the Committee passed the motion unanimously. The revised regulation shall now read:

.15 All student-operated vehicles in the Rolla area shall be registered with the University Police Office and have either a campus parking permit or student registration decal affixed properly to the vehicle. A fee of five dollars shall be payable by any student in violation of this provision. There is no charge for registration.
Dr. Adams brought up the question concerning the numbering of the lots as they had been previously. Frank Walters made a motion that the lots should be numbered as before. Dunipace seconded the motion and the Committee voted unanimously in favor of the request.

The extension of Lot 11 was further discussed at this meeting. It was decided that Lot 11 would be extended to include the boundaries of State, Park, 9th and 10th Streets.

Frank Walters made a motion that the regulation concerning University Holidays should also include days appointed by the Chief of Police. The motion was seconded by Ken Dunipace. The Committee voted unanimously for approval of this addition.

Richard Johnson asked if there could be an estimate made on getting new guttering in Lot 2. Burns Hegler asked for an estimate for a walkway from Lot 13 to State St. Robert Marlow said he would supply estimates for both projects.

Frank Walters asked Curtis Adams if there should not be one more faculty member on the Appeals Sub-Committee. Adams agreeded with this and appointed Burns Hegler to the committee.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The next scheduled meeting has not been determined at this time.
Minutes of the Academic Council meeting, December 4, 1975.

Chairman Jim Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. on December 4, 1975, in G-5 of the Humanities - Social Sciences Building. Johnson introduced the following proxies: Earl Foster representing R. A. Schaefer; Robert L. Davis, Edward E. Hornsey; Charles E. McFarland, Harold Q. Fuller; W. F. Tappmeyer, Robert R. Russell; and Melvin Garner, J. Byron Nelson.

Chairman Johnson then called for approval of the minutes of the special meeting on October 23, 1975, and the regular meeting on November 6, 1975. Wayne Cogell made a motion to approve the minutes; Adrian Daane seconded the motion; the motion carried.

V, 5

PUBLIC OCCASIONS. Since there was no unfinished business nor an administrative response, Chairman Johnson called on Gabe Skitek for a report from the Public Occasions Committee. Skitek made a motion for approval of the public events dates for 1976-77 (full copy*). Ralph Schowalter seconded the motion. Bob Gerson, speaking for Harold Fuller, requested postponement of the scheduling of National Merit Day on a Friday until some response to its being held this year on Friday is received. Skitek replied that National Merit Day has regularly been held on Friday; furthermore, he explained that, except for this year, when the arrival of the mailing list of merit scholars was delayed, National Merit Day has always been held on the Friday before University Day, based on the assumption that merit scholars who were unable to attend on Friday might attend University Day the next day. The motion to approve the public events dates carried.

V, 5

CURRICULA. Don Modesitt presented four items on the agenda from the Curricula Committee. First, Modesitt made a motion for approval of Report No. 2 (full copy, November 6, 1975, minutes). Schowalter seconded the motion. Pursell asked for the substance of the report. Chairman Johnson summarized the report:

1. Change in course title, catalog description, credit hours, and pre-requisites for Geophysics 386.
2. Substitution in chemical engineering of three hours of technical elective (or Computer Science 218 or advanced mathematics) for three hours of humanities-social sciences credit.
3. Change in course number for Metallurgical Engineering 251.
5. Course addition of Civil Engineering 413.
7. Procedure for correcting the galley for the catalog.
Cogell asked how many hours would remain in the humanities-social sciences block after the deletion of three hours. Modesitt responded that fifteen hours would remain. The motion carried.

Second, Modesitt made a motion for approval of Curricula Committee Report #3 (full copy*). The motion was seconded by Larry Josey. Chairman Johnson urged the members of the Council to study reports prior to meetings. The motion carried.

Third, Modesitt moved approval of the B.S. degree in Life Sciences, and Adrian Daane seconded. Chairman Johnson announced that Nord Gale was present to answer questions about the degree. Herbert Harvey made a motion for an amendment to be added: that approval of the proposed degree is based on academic merit without consideration of budget priorities. Gerson seconded the amendment. Ruhland requested that the amendment apply to all degree proposals. Chairman Johnson announced that he had sent a memorandum to the Chancellor explaining that Council approval of proposed degrees is based on academic merit and requesting that the Council be allowed to recommend priorities. The amendment carried.

Pursell asked whether copies of proposed degrees could be distributed to all Council members. Chairman Johnson responded that the proposals are so long that the cost would be prohibitive. Pursell then asked whether copies could be available in the offices of the school deans, as well as in the Provost's office; Pogue responded that the school deans do have copies for faculty use. Gale also announced that his office has several extra copies of the proposed degree in life sciences. The motion to approve the B.S. in Life Sciences carried.

Finally, Modesitt moved approval for the proposed B.A./B.S. degree in Sociology, and Daane seconded. It was noted that the amendment previously passed—that approval by the Council implies no budget priority—applies to this degree, as well as to the previous doctoral degrees in computer science and engineering mechanics. Chairman Johnson announced that Erwin Epstein was present to answer questions about the degree in sociology. Col. Crowley asked for clarification of the number of hours required for the degree in sociology. Epstein explained that the B.S. degree is 130 hours and the B.A. degree, 120. The motion to approve the proposed B.A./B.S. degree in Sociology carried.

Chairman Johnson deferred the next item on the agenda, Library Committee, until later in the meeting in order for Mike Patrick to be present for the discussion.

RETIREMENT AND STAFF BENEFITS. Wayne Cogell turned the floor over to Jim Pogue for two announcements:

1. Pogue reported having recently received three pamphlets that give the current status of the University retirement and staff benefits investment program. He has requested additional copies, to be placed in the library; in the meantime his copies are available for faculty to examine.
2. In regard to figuring retirement benefits, a leave of absence during the last ten years is simply omitted in determining the five best years of salary.

Then Cogell proceeded with the Personnel Committee's Response to UMC Staff Task Force Retirement Plan (full copy of the Committee's Response; full copy of the UMC Task Force Retirement Plan, October 23, 1975, minutes). Following a request from the floor that each recommendation in the report be considered separately, Cogell moved that Recommendation 1 (correlated with UMC Recommendation D) be approved:

That there be annual adjustments for inflation to the extent possible; the manner and amount of adjustment to be determined by the actuary.

Daane seconded the motion. Wollard noted that the actuary only recommends, that the Board of Curators must approve. There was consent on this being an editorial change. Leighly asked whether the recommendation is viable; Cogell responded that the adjustment should be made each year but that some years it might not be possible because of lack of funds. Most of the discussion on the motion centered on the phrase "to the extent possible." Ruhland asked whether the phrase is equivalent to the inflationary increase in the economy. Cogell responded that it pertains to the funds available. Ruhland and Barr urged that the recommendation should call for retirement payments to keep up with inflationary increases in the economy. Cogell and Gerson said that the Personnel Committee had considered such a request to be unrealistic. Chairman Johnson reported that the Board of Curators discusses the problem of inflationary increases frequently, but rules that there is insufficient money to provide the necessary increase in the retirement fund. In line with the desire of some Council members to recommend that inflationary increases be based on the economy rather than on the funds available, Chuck Johnson moved to amend the first recommendation by deleting "to the extent possible." Skitek seconded the amendment. Gerson, however, felt that the amendment was weaker than the recommendation. With a suggestion that the phrase "to the extent possible" should be retained and modified to "to the maximum extent possible," Chuck Johnson changed his amendment to that reading, and Skitek changed his second. The amendment carried.

Discussion continued on the motion for approval of Recommendation 1 as amended. Barr asked what the Committee had felt was wrong with UMC Recommendation D, which recommends that retirement payments be adjusted, for inflation purposes, according to a salary/wage index. In response, Gerson stated that the Committee did not think the salary/wage index would necessarily be desirable, that it would be better to correlate retirement with a cost of living index. Ownby, supporting the UMC recommendation rather than the Committee's, felt it would be better to relate retirement to a salary/wage index than to nothing. The motion to accept Recommendation 1 as amended ("to the maximum extent possible") carried.

At this point Ken Robertson made a motion for a recess in order to honor an individual; Schowalter seconded the motion; it carried. Announcing that the Academic Council and the Executive Committee wished to honor an individual who was present at the meeting, Robertson proceeded to read the following resolution:
DUDLEY THOMPSON

Florence of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was noted as the birthplace of a series of flamboyant, slightly dishonest, but undeniably successful administrators who propelled it from the status of a small city into one of the glories of the Renaissance. Florence of the twentieth century, albeit on another continent, produced an administrator, equally colorful, considerably more honest, who played a significant role in the development of the Rolla campus from the Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy to the University of Missouri - Rolla.

Born in South Carolina and schooled in Virginia, he received the Bachelor of Science, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy from the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Willing, as ever, to serve as an example to students, he spent fifteen years on the road from the B.S. to the Ph.D., interspersing the trip with such small diversions as a world war and professional employment at North American Rayon and American Bemberg Corporation. His military experience led to advancement from Lieutenant to Colonel, and at various stages he was Department Head of Tactics at Camp Davis and Chief of the School Division, Infantry Advanced Placement Training Center, Camp Livingston, for which he was awarded the Army Commendation Ribbon.

In 1955 he left a position as associate professor at Virginia Polytechnic Institute to assume the chairmanship of the combined departments of chemistry and chemical engineering at Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy. He was instrumental in the decisions which led to the recognition of chemistry and chemical engineering as separate disciplines and to their development as doctoral degree granting departments. In 1964 he became Dean of Faculties and simultaneously served as Director of the School of Engineering and of the Industrial Research Center. From 1965 to 1973 he was Dean of Faculties.

In September, 1973, he was appointed Acting Chancellor and during the next year performed his duties ably and conscientiously. Financial and student population crises were handled in such a manner that the academic integrity of the University remained relatively untouched. New avenues for dialogue were opened between the various divisions of the campus, and a smooth transition was made possible between old and new administrations. In November, 1974, he was named Vice-Chancellor of UMR, a position he presently holds.

Dr. Thompson is a Professional Engineer, the author of twenty-four publications, and a member of some twenty professional organizations and eleven honorary societies. He is active in civic affairs, particularly the Rolla Rotary Club, of which he was president in 1962-63. He is married to a loving, patient lady, Exie, who not only has contributed to his success but who is a good friend to us all.

Therefore,

Whereas, the Academic Council of the University of Missouri - Rolla wishes to acknowledge Dudley Thompson's tenure as Acting Chancellor; and

Whereas, it is the custom of the Council to formalize such acknowledgements; let it be

Resolved, that this expression of appreciation be made a part of the records of the Academic Council and that a copy be forwarded to Dr. and Mrs. Dudley Thompson.
Dr. Robertson called for a standing ovation for Dr. and Mrs. Thompson, who were both in attendance; he then made a motion to approve the resolution. Cagell seconded the motion, and it carried. Chairman Johnson thanked Mrs. Thompson for being in attendance.

Following the recess, Cagell moved approval for Recommendation 2 of the retirement report:

That we support the Board's action of August, 1975, which implemented Recommendation E.

Schowalter seconded the motion. A request concerning the substance of UMC Recommendation E came from the floor. Pogue identified this UMC recommendation as the one urging that the retirement plan count total years of service instead of the previous maximum of 35, thus removing the penalty of lower retirement benefits for longer service. Barr questioned that the Board had actually approved the UMC recommendation. In reply Pogue stated that Dr. Donald Holm had informed the UMR retirement representatives that the Board had implemented the extension in years of service; however, he was not certain whether the implementation was retroactive, as called for in the UMC recommendation. In order to recheck Board action, Cogell withdrew his motion for approval of Recommendation 2, and Schowalter withdrew his second.

Cogell moved approval of Recommendation 3 (relative to UMC Recommendation F—that the actuary should prepare a cost study for crediting part-time employment toward retirement):

That the present cost study results should be reported to the general faculty.

The motion was seconded by Lyle Rhea, and it carried.

Cogell next moved approval of Recommendation 4 (correlated with UMC Recommendation H):

That all summer employment should be given equitable credit toward retirement.

Leighly seconded the motion, and then asked the meaning of equitable. Cogell replied that the Committee had not been able to decide. Ownby suggested an editorial change from equitable to full, but Gerson said that that change would be no clearer. Several members of the Council cited possible problems with the recommendation:

1. Insufficient number of summer teaching jobs for all faculty who might desire them.
2. Summer teaching jobs often assigned just arbitrarily.
3. Undue pressure on chairmen to employ for summer the faculty just about to retire.
4. Higher cost of summer school if the jobs are given to those about to retire (with higher salaries).
5. Discouragement of summer employment in industry or elsewhere.
Several Council members also asked whether the Committee had considered suggestions made at the October 23 meeting: 1) prorating 11-month salaries to a 9-month basis; 2) automatically prorating all faculty salaries from a 9-month to an 11-month basis for retirement credit.

Ted Planje made a motion to refer Recommendation 4 to the Personnel Committee; Ruhland seconded the motion. Cogell said that the Committee had already considered the recommendation carefully, that he would prefer a motion. The referral motion was defeated.

In line with previous suggestions by Planje and Pursell, Ruhland submitted a substitute motion:

Retirement benefits for academic staff will be calculated on the basis of $\frac{11}{9}$ of the 9-month salary for the best five consecutive years out of the last ten.

Baird seconded the substitute motion. Gerson and Cogell objected to the substitute motion as economically impractical, for the money being placed in the retirement fund would be based only on actual summer employment. Pursell and Planje said that the Council should be concerned with making a recommendation, not with actuarial soundness. Gerson further objected that the substitute motion would give some faculty retirement money for not working. The vote on the substitute motion carried 13 to 9.

Cogell then made a motion to approve Recommendation 7 (correlated with UMC Recommendation 1):

That UMR Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee be formed: the committee will include the University-wide Staff Benefits representatives, Mrs. Walls, and another faculty member; the committee will gather information about the operation of the retirement plan and make recommendations to the Chancellor and University-wide Staff Benefits Committee representatives.

Leighly seconded the motion. Discussion included the following comments and questions:

1. Whether four on the committee is a good number.
2. Instead of naming Mrs. Walls, the job title should be given.
3. Whether Mrs. Walls would have an equal vote on the committee.
4. Whether non-academic staff have the mechanism to elect someone.
5. Whether formed means the members are elected or appointed by the Chancellor.
6. A standing committee, or even a sub-committee to the Personnel Committee, would require a change in the By-laws.
7. Why this recommendation is a recommendation to UMC.

At this point in the discussion, Robertson made a motion to table the remainder of the report (Recommendations 1 and 3 already passed) from the Personnel Committee and to direct that Committee to have an open meeting for faculty, administration, and non-academic staff to discuss further the Committee's recommendations on the UMC retirement proposal. Chuck Johnson seconded the motion, and it carried.
LIBRARY RULES. Mike Patrick brought to the Council for action the proposed changes in circulation rules for the library (full copy*). Robertson made a motion to approve the proposed rules, and Leighly seconded the motion. Ruhland expressed the opinion that faculty, upon showing an ID card, should be able to remove periodicals from the library for xeroxing. Patrick referred members to the new rules, which do make some provisions for the removal of periodicals. Another member of the Council felt that the period of three days for the first overdue notice to faculty is too short, since some faculty might be out of town; he suggested that a week should be allowed before a second notice is sent. In response, Patrick said that the total length of time allowed for both overdue notices is ten days, which should be a sufficient length of time; furthermore, students, he noted, sometimes need books immediately.

Discussion also included several questions of clarification, which were answered by Patrick:

1. Will the library allow faculty to renew books at the end of a semester by telephone? Answer: No, the faculty member must actually return the books to the library for renewal.

2. Since the rules state that check out time for faculty is one semester, exactly when does the book become due? Answer: At the beginning of the following semester.

3. Are the overdue notices to students (B.2.) on the same time schedule as overdue notices for faculty? Answer: Yes.

4. Why is there a difference between B.2., which charges the undergraduate student with the replacement cost of the book plus a $3.00 service charge if the student fails to return a book after overdue notices are not acknowledged, and A.2., which does not charge the faculty member and graduate student for the book plus the service fee after two overdue notices are not acknowledged? Answer: Faculty and graduate students depend on the library more than undergraduate students do.

Discussion continued with Cogell citing objections from his department on A.2., that is, to the notification of the department chairman and the Provost if faculty do not return a book after two overdue notices; he said that a fine system had been suggested instead. Patrick responded that library personnel prefer not imposing fines and that it would be very difficult to collect fines at the circulation desk. He did, however, refer to A.5., which says that the library committee is considering the use of fines if these proposed circulation rules fail to work. Baird also spoke against the notification of the chairman and the Provost, suggesting that the faculty member could be billed for a fine by the business office. Daane suggested that a book not returned by a faculty member might be charged to his departmental E & E. Leighly felt that the library needed some method of persuasion, like the department chairman, to encourage the return of books.

Cogell made a motion for an amendment of A.2. to delete all references to notification of the department chairman and the Provost, leaving: "Three
days after the first overdue notice is sent, a second overdue notice will be mailed". Baird seconded the amendment, and it carried.

Then Ruhland made a motion for another amendment to A.2., adding to A.2. a section from B.2. (calling for the student to be charged for replacing a book if it is not returned after overdue notices), so that A.2. (for faculty and graduate students) would read as follows:

Three days after the first overdue notice is sent, a second overdue notice will be mailed. If the book is not returned after one additional week, it shall be presumed to be lost. The charges shall be replacement price of the book plus a service charge of $3.00. This will be sent to the business officer for collection. If the book is returned after these charges are assessed, the price of the book will be returned, but the $3.00 service charge shall be retained.

Chuck Johnson seconded this amendment. There was some discussion on the matter of replacing books: Patrick stated that some faculty might choose to keep an irreplaceable book and be charged for it; Leighly commented that some books, such as out-dated ones, should not be automatically replaced. Question was called on the amendment, and it carried.

Question was then called on the original motion to approve the proposed circulation rules as contained in the report and as now amended. The motion carried.

Before concluding the meeting, Chairman Johnson announced that information regarding nominations for an award of 35 thousand dollars, offered by Texas Instruments for achievement in the physical sciences, health, engineering, management sciences, or mathematics, is available in the Academic Council office. Interested persons may review this information in the Council office.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Pogue, Secretary

*Complete document filed with the smooth copy.

Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of the actions approved.
Minutes of the special meeting of the Academic Council, December 17, 1975.

Chairman Jim Johnson called the special meeting of the Academic Council to order at 1:35 p.m. on Wednesday, December 17, 1975, in the Mechanical Engineering Auditorium. Chairman Johnson announced the following proxies: Charles A. Sorrell substituting for Darrell Ownby; Donald Oster for Jo W. Barr; and Frank G. Walters for Thomas B. Baird.

Chairman Johnson identified the calling of the special meeting as the result of a petition that requested a consideration of the restructuring of academic administrative offices. Accordingly, the Chairman continued, he had asked certain people to be present—Jim Pogue, Joe Wollard, and Harold Fuller, because of their familiarity with the UMR budget and with the U-wide financial exigency committee. Chairman Johnson then turned the floor over to Samir Hanna, who had, prior to the meeting, requested time for a presentation.

Dr. Hanna opened his presentation with several general remarks: 1) he opposes the treatment of people as items on a list of priorities, as well as an emphasis on FTE, SCH, faculty effort and profile reports; 2) he feels that education should be emphasized instead; 3) the academic administration has proliferated because of the appointment of assistant and associate deans, with a total cost of academic administration at UMR of $600,000 per year; 4) the deanships are supposed to serve as coordinating units, but actually operate as unnecessary buffers between departmental faculties and the decision-making level. Referring to Mark Edelman's (Director of the Budget for Missouri) statement that the University should reduce its administrative and public relations expenditures in order to meet the budget, Dr. Hanna concluded his remarks by saying that the University should act itself, instead of taking advice from an outsider.

Next, Dr. Hanna presented several statistical charts.

1. University of Missouri

   Total general operating budget, 1975-76 ........ $191,747,517
   Rolla Campus .................................. 16,792,833
   U-wide ........................................... 22,687,655
   Central administration support services .......... 5,007,480

Dr. Hanna commented that the $5 million figure, as 20% of the U-wide budget, is too high.

2. UMR total budget ....................... $16,792,833

   S & W     E & E     Total
   U-police  $189,356  $11,800  $201,156
   Watchmen  67,956    6,415    74,371
   Library   186,712   16,033   $202,745
Although the library is allotted $143,500 for acquisitions, Dr. Hanna noted that more money is expended on university police and watchmen than is expended on the library in S & W and E & E. Hanna also commented that only half of the total budget of $16 million plus is budgeted for instruction.

3. UMR Academic Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S &amp; W</th>
<th>E &amp; E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>$43,345</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$53,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration, Extension</td>
<td>84,306</td>
<td>14,048</td>
<td>98,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>77,986</td>
<td>14,829</td>
<td>92,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Mines &amp; Metallurgy</td>
<td>58,329</td>
<td>8,440</td>
<td>66,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Engineering</td>
<td>136,688</td>
<td>13,899</td>
<td>150,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Graduate School</td>
<td>72,716</td>
<td>14,680</td>
<td>87,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Coordinator</td>
<td>72,426</td>
<td>15,381</td>
<td>87,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$545,796</td>
<td>$ 91,277</td>
<td>$637,073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Hanna identified the preceding S & W figures as including the salaries of deans (ranging from $30 to over $37 thousand), associate or assistant deans, and secretaries (2 to 3 per unit). Further, he noted that restructuring would not save half a million dollars, since deans, associate deans, and assistant deans have academic rank in various departments. Nevertheless, he offered these advantages to restructuring: some cost savings; greater efficiency in conducting business; and strengthening of the departments as academic units.

Then Hanna presented a plan for restructuring the academic administration, using the following chart:

![Diagram of the plan for restructuring the academic administration]

Dr. Hanna supplied the following explanation of the chart:

1. Department chairmen from each of the two schools and the college would elect representatives (one per school) for a period of two years, at no extra compensation for administrative duties beyond the usual 2/11ths for the summer months. The school/college representatives could be called deans, if desired. Associate deans would succeed as deans for the
following two years.

2. The representatives (deans) would meet with the Dean of Faculties periodically and occasionally with the Chancellor, if needed.

3. One secretary would be assigned to the office of each representative (dean).

In addition, Hanna made the following proposal for the office of the Dean of the Graduate School: representatives of the departments to the graduate council would elect from among themselves, for a one-year period, a chairman who would serve as a graduate office coordinator, at no extra compensation beyond the 2/11ths for the summer months. This coordinator (perhaps called dean) would also meet with the Dean of Faculties.

In conclusion, Hanna stated that he would submit this restructuring plan to the Academic Council, with the recommendation that Chairman Johnson appoint a committee to study the plan and to report its findings to the general faculty. Bassem Armaly moved that Dr. Hanna's recommendation be accepted; Lyle Rhea seconded the motion. Gary Patterson asked for clarification: whether the committee's study would be limited to Hanna's proposed restructuring. Hanna replied that, although he fully supports his proposal, he would assume that other plans could be considered by the committee.

Following the motion, Chairman Johnson made the floor available to anyone wishing to speak.

Dr. Kreidl asked to make a presentation. He stated that, though he had initially opposed the motion as being minimal, he would now speak in favor of it since it is not limited to a consideration of only one plan. He presented the following ideas, in summary: that the University is in a state of decay; that the students should be the first priority and the faculty the second, at least in regard to educating the students; that the priority of education cannot be served with the present funds unless there is a real change in administrative costs; that the University should seriously consider restructuring the administration in order to demonstrate to the taxpayers that the primary goal of the University is the education of the students.

Taking the floor next, Phil Leighly began with the following remark: that he was a member of UMIFAC when Dr. Ratchford first became president; at that time Ratchford supported decentralization but was persuaded otherwise by advisors; the result has been an overburgeoning of the administration. Leighly cited his experience at two other universities, where administrations were smaller, with administrators teaching courses or chairmen serving as deans for three-year terms. In conclusion, he said that UMR must solve its own problems or U-wide will make decisions for the local campus; thus he expressed his support of the motion for restructuring.

Dave Wulfman took the floor next, saying that right now the administration is under attack by the legislature, but that the "fat" is found in the faculty, too. He expressed the opinion that the legislature is attacking the administration first and will attack the faculty next. Thus, he felt that any study of the administrative structure should be done very carefully. He also cited administrative expense as being less here than elsewhere. The real problem, he continued, is the lack of
support for higher education in the state—by politicians and the governor, as well as by private industry. He illustrated the lack of support by citing Missouri as 17th in wealth, but 42nd in support of education. He concluded by saying that the administration has failed to make monetary necessities known to the legislature and by expressing the opinion that the faculty should unionize.

Dean McFarland requested the floor to make several comments: 1) The budget of $5 million for the central administration is not unreasonable for administration of a total operation of around $250 million. 2) If the Board of Curators did eliminate U-wide administration, UMR would not realize as much administrative service on its 10% of the budget. 3) President Ratchford still believes in decentralization, but our campus, for instance, lacks the administrative capability to administer grants and contracts at the present budget levels. 4) Edelman's support of the governor was for public purposes. Dean McFarland concluded his presentation by speaking in favor of the sense of the motion, approving of any plan that would give better structure; but he noted that since the deans, in the proposed plan, would return to the departments in which they are tenured, the number of people would not be reduced, nor would SCH (which the Coordinating Board for Higher Education examines) be improved.

Taking the floor next, Bill James wanted to make a clarification: that the motion was not an attack on the administration, but a positive effort to reduce expenses. Similarly, he continued, the faculty should not consider themselves under attack if some programs have to be eliminated in order to reduce expenses. He made two additional comments in regard to previous statements: 1) it is irrelevant to compare the cost of administration at UM with that cost at other universities; 2) the $5 million is for U-wide only; each campus has its own administration in addition. He concluded by saying that there should be a positive attempt to help the Chancellor in making decisions to reduce expenses.

After taking the floor, Dave Summers voiced agreement with the motion in general, but expressed two concerns about it. First, he questioned whether a committee would actually accomplish anything; referring to the evaluation of administration made in 1972, he expressed disappointment that the members of the committee only repeated the evaluations made by the administrators themselves. Second, he thought that the motion should not be restricted to the academic administration, but widened to include the Business Office and its various units as well.

Chairman Johnson then asked Harold Fuller to report on the financial exigency committee. After explaining that the committee was requested by Mel George, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, on October 30, 1975, Fuller identified the following issues to be considered:

1. In terms of preventive planning, how can the University avoid financial exigency?

2. What is the definition of a financial exigency? Who declares it? Can it exist on a single campus or must it be University-wide?

3. If one is declared, how are decisions made about programs to be reduced? How would such decisions relate to the academic plan? Who would make the decisions? An AAUP statement calls for faculty involvement in the decisions.
4. If programs are reduced, how are individuals chosen for release? Would such individuals be relocated? What rights does an individual (tenured or not) have in such a situation—right to a hearing, right to notice, right to reinstatement later?

5. How is the end of a financial exigency determined?

6. How is the discontinuation of a program handled?

Concluding his report, Fuller announced that the committee consists of four members from each campus and that the first meeting will be held in January, 1976.

Next, Nord Gale made some comments. First, he said that each individual should make an attempt to be productive and evaluate his own function; however, he noted that there is too much paper work, leaving too little time for the education of students, which is the primary function of the University. Second, since the faculty is evaluated, the administration should be evaluated also, especially in regard to implementing the academic plan. He stated that the academic plan calls for programs, like life sciences, and that something positive should be done to implement the academic plan, even though the financial situation is bad.

Gary Patterson moved to amend the original motion: that the chairman of the Budgetary Affairs Committee be included on the ad hoc committee to study the administrative restructuring and that the Budgetary Affairs Committee be called for consultation whenever the ad hoc committee should deem it necessary. Harvey seconded the amendment, and it carried. Then the motion calling for Chairman Johnson to appoint a committee to study the restructuring of the administration (as amended) carried.

Ken Robertson moved to adjourn; Bassam Armaly seconded. The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Pogue
Secretary

Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of the actions approved.
A RESOLUTION

Whereas, the University of Missouri has undertaken to use a single computer program encompassing all campuses of the University to record student grades, to record other information on students, and to produce statistical information based on student grades and programs, and

Whereas, this program led to chaos at the end of the fall semester, 1975, and during the registration for the spring semester, 1976, on the campus of UMR, and

Whereas, the new computer program will require an increase of the personnel processing student records from 3 to 7 on the campus of UMR, and

Whereas, this situation has done a real disservice to our students;

To wit: 1) they have been unable to obtain current transcripts of their academic records for inclusion with applications for employment or graduate schools, and 2) the faculty advisors have been unable to counsel students intelligently on their academic programs due to the lack of up-to-date academic information.

Therefore, the Academic Council of UMR deplores this disservice to our students, our faculty, and our friends in industry, in government, and in other academic institutions; furthermore, it requests President C. Brice Ratchford to investigate this fiasco, to assess responsibility for the present situation, and to explore alternatives to prevent a reoccurrence of the recent unfortunate events.
MEMORANDUM TO: UMR Faculty

RE: AGENDA for the Academic Council Meeting Thursday, January 29, 1976, at 1:30 p.m. in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building.

I. Approval of the minutes of the December 4, 1975, meeting, and the minutes of the December 17, 1975, special meeting of the Academic Council.

II. Unfinished business.
   A. Tabled item:
      **1. Retirement and Staff Benefits: September 4, 1975, V,1.7. Wayne Cogell

III. Reports of administrative responses to actions approved by the Academic Council.

IV. Reports of standing or special committees.
   A. 4.516 Curricula
   B. 4.521 Rules, Procedure, and Agenda
      1. Referrals to the Admissions & Academic Standards Committee.
         a. Final examinations.
         b. Scheduling of Classes.
         c. Admissions requirements.
         d. Transfer Policy for Undergraduates.
      2. Referral to the Personnel Committee.
         a. Evaluation of administrators.
      3. Referral to the Faculty Conduct Committee.
         a. Grievance Procedures.
   C. 4.522 Student Affairs
      *1. Student Organization Constitutions.
   D. 4.533 Security and Traffic Safety
      *1. Recommendation for approval - changes in parking regulations.
   E. Report: Faculty Advisory Committee to the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education.

V. New business.
   *A. Resolution: U-wide Computer System.

VI. Announcements.

*Supplementary material sent to Academic Council members.
**Supplementary material sent to Academic Council members with the December Agenda.
MEMORANDUM TO: UMR Academic Council

FROM: UMR Curricula Committee

RE: Committee Report No. 4 (1975-76)

January 23, 1976

The following requests have been made to the Curricula Committee and, after consideration, are herewith recommended to the Academic Council for approval.

A. New Courses:

1. Computer Science 388, Computer Center Management, 3 credit hours.
   Prerequisite: A 200 level course in Computer Science.
   Catalog Description: A thorough survey of the management of computing facilities and services including: selection and evaluation of hardware and software, cost analysis, scheduling, security, privacy, budgets, documentation, effective programming, system planning, project management, and data communications.
   Justification: The increasing complexity of computer facilities and services has put much greater emphasis on effective management by computer professionals—few managers are hired on technical competence alone. Other leading universities are introducing courses in Computer Center Management.

2. Aerospace 281, Aerospace Systems Design II, 3 credit hours.
   Prerequisites: AE 280, 253, 235.
   Catalog Description: Preliminary design of aerospace systems. Project to integrate the knowledge of different aerospace engineering areas through synthesis and analysis. The creative design will include a consideration of such factors as performance, reliability, cost, human factors, energy, and ecology.
   Justification: To provide the students ample time to obtain information, in AE 280, so that the entry course of AE 281 can be spent on the actual preliminary design.

3. Electrical Engineering 341, Digital Signal Processing, 3 credit hours.
   Prerequisites: EE 265 or consent of instructor.
   Catalog Description: Spectral representations, sampling, quantization, z-transforms, digital filters, and discrete transforms including the Fast Fourier transform.
   Justification: This course was taught fall semester, 1974, as EE 301, with an enrollment of 17 students, and is again being offered fall semester, 1975. This course covers an area which is currently void in our curriculum. It will serve both EE majors as well as out-of-department students, such as geophysics, and will provide a background which is essential to students interested in digital processing of data and of signals.

   Prerequisites: Variable.
   Catalog Description: Lectures in an area of engineering mechanics
of immediate need or interest, which may develop into a continuing course. (Upper classmen or graduate standing.)

Justification: Allow the department to offer new material in areas of need or interest until such material may be incorporated into an established course or new course.

5. Petroleum Engineering 341, Well Test Analysis, 3 credit hours.
   Prerequisites: Petr. 241, Math 201.
   Catalog Description: Causes of low well productivity; analysis of pressure buildup tests, drawdown tests, multi-rate tests, injection well fall off tests, and open flow potential tests; and design of well testing procedures.

   Justification: Dr. Koderitz is a new faculty member and has worked in the area of transient pressure analysis. Most oil companies use these tests to determine reservoir parameters and optimum producing rates. A beginning engineer is assumed to have some background in this field.

   Lab is required for calculations due to the length of the problems involved. The course has been taught as Petr. 301 or Petr. 401.

B. Deletion:

1. English 387, Senior Examination; English (Lecture 1).

C. Changes: Credit Hours (CH), Prerequisite (P), Course Title (CT), Catalog Description (CD), Course Number (CN), and Curriculum (Cur).

   (P) None listed to Mgt. 210, C.Sc.73.

2. Economics 320, Money and Banking.
   (P) Econ.100 to Econ.100, 203.

   (CT) to Theory of Compiling.
   (CD)
   Present: The study of formal languages and their abstract description; the structure and construction of compilers of high level languages, and automatic syntax recognition of modern procedure oriented languages.

   Proposed: Properties of formal grammars and languages, language-preserving transformations, syntax-directed parsing, classes of parsing methods and properties of the grammars for which they are suited, control flow analysis, and the theoretical framework of local and global program optimization methods.

   (CH) from Lecture 2, Laboratory 1 to Lecture 3.
5. Life Science 1, General Biology.
   (CD) Delete "Does not meet requirements for life science majors."

   (P) from Junior standing to Junior standing or by consent of instructor.

7. French 1, Elementary French I.
   (CD) from "Laboratory required." to "Laboratory optional."

   (CD) Present: Deals with the growth and development of aerospace power, astronautics, and space operations. Junior year, second semester.

   Proposed: Covers the strategy and management of international conflict and the formulation and implementation of U.S. defense policy. Reviews case studies in defense policy making. Junior year, second semester.

   Justification: Last year the course content was redefined as part of a nationwide Air Force ROTC curriculum adjustment. The "proposed" catalog description is as it is listed in the current UMR Bulletin.

   (CD) Present: Deals with the growth and development of aerospace power, astronautics and space operations. Junior year, first semester.

   Proposed: Briefly reviews the development of communicative skills and the role and function of the professional officer in society. Also reviews the framework of defense policy and the foundation of defense strategy. Junior year, first semester.

10. Aerospace Studies 135.
    (CD) Present: Deals with the growth and development of aerospace power, astronautics, and space operation. Junior year, first semester.

    Proposed: The environment of the Air Force officer, the Air Force as a career, advanced leadership experiences through laboratory presentations, and management exercises. Junior year, first semester.

11. Geophysics 385, Seismic Prospecting I.
    (CT) to Reflection Seismology.

    (P) Geop. 283, Math 201 to Geop. 283, Geol. 220 or consent of instructor.

    (CD) Present: Detailed study of the theory for application of the refraction and reflection methods of geophysical prospecting. Problems and instrumentation work.

    Proposed: Principles of reflection seismology as applied to the determination of geological structures. Construction of geological maps from seismic data and data enhancement techniques. First semester. (Geophysics 283 and Geol. 220, or approval of instructor)
   (CT) to Introduction to Geophysics.
   (P) from Geol. 51, Phy. 25, Math. 22, Geol. 51 or Geol. 50.
   (CD) Present: An introduction to the gravitational, magnetic, electrical, radioactive, and seismic methods of geophysical prospecting as applied to mineral exploration and engineering problems.
   Proposed: An introduction to the theory and application of seismic reflection and refraction, magnetic, gravity, electrical, radiation, and geothermal methods to the study of the planet earth. Special emphasis is placed upon mineral exploration techniques. Problems and instrument work.

13. Computer Science; B.S. Requirements.
   (Cur)(CD) Change in Literature requirements.
   Present: Literature requirement: "Any six hour sequence of literature courses or any two 300 level literature.
   Proposed: Literature requirement: "Any six semester hours of literature or three semester hours of literature and three semester hours of speech."

   (CN) Change from 475 to 435 to remove a conflict.

   (P) From Eng. 75 to a sophomore level course in literature.

   (P) From Eng. 75 to a sophomore level course in literature

17. Philosophy 350, Directed Readings.
   (P) From none to Phi. 5.

18. Philosophy 345, Philosophy of Science.
   (P) From none to Phi. 5.

19. Philosophy 325, Philosophical Ideas in Literature.
   (P) From none to Phi. 5.

   (CH) Lecture 1, Lab. 3, Total 4 to Lecture 1, Lab. 0, Total 1.
   (CT) to Aerospace Systems Design I.
   (P) AE 235, 251, 271 to AE 251, 271.
   (CD) Present: Preliminary design of components and complete systems for aircraft, missiles, and space vehicles. Projects to integrate the knowledge acquired in the different areas of aerospace engineering through the synthesis and analysis of aerospace vehicles or components. Consideration of factors affecting performance, cost, and reliability.
   Proposed: Consideration of the creative design process with emphasis on aeronautical-aerospace systems. Short design problems to illustrate the process. Selection of design projects for A.E. 281.
Information gathering for the design projects which will be completed in Aerospace Systems Design II.

21. Aerospace Engineering
   (Cur) Incorporation of AE 280 and AE 281 into curriculum.
   NOTE: No change in lecture or laboratory credit hours from the former 4 C.H. AE 280.

22. Aerospace Studies II, Leadership Laboratory.
   (CD) Present: The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.
   Justification: Last year the course content was redefined as part of a nationwide Air Force ROTC curriculum adjustment. The "Proposed" catalog description is as it is in the current UMR Bulletin.

23. Aerospace Studies 21, Leadership Laboratory.
   (CD) Present: The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.

   (CD) Present: The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.

25. Aerospace Studies 41, Leadership Laboratory.
   (CD) Present: The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.

(CD) Present: The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.

Proposed: The environment of the Air Force officer; the Air Force as a career, advanced leadership experiences through laboratory presentations, and management exercises. Junior year, second semester.

27. Aerospace Studies 147, Leadership Laboratory.
(CD) Present: The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.

Proposed: The environment of the Air Force officer, the Air Force as a career, advanced leadership experiences through laboratory presentations, and management exercises. Senior year, first semester.

(CD) Present: The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.

Proposed: The environment of the Air Force officer, the Air Force as a career, advanced leadership experiences through laboratory presentations, and management exercises. Senior year, second semester.


Proposed: Familiarization with the background doctrine, mission, and organization of the U. S. Air Force, the functions of strategic and defensive forces, general purpose forces, and aerospace support forces. Freshman year, first semester.

(CD) Present: Aerospace defense; missile defense; U. S. general purpose and aerospace support forces; the mission, resources, and operation of tactical air forces, with special attention to limited war; review of Army, Navy, and Marine general purpose forces.
Proposed: Familiarization with the background doctrine, mission, and organization of the U. S. Air Force, the functions of strategic and defensive forces, general purpose forces, and aerospace support forces. Freshman year, second semester.

(CD) Present: This course deals with the theory and application of general concepts of leadership to Air Force situations. Group discussions, case studies, and role playing as teaching devices will be employed. Oral and written reports will be expected. Also includes a review of the military justice system.

Proposed: Surveys managerial and communicative skills. Dialogue between students and instructors is stressed. Senior year, first semester.

32. Aerospace Studies 108
(CD) Present: A study of the general theory and practice management with special reference to the Air Force. The student will be introduced to information systems, quantitative approaches to decision making, and resource control techniques used by successful Air Force managers. Participation in problem-situation exercises and field trips, and oral and written student reports will be expected.

Proposed: Surveys managerial and communicative skills. Dialogue between students and instructors is stressed. Senior year, second semester.

33. Aerospace Studies 40.
(CD) Present: U. S. defense policy, organization, and national power are studied. The military strength of major military powers is analyzed.

Proposed: Changes in the nature of military conflict, air power as a primary element of national security, the effect of technology on air power growth and development, the changing mission of the defense establishment. Sophomore year, second semester.

34. Aerospace Studies 30.
(CD) Present: U. S. defense policy, organization, and national power are studied. The military strength of major military powers is analyzed.

Proposed: Changes in the nature of military conflict, air power as a primary element of national security, the effect of technology on air power growth and development, the changing mission of the defense establishment. Sophomore year, first semester.

35. Electrical Engineering 211, Digital System Design.
(P) EE 63, 281, 289 to EE 63, 283, 389.

(P) EE 211 or CSE 253 or consent of instructor to EE 211 or consent of instructor.
(CT) to Digital Systems Design Laboratory.
   (P) EE 211 or CS 253 to EE 211 or consent of instructor.
   (CT) to Digital Computer Design.

38. Engineering Mechanics:
   Curriculum Change: First semester, senior year, Physics 107,
   Introduction to Modern Physics, dropped. Replaced with
   Metallurgy 121, Metallurgy for Engineers.

   (P) L.Sc. 15 to L.Sc. 15 or consent of instructor.

40. Life Science 15, Zoology.
   (P) L.Sc. 2 and 11 or consent of instructor to L.Sc. 1.

41. Engineering Management 353, Managerial Economics.
   (P) Econ. 101 to Econ. 101 or consent of instructor.
   (CD) Present: Emphasis on the economic forces that affect the
   industrial enterprise, stressing types of analysis and relationship
   to the decision processes of the manager. Study of national income,
   economic activity, prices and business cycles, banking principles,
   and international economics.

   Proposed: The application of economic analysis to business and govern­
   ment decision making. Includes an exposition of theoretical tools of
   economics useful to decision making; a review of empirical studies
   and illustrations of applications of economic analysis in management;
   and cases involving managerial situations.

42. Engineering Management 454, Advanced Production Management.
   (P) None to Math 115, 215, or equivalent.

   (P) Mgt. 130 to Senior or graduate standing.

44. Civil Engineering I, Fundamentals of Surveying.
   (P) Entrance requirements to Math 6 or equivalent.

45. Civil Engineering 10, Introduction to Civil Engineering.
   (CD) Present: Introduction to the profession of civil engineering,
   and description of preference areas; orientation to university life
   and guidance on forming good study habits; theory and use of the
   slide rule. Required of first semester freshmen.

   Proposed: Introduction to the profession of civil engineering and
   description of preference areas; orientation to university life and,
   guidance on forming good study habits; techniques of problem solving.
   Required of first semester freshmen.

46. Civil Engineering 345, Construction Methods.
   (P) CE 241 to CE 215, 216, 218, 241.

47. Civil Engineering 346, Management of Construction Costs.
   (P) CE 345 to Preceded or accompanied by CE 345.
MEMORANDUM TO: UNR Academic Council

FROM: UNR Curricula Committee

SUBJECT: Committee Report No. 4 (1975-76)

The following requests have been made to the Curricula Committee and, after consideration, are herewith recommended to the Academic Council for approval.

A. New Courses:

1. Computer Science 388, Computer Center Management, 3 credit hours.
   Prerequisites: A 200 level course in Computer Science.
   Catalog Description: A thorough survey of the management of computing facilities and services including selection and evaluation of hardware and software, cost analysis, scheduling, security, privacy, budgets, documentation, effective programming, systems planning, project management, and data communications.
   Justification: The increasing complexity of computer facilities and services has put much greater emphasis on effective management by computer professionals—few managers are hired on technical competence alone. Other leading universities are introducing courses in Computer Center Management.

2. Aerospace Systems Design II, 3 credit hours.
   Prerequisites: AS 260, 253, 235.
   Catalog Description: Preliminary design of aerospace systems. Project to integrate the knowledge of different aerospace engineering areas through synthesis and analysis. The creative design will include a consideration of such factors as performance, reliability, cost, human factors, energy, and ecology.
   Justification: To provide the students ample time to obtain information in AS 260, so that the entry course of AS 261 can be spent on the actual preliminary design.

3. Electrical Engineering 361, Digital Signal Processing, 3 credit hours.
   Prerequisites: EE 265 or consent of instructor.
   Catalog Description: Spectral representations, sampling, quantization, s-transforms, digital filters, and discrete transforms including the Fast Fourier transform.
   Justification: This course was taught fall semester, 1974, as EE 301, with an enrollment of 17 students, and is again being offered fall semester, 1975. This course covers an area which is currently void in our curriculum. It will serve both EE majors as well as out-of-department students, such as geophysics, and will provide a background which is essential to students interested in digital processing of data and of signals.

   Prerequisites: Variable.
   Catalog Description: Lectures in an area of engineering mechanics...
of immediate need or interest, which may develop into a continuing course. (Upper classmen or graduate standing.)

Justification: Allow the department to offer new material in areas of need or interest until such material may be incorporated into an established course or new course.

3. Petroleum Engineering 341, Well Test Analysis, 3 credit hours.
   Prerequisites: Petr. 241, Math 201.
   Catalog Description: Causes of low well productivity; analysis of pressure buildup tests, drawdown tests, multi-rate tests, injection well fall off tests, and open flow potential tests; and design of well testing procedures.
   Justification: Dr. Koderits is a new faculty member and has worked in the area of transient pressure analysis. Most oil companies use these tests to determine reservoir parameters and optimum producing rates. A beginning engineer is assumed to have some background in this field.
   Lab is required for calculations due to the length of the problems involved. The course has been taught as Petr. 301 or Petr. 401.

B. Deletion:

1. English 387, Senior Examination; English (Lecture 1).

C. Changes: Credit Hours (CH), Prerequisites (P), Course Title (CT), Catalog Description (CD), Course Number (CN), and Curriculum (Cur).

   (P) None listed to Mgt. 210, C.Sc.73.

2. Economics 320, Money and Banking.
   (P) Econ.100 to Econ.100, 203.

   (CT) to Theory of Compiling.
   (CD)
   Present: The study of formal languages and their abstract description; the structure and construction of compilers of high level languages, and automatic syntax recognition of modern procedure oriented languages.
   Proposed: Properties of formal grammars and languages, language-preserving transformations, syntax-directed parsing, classes of parsing methods and properties of the grammars for which they are suited, control flow analysis, and the theoretical framework of local and global program optimization methods.

   (CH) from Lecture 2, Laboratory 1 to Lecture 3.
5. Life Science I, General Biology.
   (CD) Delete "Does not meet requirements for life science majors."

   (P) From Junior standing to Junior standing or by consent of instructor.

7. French 1, Elementary French I.
   (CD) From "....laboratory required." to "....laboratory optional."

   (CD) Present: Deals with the growth and development of aerospace
   power, astronautics, and space operations. Junior year, second
   semester.

   Proposed: Covers the strategy and management of international con-
   flict and the formulation and implementation of U.S. defense policy.
   Reviews case studies in defense policy making. Junior year, second
   semester.

   Justification: Last year the course content was redefined as part
   of a nationwide Air Force ROTC curriculum adjustment. The "proposed"
   catalog description is as it is listed in the current UMR Bulletin.

   (CD) Present: Deals with the growth and development of aerospace
   power, astronautics and space operations. Junior year, first
   semester.

   Proposed: Briefly reviews the development of communicative skills and
   the role and function of the professional officer in society. Also
   reviews the framework of defense policy and the foundation of defense
   strategy. Junior year, first semester.

10. Aerospace Studies 135.
    (CD) Present: Deals with the growth and development of aerospace
        power, astronautics, and space operation. Junior year, first semester.

    Proposed: The environment of the Air Force officer, the Air Force
        as a career, advanced leadership experiences through laboratory
        presentations, and management exercises. Junior year, first semester.

    (CD) to Reflection Seismology.

    (P) Geop. 283, Math 201 to Geop. 283, Geol. 220 or consent of
        instructor.

    (CD) Present: Detailed study of the theory for application of the
        refraction and reflection methods of geophysical prospecting. Problems
        and instrumentation work.

    Proposed: Principles of reflection seismology as applied to the
        determination of geological structures. Construction of geological
        maps from seismic data and data enhancement techniques. First semester.
        (Geophysics 283 and Geol. 220, or approval of instructor)
   (CR) to Introduction to Geophysics.
   (P) from Geol 51, Phy. 25, to Math. 22, Geol. 51x or Geol 50.
   (CD) Present: An introduction to the gravitational, magnetic,
electrical, radioactive, and seismic methods of geophysical pros-
pecting as applied to mineral exploration and engineering problems.

     Proposed: An introduction to the theory and application of seismic
     reflection and refraction, magnetic, gravity, electrical, radiation,
     and geothermal methods to the study of the planet earth. Special
     emphasis is placed upon mineral exploration techniques. Problems
     and instrument work.

   (Cur)(CD) Change in Literature requirements.
     Present: Literature requirement: "Any six hour sequence of
     literature courses or any two 300 level literature.
     Proposed: Literature requirement: " Any six semester hours of
     literature or three semester hours of literature and three semester
     hours of speech."

   (CR) Change from 475 to 435 to remove a conflict.

   (P) From Engl. 75 to a sophomore level course in literature.

   (P) From Engl. 75 to a sophomore level course in literature

17. Philosophy 350, Directed Readings.
   (P) From none to Phil. 5.

18. Philosophy 345, Philosophy of Science.
   (P) From none to Phil. 5.

19. Philosophy 325, Philosophical Ideas in Literature.
   (P) From none to Phil. 5.

    (CR) Lecture 1, Lab. 3, Total 4 to Lecture 1, Lab. 0, Total 1.
    (CR) to Aerospace Systems Design I.
    (P) AE 235, 252, 271 to AE 252, 271.
    (CD) Present: Preliminary design of components and complete systems
    for aircraft, missiles, and space vehicles. Projects to integrate the
    knowledge acquired in the different areas of aerospace engineering
    through the synthesis and analysis of aerospace vehicles or components.
    Consideration of factors affecting performance, cost, and reliability.
    Creative design.

    Proposed: Consideration of the creative design process with emphasis
    on aeronautical-aerospace systems. Short design problems to illustr-
    ate the process. Selection of design projects for A.S. 281.
Information gathering for the design projects which will be completed in Aerospace Systems Design II.

21. **Aerospace Engineering**
   (Car) Incorporation of AE 280 and AE 281 into curriculum.
   **NOTES:** No change in lecture or laboratory credit hours from the former 4 C.H. AE 280.

22. **Aerospace Studies II, Leadership Laboratory.**
   (CD) **Present:** The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.

   **Proposed:** The environment of the Air Force officer; the Air Force as a career. A review of Air Force customs and courtesies, and drill and ceremonies instructions. Freshman year, first semester.

   **Justification:** Last year the course content was redefined as part of a nationwide Air Force ROTC curriculum adjustment. The "Proposed" catalog description is as it is in the current UMR Bulletin.

23. **Aerospace Studies 31, Leadership Laboratory.**
   (CD) **Present:** The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.

   **Proposed:** The environment of the Air Force officer; the Air Force as a career. A review of Air Force customs and courtesies, and drill and ceremonies instructions. Freshman year, second semester.

24. **Aerospace Studies 31, Leadership Laboratory.**
   (CD) **Present:** The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.

   **Proposed:** The environment of the Air Force officer; the Air Force as a career. A review of Air Force customs and courtesies, and drill and ceremonies instructions. Sophomore year, first semester.

25. **Aerospace Studies 41, Leadership Laboratory.**
   (CD) **Present:** The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.

   (CD) Present: The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.
   Proposed: The environment of the Air Force officer; the Air Force as a career, advanced leadership experiences through laboratory presentations, and management exercises. Junior year, second semester.

27. Aerospace Studies 147, Leadership Laboratory.
   (CD) Present: The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.
   Proposed: The environment of the Air Force officer; the Air Force as a career, advanced leadership experiences through laboratory presentations, and management exercises. Senior year, first semester.

   (CD) Present: The course involves a study of Air Force customs and courtesies, drill and ceremonies, career opportunities in the Air Force, and the life and work of an Air Force junior officer. Students develop their leadership potential in a practical supervised training laboratory, which typically includes field trips to Air Force installations throughout the United States.
   Proposed: The environment of the Air Force officer; the Air Force as a career, advanced leadership experiences through laboratory presentations, and management exercises. Senior year, second semester.

   Proposed: Familiarization with the background doctrine, mission, and organization of the U. S. Air Force, the functions of strategic and defensive forces, general purpose forces, and aerospace support forces. Freshman year, first semester.

   (CD) Present: Aerospace defense; missile defense; U. S. general purpose and aerospace support forces; the mission, resources, and operation of tactical air forces, with special attention to limited war; review of Army, Navy, and Marine general purpose forces.
Proposed: Familiarization with the background doctrines, mission, and organization of the U.S. Air Force, the functions of strategic and defensive forces, general purpose forces, and aerospace support forces. Freshman year, second semester.

(CD) Present: This course deals with the theory and application of general concepts of leadership to Air Force situations. Group discussions, case studies, and role playing as teaching devices will be employed. Oral and written reports will be expected. Also includes a review of the military justice system.

Proposed: Surveys managerial and communicative skills. Dialogue between students and instructors is stressed. Senior year, first semester.

32. Aerospace Studies 108.
(CD) Present: A study of the general theory and practice management with special reference to the Air Force. The student will be introduced to information systems, quantitative approaches to decision making, and resource control techniques used by successful Air Force managers. Participation in problem-simulation exercises and field trips, and oral and written student reports will be expected.

Proposed: Surveys managerial and communicative skills. Dialogue between students and instructors is stressed. Senior year, second semester.

33. Aerospace Studies 40.
(CD) Present: U.S. defense policy, organization, and national power are studied. The military strength of major military powers is analyzed.

Proposed: Changes in the nature of military conflict, air power as a primary element of national security, the effect of technology on air power growth and development, the changing mission of the defense establishment. Sophomore year, second semester.

34. Aerospace Studies 30.
(CD) Present: U.S. defense policy, organization, and national power are studied. The military strength of major military powers is analyzed.

Proposed: Changes in the nature of military conflict, air power as a primary element of national security, the effect of technology on air power growth and development, the changing mission of the defense establishment. Sophomore year, first semester.

35. Electrical Engineering 211, Digital System Design.
(P) EE 63, 201, 289 to EE 63, 289, 389.

(P) EE 211 or CSE 253 or consent of instructor to EE 211 or consent of instructor.
(CD) to Digital Systems Design Laboratory.
(P) EE 211 or CE 253 to EE 211 or consent of instructor.  
(CD) to Digital Computer Design.

38. Engineering Mechanics:  
Curriculum Change: First semester, senior year, Physics 107,  
Introduction to Modern Physics, dropped. Replaced with  
Metallurgy 121, Metallurgy for Engineers.

(P) L.Sc.15 to L.Sc.15 or consent of instructor.

(P) L.Sc.2 and 11 or consent of instructor to L.Sc.1.

41. Engineering Management 353, Managerial Economics.  
(P) Econ.101 to Econ.101 or consent of instructor.  
(CD) Present: Emphasis on the economic forces that affect the  
industrial enterprise, stressing types of analysis and relationship  
to the decision processes of the manager. Study of national income,  
economic activity, prices and business cycles, banking principles,  
and international economics.

Proposed: The application of economic analysis to business and govern-  
ment decision making. Includes an exposition of theoretical tools of  
economics useful to decision making; a review of empirical studies  
and illustrations of applications of economic analysis in management;  
and cases involving managerial situations.

42. Engineering Management 454, Advanced Production Management.  
(P) None to Math 115, 215, or equivalent.

(P) Mgt. 130 to Senior or graduate standing.

44. Civil Engineering I, Fundamentals of Surveying.  
(P) Entrance requirements to Math 5 or equivalent.

45. Civil Engineering 10, Introduction to Civil Engineering.  
(CD) Present: Introduction to the profession of civil engineering  
and description of preference areas; orientation to university life  
and guidance on forming good study habits; theory and use of the  
slide rule. Required of first semester freshman.

Proposed: Introduction to the profession of civil engineering and  
description of preference areas; orientation to university life and,  
guidance on forming good study habits; techniques of problem solving.  
Required of first semester freshman.

46. Civil Engineering 345, Construction Methods.  

47. Civil Engineering 346, Management of Construction Costs.  
(P) CE 345 to preceded or accompanied by CE 345.
Chairman Jim Johnson called the meeting of the Academic Council to order at 1:34 p.m. on Thursday, January 29, 1976, in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building. After announcing two proxies, Dave Dearth substituting for Ralph Lee and Glen Haddock for Lyle Pursell, Chairman Johnson introduced a new member, Sidney Bennett, replacing Byron Nelson from Engineering Management.

For the first item of business, Chairman Johnson requested approval of the minutes of the regular meeting held on December 4, 1975, and of the special meeting held on December 17, 1975. Adrian Daane moved approval of both minutes, and Gabe Skitek seconded. The motion carried.

V,7 RETIREMENT AND STAFF BENEFITS. Chairman Johnson reminded the Council of a tabled item (V,5.6): the report from the Personnel Committee on the UMC Task Force Proposal on Retirement and Staff Benefits (V,1.7). Since no motion to untable followed, the Chairman stated that the item would be dropped from the agenda until the Personnel Committee brings another report to the Council.

V,7 .2 CURRICULA. Chairman Johnson announced that, since Report No. 4 from the Curricula Committee (full copy*) was distributed to Council members just prior to the meeting, the Council would not take action on the report until the next meeting.

V,7 .3 RULES, PROCEDURES, AND AGENDA. Ralph Schowalter announced that the RP&A Committee had referred several items of business to Academic Council committees (full copies of referrals on file in the Academic Council office). First, the following items had been referred to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee:

a. A review of final examinations, requested by Harold Fuller, from the viewpoint that the semester is shortened by one week if final exams are not required.

b. A consideration of problems with the scheduling of classes, requested by David Law and Harold Fuller, primarily from the viewpoint of avoiding conflicts for students.

c. A consideration of raising admission requirements if enrollment must be limited because of insufficient housing, requested by Harold Fuller.

d. Review of transfer policy for undergraduates between campuses of UM.

Second, a procedure for the evaluation of administrators from Central Administration had been referred to the Personnel Committee. Third, a statement of grievance procedures from Central Administration had been referred to the Faculty Conduct Committee. Concluding his report, Schowalter stated that these referral items would be carried on the agenda for committee reports.
After deferring the next two items on the agenda, Student Affairs and Security and Traffic Safety, Chairman Johnson called on Ken Robertson, the UMR representative on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education, for a report. Robertson summarized information presented by Jack Cross at a meeting in Jefferson City, as follows: one thousand Missourians from various vocations have responded to questionnaires concerning higher education; committees, 32 to 67 members each, will formulate a five-year plan for higher education in Missouri by May, 1976. Robertson commented that, according to Cross, the committees have not yet met or selected chairmen. Concluding his report, Robertson said that he expected to learn the membership of the committees since it will be necessary for UMR to have input.

STUDENT AFFAIRS. Gary Patterson moved approval of constitutions for three student organizations: Alpha Phi Chapter of Gamma Delta; African Students Association; and Thai Students Association (full copies*). Wayne Cogell seconded the motion. In the discussion that followed, Joe Wollard suggested an editorial change in the constitution of the African Students Association from "University of Missouri at Rolla" to "University of Missouri - Rolla." Concerning the same constitution, Summers asked whether members must be African students. Patterson responded that a close interpretation does require members to be African but that the constitution also allows for other persons to be associate members. He added that the constitutions of other international organizations have the same pattern of membership requirements.

In making the motion for approval Patterson had pointed out to Council members a committee change in the constitution of Alpha Phi Chapter of Gamma Delta from "Lutheran" students to "concerned" students--this change found in passages identifying membership. In regard to that change Chuck Johnson asked whether it was an attempt to conceal the religious affiliation of the organization, despite the use of the word Lutheran in several of the stated objectives. Patterson responded by informing the Council of two stipulations the committee must consider: 1) that membership cannot be limited; 2) that religious organizations cannot meet on campus. In regard to point 1, he said that it was necessary to change the wording so that membership would not be limited to Lutherans only. Wollard clarified point 2—that a religious organization can use campus facilities as an organization but not for religious teachings.

The motion to approve the three constitutions carried.

SECURITY AND TRAFFIC SAFETY. Curt Adams summarized the main points in the copies of proposed changes in parking regulations previously distributed to Council members (full copy*):

1. The creation of a new lot category, red, for lots 1 and 2, which would also include, as a special permit lot, #10 at the Buehler Building.

2. A change in the fee structure: red lots at $25; gold lots (#4, 5, 6, 8, 18, and 36) at $18; silver lots (#7, 13, 17, 19, 22, 11 except for special parking, and 26) at $12; and green lots (#9, 12, 15, 20A, 20B, and 20C) at $6. The rebate structure for the spring semester and summer session is changed accordingly.
3. Students who have current parking permits are not required to display student stickers in addition.

From the floor came a question on whether city registration is necessary for students. Adams replied that there is no reference in city ordinances to registration at the University for student vehicles; furthermore, students and their spouses at the University are not required to purchase city stickers. Ruhland questioned whether the proposed regulations solve the original problem, that is, the overloading of lots 1 and 2 with student parking. For, he commented, students could purchase red stickers. After reminding the Council that the traffic regulations include a list of priority groups for purchasing stickers, Adams noted that lots 1 and 2, containing approximately 160 spaces, will not be oversold as previously done. He added that those lots should accommodate requests from faculty, administration, and a limited number of secretaries.

Several questions from the floor concerned multiple vehicle parking. Chuck Johnson asked whether it is possible to enforce the regulations against parking multiple vehicles, particularly if the cars are parked on opposite sides of the campus. Adams replied that the University police attempt to cross-check and have discovered some illegal parking of multiple vehicles. Further, he reminded the Council that a temporary regulation has allowed the parking of a second car after prior notification of the University police. Discussion on multiple vehicle parking continued with requests for information: 1) the penalty for violating the regulation; 2) the meaning of "limited occasional use" in the proposed changes. Adams responded that the penalty for multiple parking had been lowered from $10 to $5, to avoid its being higher than the penalty for reckless driving, which is $5. He explained "limited occasional use" for a second car as permission for a faculty wife to park a second car while attending single events, such as a meeting, workshop, or conference (even though a conference might last a week), but not while attending a continual function, like a three-hour class. Limited use would also allow a wife, after notification of the police, to park in the visitor's lot despite the parking sticker on the car.

Discussion continued on the subject of fines. Robertson suggested that the University penalty, of $1.00, should not be higher than the city parking penalty; Adams replied that a fine of 25¢ would probably not be a deterrent and would cost too much to process. Ruhland asked whether the amount of revenue from parking violations justifies the salaries of the police necessary to enforce them. Adams replied that the police, also involved with security, represent a fixed cost; thus, most of the money from parking penalties is extra income used to improve and maintain traffic facilities.

Finally, Russell asked the location of lot 4 and questioned student use of it. Adams informed the Council that lot 4, south of the Chemistry Building and newly sealed, has been raised from silver to gold to deter the heavy use it has received, especially its use for storage (leaving of a vehicle without moving it for a long period of time). Furthermore, Adams noted, lot 17 has been enlarged to absorb storage for the dormitories.

Wayne Cogell moved to approve the proposed changes in parking regulations; the motion was seconded by Summers, and it carried.

Robertson suggested that the Traffic Safety Committee should eliminate storage of vehicles on parking lots.
Chairman Johnson reminded Council members that copies of referrals to committees, minutes of various campus administrative and faculty groups, and informational reports addressed to him are always available for examination in the Academic Council office. Patterson announced that a meeting of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee has already been scheduled to consider the referrals to it.

V,7 6 RESOLUTION ON COMPUTER SYSTEM. Phil Leighly read a resolution describing the difficulties UMR has had with the computerized Student Information System and requesting President Ratchford to investigate and attempt to correct the situation (full copy). Leighly moved approval of the resolution, and Cogell seconded. Then Leighly read several excerpts from a UMC faculty report criticizing the computer system and the administrative handling of it (copy on file in the Academic Council office).

Chairman Johnson called on Harvey Grice, a UMR representative to UMIFAC, for a report. Grice reported that President Ratchford, having been informed of problems with the computer system at a UMIFAC meeting, requested a memorandum describing the situation. Grice, with the help of Joe Wollard and Bob Lewis, is preparing a memorandum to the president on specific UMR problems.

The motion to approve the resolution carried.

V,7 7 ANNOUNCEMENTS. Bob Lewis, referencing an enrollment check on January 15, 1976, informed the Council that next fall's projected enrollment is running 35-40% higher than on the same check date last year; he also indicated that it is difficult to predict graduate enrollment and that transfer student enrollment is just beginning.

Joe Wollard reported that the University may have the opportunity to purchase Thomas Jefferson with a low down payment and long-term financing, and that estimates are currently being made on the cost of preparing the building for use, including kitchen equipment, roofing, and air-conditioning. He announced that the purchase of Thomas Jefferson would be considered by Central Administration shortly, and that it might be possible to begin partial use of the facility this summer with full operation in the fall.

Bernie Sarchet presented information on the development program. He first showed a film of members of the Board of Curators expressing their disappointment with the budget cut for UM; in general, the Curators indicated their desire to do everything possible to relieve the budget situation. Sarchet then described the concern of Central Administration with the budget cuts, informing the Council that President Ratchford is regularly briefed on the legislative position by Virgil Sapp. According to Sarchet, a conference call is made to the campuses each week to keep campus representatives informed. Then the campus representatives encourage alumni to make the interests of the University known to legislators. He also remarked that President Ratchford has met with the House Appropriations Committee and that Ratchford and the chancellors have met with the Senate Committee.

Sarchet then gave a report on the development plan at UMR. He reviewed efforts last year: the Chancellor's appointment of a committee headed by Adrian Daane and the hiring of the Ketchum Company to survey UMR's potential; the appointment of an ad hoc development committee last July and the hiring of the Ketchum Company to conduct a development campaign to raise 5 million dollars in a period of three years with 18 million dollars the goal for a ten-year period. Sarchet noted that last
fall he was appointed Director of Development and worked with a Ketchum Company representative to launch a campaign. However, during the fall it became apparent that the campaign for obtaining money from corporations, as planned by the Ketchum Company, was not feasible. Sarchet gave the following examples: 1) Rensselaer (similar in size and mission to UMR) spent 3.5 times our budget and realized only 1 million; 2) Penn State realized only 1.5 million from an intensive program with 45 people working on it and drawing from corporations in Pittsburgh, which give 1.9% of their net corporation profits to charities, as opposed to St. Louis corporations, which give .25%. As a result of these findings, it was decided, Sarchet continued, to terminate the Ketchum Company and to establish a solid development program rather than the originally planned campaign. Sarchet indicated that last fall's work had, however, produced a brochure, which is being printed now, and a flip chart, both of which present UMR's case for financial support. Sarchet explained that one aspect of the development program will emphasize contributions from corporations, using an individual department and its faculty as the primary tool to get money. To that end, Sarchet indicated that he and departmental representatives, chairman and faculty, would try to strengthen the relationship between department and corporation. At the same time, Sarchet explained, an attempt would be made to show the corporation the need of the campus as a whole and to improve the image of UMR as providing industry with graduates who are problem-solvers. He thought that meetings between the Chancellor and corporation executives as well as the help of deans, chairmen, and faculty would be used to improve the image of UMR. Sarchet informed the Council that only 100-150 corporations now contribute to UMR and that an effort would be made to convince these contributors to increase their gifts as well as to develop non-givers. Contributions would be used in three areas: faculty development, equipment, and scholarships.

Sarchet requested Council members to assure their departments that the emphasis would be on corporation-giving to individual departments even though an attempt is made to improve the overall image of UMR. Further, he noted the need to coordinate all campus efforts for financial support.

Next, Sarchet explained a second aspect of the development program—a new approach to alumni giving. He described present alumni support as very low; as a result, 60-70% of UMR money comes from corporations, whereas the national average is 15.8% and RPI (similar to UMR) obtains only 25% from corporations. Sarchet outlined the areas of alumni support that would be emphasized: 1) continuation of wills and trusts to UMR; 2) cultivation of major doners (5 to 75 thousand dollars) by alumni; 3) broad alumni giving, with the Alumni Association possibly initiating dues and the development committee conducting a pledge drive or an annual fund drive, perhaps using the technique of a phonathon. In concluding, Sarchet stated that the development committee would also contact national foundations, although prospects there are less. He believed that the first big step would be to increase alumni giving to equal the amount of corporation contributions.

Following Professor Sarchet's presentation, Chairman Johnson made several announcements:

1. President Ratchford and Virgil Sapp will be on campus for luncheon meet­ings on February 12, March 18, and April 22. RP&A members, officers of the Academic Council, and representatives of the administration have been invited to attend to discuss items of concern in regard to the legis­lature. Any items for discussion should be forwarded to Jim Johnson or to the RP&A Committee.
2. President Ratchford, along with several members of the Board of Curators, will be on campus March 3 for a rap session.

3. The committee to study restructuring of the academic administration has been appointed: Bill James for science in Arts and Sciences; Bob Oaks for arts in Arts and Sciences; Harvey Grice for Engineering; George Clark for Mines and Metallurgy; Harold Fuller from the Budgetary Affairs Committee; and John Vaughn representing the Business Office. Any suggestions to improve the efficiency of academic administration should be forwarded to this committee, which is meeting weekly.

4. The UM Exigency Committee met recently. Representatives from UMR include the following: Harold Fuller and Jim Johnson, representing the faculty; Jim Pogue and Joe Wollard, representing the administration. This committee will not be involved in declaring an exigency but is concerned with defining conditions that would necessitate declaring one. Tenured faculty should be particularly concerned about the possibility of a financial exigency.

5. Chairman Johnson gave the following summary of the budget situation at UMR: a) unless the legislature increases the appropriation over the 5.8 million figure, there will be no raises next year; b) the Chancellor has stated that no newly hired faculty will be released at the end of this year; c) the Chancellor has stated that tenure will be given to outstanding people only; d) the faculty is under an obligation to be more productive, to absorb attrition in order to reduce S&W, to reduce specialties and small classes; e) since state colleges and junior colleges have work loads of 12-18 hours, teaching loads at UMR may have to be increased to 12 hours or more for faculty not engaged in research or being funded from outside sources. Glen Haddock, asked by the chairman for comments from the committee to study UMR academic programs, said that the committee is trying to define the problems, and concurred with Chairman Johnson's comments about the financial problems affecting us at present.

6. President Ratchford's statement to the Board of Curators on the budget request is available in the Academic Council office.

7. Chairman Johnson has received notice of an offer to establish a memorial society in Rolla as an alternative to traditional funerals, with a reduction of 60-70% in the cost of funerals. The information will be available to any interested persons.

Harold Fuller moved to adjourn and the motion was seconded by Lyle Rhea. The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Pogue, Secretary

*Complete document filed with the smooth copy.*

Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
MEMORANDUM TO: UMR Academic Council  
FROM: UMR Curricula Committee  
RE: Curricula Committee Report No. 5 (1975-76)

February 18, 1976

The following requests have been made to the UMR Curricula Committee and, after consideration, are herewith recommended to the Academic Council for approval.

A. Curriculum change.

1. No definite guidelines have been found regarding the requirements for obtaining a departmental minor area of study. Therefore, the Committee has determined the following general guidelines:

   a. 12 to 15 hours would be required exclusive of courses without a prerequisite.
   b. No fewer than 9 credit hours at the 200 and 300 course level.
   c. Not to include credit hours required for the student's major curriculum.

2. Request for Minor in Geology: Dr. Eyer has requested the establishment of a minor in Geology consisting of 15 credit hours of Geology courses in addition to those taken to satisfy a student's major curriculum. The final choice of courses must be approved by both the student's major and minor departments.

   Suggested courses could include: Geology 51, 52, 111 or 113, 220 223, 254, 275, 283, 292.

B. Change in credit hours, prerequisites, and catalog description.


   Change credit hours from Lecture 2, Laboratory 0, Total 2, to Lecture 3, Laboratory 0, Total 3.
   Change prerequisites from Petr 241 to Petr 241, Econ 100 or 101.

   Catalog Description:

   Present: Estimation of oil and gas reserves; appraisal of oil and gas properties; engineering costs; oil and gas law; depletion and depreciation.

   Proposed: Estimation of oil and gas reserves; engineering costs; depreciation; evaluation of producing properties; federal income tax considerations; chance factor and risk determination.

Respectfully Submitted,

S/ Donald E. Modesitt
MEMORANDUM

To: Members, Academic Council

From: Admissions and Academic Standards Committee

RE

The following will be proposed at the February 26th meeting:

Whereas there is a growing range of abuses given the optional status of the final exam,

Whereas there seems to be a large number of last exams given during the final week of classes that interfere with preparation for other classes and can place an unfair burden on the student, and

Whereas there is a question of integrity involved in saying we have a sixteen week semester while we have students and faculty leaving campus after 15 or even 14 weeks,

Be it resolved

that for all lecture courses of 300 or lower, a final exam shall be given during the regularly scheduled examination period and that no one-hour examinations shall be given during the last week of classes.
INCIDENTAL FEE ALTERNATIVES

(The following are estimates only, based on generation of fees for the entire University at same dollar total as for 1974-75 fiscal year.)

Note: In all alternatives, first professional students (DDS, MD, JD, DVM, DPharm candidates) would pay a flat rate per semester higher than that of a full-time (15 hours or more) undergraduate. This rate might vary between the professional schools to acknowledge that there are large differences in costs between those programs. Presumably, a first professional student would pay $150-$300 more per semester than whatever rate each model below calculates for an undergraduate carrying 15 hours.

A. Basically, a straight per credit hour rate for all students (except first professional—see Note above.) Hence, undergraduates and graduate students would pay approximately $20 per credit hour for any number of hours—e.g., for 3 hour load, incidental fee would be $60; for 15 hour load, incidental fee would be approximately $300.

A'. Same as A, except that graduate students would pay a higher rate than undergraduates. For example, if undergraduates were charged $19/credit hour, graduates would pay $24; if undergraduates paid $18/credit hour, the rate for graduates would be $31. The note above (re first professional students) still applies.

B. Basically, a per credit rate up to 15 hours, and a flat rate for 15 or more hours for all except first professional students. This would require a charge of about $21 per credit hour for 0-14 hours, with a flat rate of $315 for 15 or more hours.

B'. Same as B, but with a higher rate for graduate students. For example:

Undergraduates: 0-14 hours, $20/credit hour
15 or more hours, $300

Graduates: 0-14 hours, $34/credit hour
15 or more hours, $510

C & C'. Same as B and B', except that there would also be a flat rate for 0-3 hours. We don't have accurate data to estimate charges here, but it is clear that there would be only modest change from B because there are few credit hours generated by persons taking fewer than 3 hours.

D. Same as B, except the flat rate begins at 12 rather than at 15 hours. This would require a charge of about $24 per credit hour for 0-12 hours, with a flat rate of something like $288 for 12 or more hours.
D'. Same as D, but with a higher rate for graduate students. For example:

Undergraduates:  
0-12 hours, $23/credit hour  
12 or more hours, $276  

Graduates:  
0-12 hours, $36/credit hour  
12 or more hours, $432  

OUT OF STATE TUITION

I. In this alternative, there would continue to be no tuition charge for 0-6 credit hours. Beyond that, the tuition rate would be about double the incidental fee. For example, under Incidental Fee Option B', an out of state undergraduate taking 9 hours would pay approximately:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidental Fee</th>
<th>9 x $20 = $180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$540</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. In this alternative, there would be a modest tuition charge for 0-6 credit hours, say $5 per credit hour. Beyond 6 hours, out of state tuition would be somewhat less than double the incidental fee. For instance, under Incidental Fee Option D, an out of state student taking 3 hours would pay approximately:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidental Fee</th>
<th>3 x $24 = $72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>3 x $5 = $15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An out of state student taking 9 hours would pay something like:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidental Fee</th>
<th>9 x $24 = $216</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$616</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER FEES

There could be an increase in the incidental fee and a reduction of other fees charged to students. For instance, a 50 cent increase in the incidental fee would, in the course of a fiscal year, bring in as much revenue as the present $5 diploma charge.
Memorandum to: UMR Faculty

Re: AGENDA for the Academic Council Meeting, Thursday, February 26, 1976, at 1:30 p.m. in G-5 of the Humanities - Social Science Building.

I. Approval of the minutes of the January 29, 1976, meeting of the Academic Council.

II. Unfinished business.

III. Reports of administrative responses to actions approved by the Academic Council.

IV. Reports of standing or special committees.
   A. 4.512 Admissions & Academic Standards
      *1. Final examinations.
      2. Scheduling of classes.
      3. Admission requirements.
      4. Transfer policy for undergraduates.
   B. 4.516 Curricula
      2. Curricula Committee Report #5 (1975-76).
   C. 4.519 Personnel
      1. Evaluation of administrators.
   D. 4.601 Faculty Conduct
      1. Grievance procedures.

V. New business.

VI. Announcements.

*Supplementary material sent to Academic Council members.
**Supplementary material handed out at the January 29, 1976, meeting.
March 16, 1976

MEMORANDUM TO: UMR Academic Council
FROM: UMR Curricula Committee
RE: Committee Report No. 6 (1975-76)

The following requests have been made to the Curricula Committee and, after consideration, are herewith recommended to the Academic Council for approval:

A. New course:

1. Electrical Engineering 335, Direct Energy Conversion, Lecture, 3 Credit hours.
   Prerequisites: Senior standing in electrical engineering or consent of instructor
   Catalog Description: The study of devices which convert solar, thermal, nuclear, and chemical energies directly into electrical energy. Device topics include: solar cells, fuel cells, thermionic converters, thermoelectric converters, and MHD generators.
   Justification: This course is designed to provide students with background in those areas of energy conversion which are not normally covered in the conventional electromechanical energy conversion courses. The future development of conversion processes which utilize renewable energy sources will be determined to a great extent by the availability of engineering personnel trained in the direct energy conversion area.

B. Deletions:

1. Mining Engineering 207, Drilling and Blasting, 3 credit hours (Lect. 2, Lab. 3 hours per week).
   Justification: Mining engineering students require greater depth in coverage. Substitution of Min. 307 as a required course in the mining engineering curriculum will meet the need and reduce the number of courses being taught.

2. Electrical Engineering 330, Physical Electronics I, 3 credit hours (3 Lect./wk.)
   Justification: An undergraduate curriculum change moved EE251 from the junior to the senior year. EE251 content is also changed to include a significant amount of the old EE330 material. This action drops EE330 rather than redesign the course.

3. Electrical Engineering 332, Physical Electronics, Laboratory, 1 credit hour.
   Justification: Course has not been offered in recent years due to lack of both student and faculty interest.

C. Changes: Credit hours (CH), Prerequisite (P), Course title (CT), Catalog description (CD), Other.

1. Geology 387.
   CT change from "Elements of Potential Theory" to "Potential Fields of the Earth"
   CH from Lect. 3 (total 3) to Lect. 2, Lab. 1 (total 3).
   P from Math. 201 to Geop. 283, Math 322, or consent.

P from Phy. 25, EM 150,110 to GeE 50, EM 110,120.

Justification: Adequate pre-enrollment preparation.

3. Mining Engineering 308.

CT from "Explosives Engineering Design" to "Drilling and Blasting Laboratory."

CD

Present: Investigations in rock drilling mechanisms and equipment systems, phenomenology of explosion-induced stressing and the application of engineering design principles in the solution of industrial and military blasting problems. Either semester, one lecture and two laboratory hours per week.

Proposed: The mechanics of rock breakage in drilling and blasting. Drill equipment systems, and the application of engineering principles in the design of blasting rounds for construction and mining excavation problems. Either semester, three laboratory hours per week.

CH from Lect. 1, Lab. 1 (total 2) to Lab. 1 (total 1).

P from Senior standing, Min. 307, consent to Acc. or Prec. Min. 307.

Justification: To provide practical experience in drilling and blasting for civil, geological, and mining engineering students. Safe instructional conditions will be obtained by limiting laboratory sections to 12 students each. Two or more sections to be offered as needed during both fall and spring semesters to accommodate increased enrollment.

4. Mining Engineering - Curriculum change:

Deletion of Min. 207 and requiring all mining students to take Min. 307 will meet the need for better theoretical education in blasting. Laboratory work in drilling and blasting can be obtained by electing Min. 308.


CD

Present: The physical phenomena associated with high voltage dielectric breakdown are presented. Methods of generating and measuring high voltages and currents are explained and then demonstrated by laboratory testing of high voltage apparatus.

Proposed: The physical phenomena associated with high voltage dielectric breakdown are presented. Methods of generating and measuring high voltages and currents are explained. Demonstration of design and performance. Laboratory testing of high voltage apparatus according to industry standards.

Justification: Editorial change to better suit description for current usage.


CT change from "Network Analysis and Synthesis" to "Introduction to Circuit Synthesis."

Justification: The amount of analysis in this course is negligible compared to the amount of synthesis. "Circuit" is preferred to the word "Network" in electrical engineering today.
7. Electrical Engineering 379.

CT from "Ultra-high Frequency Techniques" to "Microwave Theory and Techniques."

Current: Waveguides; electron velocity modulation; electron bunching, current and efficiency of klystron oscillators, magnetron oscillators; traveling wave tubes; U.H.F. detectors and power measuring techniques.

Proposed: Microwave systems; coupled transmission lines, waveguides and resonators; klystron, magnetron, and traveling wave tubes; microwave integrated circuits and semiconductor devices.

Justification: Microwave devices covered in this course have changed since this course was initiated over ten years ago. The title change is editorial and in tune with current electrical engineering usage.


CT from "Ultra High Frequency" to "Microwave Measurements."

Justification: Proposed title is a better description of the present course.


P from EE211 or CSc 253 or consent to EE211 or consent.

10. Electrical Engineering 443.

CT from "Communication Theory" to "Statistical Signal Analysis."

Justification: Editorial; more suitable title.


CN from EM 434 to EM 334.

Justification: Material covered is more in line with 300 level course work with 400 level material reserved for Theory of Stability II (EM 435).
Committee Recommendations to the Academic Council and the Chancellor on Administrative Restructuring on the UMR Campus

The present academic and nonacademic administrative and functional structures of the University of Missouri-Rolla are the result of many influences: the historical MSM image and function, the expansion of the 1950's and 60's, the years of student unrest, the pressure of educational expansion, increasing and declining enrollment trends, an abundance and subsequent shortage of State and Federal funds and student fees, high and declining interest in science and engineering, other cogent factors, all of which generated related policy structures and procedures within the University.

Two of the products of the last twelve years were the rapid growth of the administrative structure, and the rapid growth of ancillary or peripheral functions. These expansions were also affected by the demand for increased public service, as well as the growing complexity of requirements for compliance to Federal laws and regulations.

However, while it is recognized that the demands of governmental regulations and other requirements call for appropriate University organization to assure compliance, and to accomplish related tasks, the complexity of the whole University administrative organization must be compatible with the demands of effectiveness, efficiency and economy. Effective utilization of University administrated funds is now being demanded by the State government and expenditures will be subjected to closer scrutiny in the lean years to come.

As a fundamental principle of sound University administration, it must be recognized that while the ancillary or peripheral functions of the University may fluctuate, the basic on-campus missions of the University are teaching and research. Hence, both the organizational structure and the policy structure must be designed and implemented to give first priority to support fully these functions in terms of service to the students and faculty, and also in terms of public service.
At present a large portion of the effort on the Rolla campus is spent on administrative problems, many of which are trivial in nature and which come into being because of the complexity and bureaucracy of the University academic and nonacademic administration. Academic problems, consequently, are frequently subordinated to even minor administrative problems. The converse should be true; that is, the first priority should be given to the solution of academic problems and to the creative support of academic programs.

A large portion of the "Cost Savings" required of the University in recent years has been accomplished by reduction of faculty and other direct educational expenditures. Future cost savings should be accomplished in reduction of real administrative costs rather than by means of cost accounting procedures.

It is further recognized that many of the apparently critical factors which led to the expansion of the administration and ancillary functions (e.g., the rather large security force) have changed and are not minimal. Other ancillary functions have not produced educational values commensurate with the dollars spent. On the other hand, library and other vital services have been reduced below acceptable minimums.

An examination by this committee of the percentage of University funds expended on this campus for administration reveals that the principle objectives of UMR do not justify this expenditure.

At the present time lines of authority from the central administration of the university to this campus and from the Chancellor to the deans and departments are not well defined. Consequently, the separation of academic and nonacademic authority of decision making is not clear; this causes much confusion because of recurrent overlapping of responsibilities.

The interpretation and transmission of University regulations are often legislative instead of instructive, sometimes even at the clerical level.
Physical Plant costs for projects other than nominal maintenance and repairs are much higher than local contractor costs. Additionally, the limited range of personnel skills places severe restrictions on the ability of the physical plant to respond to the priority needs of units of the University. The practice of scheduling work with secondary regard for priorities of academic units simply to keep the Physical plant crew busy for the year is obviously inefficient.

The latter also results in excessive hidden costs due to delays in academic operations. It is therefore recommended that only skeleton crews be maintained for nominal repairs and maintenance as line items in the budget and that larger jobs be let for bid on contract.

The primary function of both the academic and nonacademic administrations is service to the faculty and students. In view of the urgent need for greater effectiveness, efficiency, and economy in all phases of the administration of the Rolla campus operation, it is recommended that the following actions be taken to simplify the structure of the administration, to increase effective delegation of authority, and implement a meaningful policy-structure to support the University in the accomplishment of its missions:

1. Examine the need for all categories of assistants and secretaries and other nonacademic help at all levels of administration in the academic organization, including the offices of the Chancellor, Provost, Graduate Dean, Dean of Extension, other academic Deans, Departments, Centers, Registrar's Office, and other academic service offices.

2. Examine the need for assistants, secretaries, and other nonacademic help in the Business Office, Purchasing, Physical Plant, University Police, and all other nonacademic offices.

3. Determine those functions of, or within, these offices which can be combined, or jobs of personnel within the offices which can be reduced or eliminated.
4. Determine the current requirement for those groups on campus that were organized for an urgent or apparent need, which now is minimal.

5. Determine those changes in nonacademic and academic personnel which can be made to give greater priority to teaching and research, compatible with the demands of effectiveness, efficiency and economy.

6. Direct the efforts of academic administrative personnel to strengthening academic and research programs. This calls for more energetic direction from the administration than just requesting five- or ten-year plans.

7. Establish a zero-base budget system for determining the real needs and distribution of funds for supporting the basic goals of the University.
Recommendations for Implementation of Administrative Restructuring

1. All administrative units including the office of the Chancellor should consider staff reductions by elimination or consolidation of certain functions. Specifically:

   a. All the positions of Associate and Assistant Dean should be eliminated. The title of "Dean" implies the power of making or contributing to policy decisions. As the committee can best ascertain, the functions of the Associate and Assistant Deans do not involve policy making. Rather their present duties could be carried out by a good senior secretary in each Dean's office.

   b. The size of the graduate enrollment and the attendant administrative work requires a reduction of staff in the administration of the graduate office. The function of the graduate office should be restricted to the administration of the graduate program.

   c. The Research Coordinator's office performs the following: types proposals, checks their format, compiles annual reports and disseminates information. These functions might best be performed with a Contracts Officer and one secretary on a part-time basis.
d. With diminished hiring of non-academic personnel the need for a personnel officer and assistant to supervise routine clerical work appears to be less than minimal.

e. Possible consolidation of jobs of supervising personnel in the Registrar's office should be considered. Additionally, the Registrar's Counseling and Student Personnel offices should be evaluated with an eye to consolidating their functions for the purpose of increased efficiency.

f. The University Police were established and staff was increased to meet the threats during the years of student unrest. There is no longer a need for more than the minimal staff commensurate with the campus's need for protection and security of facilities.

g. Effort and support should be shifted from Extension, Engineering Research Center and other areas to strengthen teaching and research programs. Additionally, Extension should go into programs which are self-supporting and should reduce the high ratio of administrative costs.

2. The salary gap between the professorial staff and the deans should be closed if not actually inverted. Extra compensation for Deans should be based upon their contribution to the University over and above routine administrative duties, that is, in terms of national recognition, participation in professional activities, building of academic and research programs within the University and related factors which indicate professional stature.
3. Take out of the hands of the Business Officer that admin­
istrative authority and those functions which should be the
responsibility of the academic administration. The Institutional
Studies Director should be Financial and Budgetary Advisor to the
Provost and Dean of Faculties.

4. Establish a UMR Budget Committee with Faculty represen­
tation.

5. Establish a zero-base budget system for determining the
real needs and distribution of funds for supporting the basic goals
of the University.

6. The practice of allocating salary raise funds on the basis
of total budgeted S&W of filled and unfilled positions instead of
upon actual S&W for filled positions is an unsound administrative
practice and should be stopped.

7. Institute a policy that any job done by the Physical Plant
over $500 must go out on bids. This procedure will get a lot more
needed work done at lower cost. Present procedures are reducing
the value of University dollars at a factor of 40 to 50 percent.

8. The policy of cutting the Library budget because it is
one of the easiest temporary expedients for cost savings has a
deleterious if not disastrous effect on the whole long-range
education program of UMR. Reductions must be made elsewhere to
restore the budget of the Library for acquisitions and supervisory
personnel.
9. The number and authority of standing committees should be reduced to a level that will cause minimum or no interference with faculty productivity.

10. The current policy of peer evaluation for promotion and pay increase is necessary but should not result in an abdication of responsibility by administrators. The practice of evaluation by faculty who do not possess the professional expertise in the candidate's discipline should be discontinued.

11. Establish and implement an effective policy for rewarding merit and productivity.

In the past "cost savings" have been accomplished at the expense of essential direct services. It is evident that future cost savings must come from the less essential administrative and peripheral functions of the University rather than from the academic area.

( None of the preceding is intended to reflect upon the quality or effectiveness of the people involved.)
WHEREAS: The nature and timing of examinations given in a course can best be determined by the faculty member who is teaching that course;

WHEREAS: The goals of a particular course may be such that in certain cases scheduled examinations may be an invalid method for assessing student performance;

WHEREAS: Many faculty view examinations primarily as a learning rather than evaluative tool and might prefer to use the examination week to return and review final exams;

WHEREAS: The requiring of final exams is an inappropriate way to insure faculty commitment to teaching;

WHEREAS: If a faculty member is considered to be derelict in his/her teaching responsibilities, sufficient devices already exist for rectifying such inappropriate conduct;

WHEREAS: This act of imposing a requirement regarding the scheduling of examinations clearly violates the faculty's freedom to structure courses in the manner they deem most appropriate;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Department of Social Sciences opposes any efforts to establish a general policy aimed at requiring final examinations during the final examination period; and FURTHER that it opposes the prohibition of exams during the final scheduled week of class.
The October 1, 1975 Promotion and/or Tenure "Policies and Procedures for Recommendation" submitted by Dean Pogue to the Academic Council were followed. Generally, the procedures were successful in guaranteeing a fair and complete review of each recommendation. The appeals procedures were especially effective in allowing each candidate to present new evidence which the Chancellor reviewed.

The following recommendations were made by Chancellor Bisplinghoff to President Ratchford:

- 11 persons recommended for tenure (No person proposed for tenure was denied; one person withdrew)
  - 5 tenure only
  - 6 tenure and promotion
    (3 persons were changed from non-regular to regular)

- 11 persons recommended for promotion to Associate (13 proposed by School/College)

- 8 persons recommended for promotion to Professor (15 proposed by School/College)

- 4 persons made appeals (one won, one lost, and one withdrew)

The criteria used by Chancellor Bisplinghoff involved questions of need and merit. The need for an individual's professional specialization in the department, the balance of research and teaching in the department, the balance between the professional ranks in the department, and the importance of the present tenure/promotion recommendations compared to possible future recommendations were concerns expressed by the Chancellor. Individual cases were reviewed in terms of their own merit. The single most important factor which the Chancellor tried to assess was the demonstrated quality of an individual's performance. How good is the person at what he/she does? Minimum standards set out in Policy Memorandum #16 were not
sufficient for tenure or promotion; demonstrated quality was.

One problem occurred this year. Some promotion and tenure files were not as well prepared as others. The complete evidence relevant to each case was not always clearly given, which made some cases difficult to evaluate. To correct this problem, a good model should be presented that departments may follow; Research Centers must be encouraged to increase their input for candidates who work in their centers, and outside letters evaluating specific aspects of a candidate's performance must be included in his file.

Wayne Coyle
Chairman Personnel Committee
The referenced document was circulated to the members of the Committee, with a questionnaire attached. Response was received from thirteen of the seventeen members. Nearly all felt that these grievance procedures required no substantial comment; however, the following comment was received:

"The time limit required to initiate step one of the procedure after the occurrence of the alleged act appears to be too short. In essence, it amounts to a thirty day statute of limitations on administrative misconduct.

"There is no clearly stated maximum time limit between completion of step 1 and initiation of step 2. Suggest a short paragraph comparable to A. under step 3.

"Considering that the grievant loses his/her right to redress if grievant fails to meet the time limitations it is surprising that there is no limitation on the time between close of the hearing in step 4 and the hearing officer's submission of a written decision to the president. At this point the administration has the perogative of stalling indefinitely. Suggest a 15 or 30 calendar day limit."

The Chairman of the Academic Council has agreed to transmit these comments to Chancellor Bisplinghoff.

I feel that this report completes the work of the Faculty Conduct Committee on the "Affirmative Action Grievance Procedure".

George McPherson, Jr.
Chairman
MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. J.C. Pogue, Provost and Dean of Faculties

FROM: Bryan M. Williams, Acting Librarian

RE: Current faculty periodical and book requests that cannot be purchased on the current 1975-76 budget — arranged on a priority basis.

1ST PRIORITY

Faculty book requests on hand — this is faculty requests that are ready to be ordered — cannot order on present budget. $19,550.00

2ND PRIORITY

Reference books, such as Dissertation Abstracts Cumulative, 1974; Int’l Aerospace Abstracts Cumulative Index, and buying selected general encyclopedias and reference materials in energy resources. $3,975.00

3RD PRIORITY

(Large sets — all faculty requests)

(a) American Poetry 1609-1900 microfilm — 4,600 titles (not duplicated) $16,147.00
(b) Methodium Chemicum (11 vols) 2,200.00
(c) Journal of Southern History (Back issues) 720.00
(d) American History and Life v.7-12 (Bibliography of American history) 1,325.00
(e) Cumulative Index and Reprint Edition of the Bulletin of Public Affairs — 67 vols. 2,850.00
(f) Cumulative Subject Index to U.S. Government Publ. 1900-1971 1,260.00
4TH PRIORITY

Back issues and complete sets on microfilm of journals in the humanities, social studies and the material sciences. $15,000.00

Bryan M. Williams
Acting Librarian

BMW:dh
Memorandum to: UMR Faculty

From: Academic Council

Re: Spring Breaks

The Academic Council, at its meeting November 6, 1975, voted to take a poll concerning faculty opinion regarding spring breaks. Would you please fill in the following questionnaire and return it to the Academic Council office by April 10.

_____ I prefer one spring break corresponding to the St. Pat's Holiday.

_____ I prefer one spring break corresponding to the Rolla Public School System's spring vacation.

_____ I prefer two spring breaks— one corresponding to the St. Pat's Holiday and one:

    _____ At mid-term.

    _____ Corresponding to the Rolla Public School System's holiday.

    _____ Other - Specify _______________________________________________________

_____ I would like a fall break in addition to the Thanksgiving Holidays.

Remarks:
MEMORANDUM TO: UMR Faculty

RE: AGENDA for the Academic Council meeting, Thursday, March 25, 1976, at 1:30 p.m. in G-5 of the Humanities - Social Sciences Building.

I. Approval of the minutes of the February 26, 1976, meeting of the Academic Council.

II. Unfinished business.
   A. Tabled items.

III. Reports of administrative responses to actions approved by the Academic Council.

IV. Reports of standing and special committees.
   A. 4.512 Admissions & Academic Standards. Carol Ann Smith
      1. Scheduling of classes.
      2. Admission requirements.
      3. Transfer policy for undergraduates.
   B. 4.516 Curricula. Don Modesitt
   C. 4.519 Personnel. Wayne Cogell
      1. Evaluation of administrators.
      2. Grievance Procedures.
      3. UMR retirement recommendations.
   D. 4.601 Faculty Conduct George McPherson
      1. Grievance Procedures.
   E. *Report of the Committee to Study Restructuring of the Academic Administration. Bill James

V. New business.

VI. Announcements.

*Supplementary material sent to Academic Council members.
MINUTES of the Academic Council meeting, February 26, 1976.

Chairman Jim Johnson called the meeting of the Academic Council to order at 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 26, 1976, in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building. Chairman Johnson requested approval of the minutes of the January 29, 1976, meeting. Wayne Cogell moved approval, and Dave Summers seconded; the motion carried. Chairman Johnson then announced the following proxies: K. R. Dunipace substituting for Gabe Skitek, August Garver for Lyle Pursell, and John Eilers for Yildirim Omurtag.

V.B ADMISSIONS AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS. Chairman Johnson called on Carol Ann Smith, chairman of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, to report on four referrals to that committee (V,7.3). Dr. Smith requested a change in the order of the referrals on the agenda, in order to begin with Item 2, the scheduling of classes. She reported first on the committee's response to a memorandum from David Law, calling for a set scheduling of courses so that students might plan for sequence courses without conflicts. The committee, she indicated, considered set scheduling impractical because of coop students, transfer students, and failures. Dr. Smith announced that the committee, since it still needs to consider a second memorandum on scheduling of classes from Harold Fuller, would ask for removal of this item on the agenda later. She concluded this portion of the report by announcing that the committee would meet with Fuller shortly in order to prepare a report for the next Council meeting.

In regard to Item 4, transfer policy for undergraduates, Dr. Smith reported that the committee, having had time for only an individual response to the policy, had requested and received an extension of time to consider the transfer policy.

Dr. Smith reported next on Item 3, a referral from Harold Fuller requesting consideration of stricter entrance requirements in light of a possible restriction on enrollment caused by insufficient housing. She announced that the committee considered it unnecessary to pursue the recommendation at this time, because of the probable purchase of Thomas Jefferson. Nevertheless, she reported, Fuller had responded to the committee that he would like to have the committee consider academic quality and admission requirements regardless. Dr. Smith, indicating to the Council that changes are difficult to accomplish, requested that the Council give the committee a definite charge to study the matter of stricter admission requirements. At this point Dave Summers moved that the referral on admission requirements be deleted from the agenda, and Jim Pogue seconded. The effect of the motion was clarified: passage of the motion would discontinue the committee's consideration of admission requirements; defeat of the motion would constitute a charge to the committee to study academic quality and entrance requirements.

Fuller, favoring defeat of the motion, stated his opinion that UMR should tighten the admission requirements in order to graduate better students. He cited statistics to illustrate the decrease in quality of entering students, as illustrated by test scores on the Missouri Math Test, which, he said, provides a good indication of a student's performance in college: 1) approximately 65% of entering students scored 30 or below on the test in 1968-69, whereas 82% of the students now score 30 or below; 2) in 1968-69, 17% of the students scored 20 and below, whereas 38% have so scored during the last two years.
As discussion on the motion continued, the following points, opinions, and considerations were presented:

1. The University cannot discriminate on the basis of race, color, etc., but can establish minimum standards.
2. Uncertainty was expressed whether an increase in entrance requirements would decrease the number of freshmen.
3. Increasing entrance requirements would place pressure on high schools to graduate better products.
4. Secondary schools will not be influenced by an increase in admission standards at UMR.
5. Perhaps students scoring low should be admitted but required to make up their deficiencies before pursuing a program of study.
6. Statistics show that students forced to take remedial mathematics courses because of low entrance scores still have a high mortality rate.
7. Another measure to assure that remedial mathematics students can progress successfully is needed.
8. The Committee of Deans is also examining the issue of restricting enrollment by means of admission standards if housing remains insufficient.
9. Dean McFarland stated that the Missouri Commission on Higher Education had allowed the University to admit only the upper quartile of high school classes, but that the Board of Curators established the top one-third for entrance. A University committee gave a conflicting recommendation of the top half. The University, he continued, may have eroded its own entrance requirements without approval by the Curators or the Commission. He cited an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education which attributed lower entrance scores to the higher number of women now enrolling in colleges. Since most physical science majors are men, he continued, it might not be fair to consider scores on a national basis. He indicated that the graduate deans have been concerned about the erosion of quality on the undergraduate level for its effect on the graduate level. He also indicated that the lowering of graduation requirements from high school needs to be examined. Concluding, he suggested that high school requirements have not been monitored well, giving as an example the classification of high schools as AAA based on physical facilities, with no mention of quality of students.
10. A study announced by Vice-President Unklesbay last year showed that 71% of the students admitted to UMR were in the top 30% of their classes--the highest percentage in the state except for Cottey College and the School of Pharmacy in St. Louis.
11. It is probably not practical to expect any change in admission requirements for next year.
12. The quality of high schools should be considered in regard to stipulations for admitting only the top third or half of high school classes.
13. Lauren Peterson, upon request, gave a summary of UMR's policy on admitting students: student standing is determined by class rank and standardized test scores; if students are below, they must successfully pass six hours during summer session before being admitted in the fall; ordinarily students are admitted without much difficulty unless they fall below the upper one-half or two-thirds of their classes.

14. Since UMSL was criticized for its desire to limit enrollment because of insufficient classroom space, how could UMR justify to the legislature a desire to limit enrollment when there is still space here. Thus, an attempt to limit enrollment at UMR could have political ramifications.

15. Instead of just criticizing the standards of high schools, we should examine our own. Chuck Johnson cited an example of a student who had not passed calculus after ten semesters.

16. Less emphasis should be placed on math as a measure of success, for students might place high in other fields and should have an opportunity in college.

17. Students who need remedial work would be better advised to attend a junior college first; then those who made high grades could have a real opportunity to succeed in the University.

18. Any consideration of raising admission standards should separate the two issues of quality and limited housing.

The motion to delete from the agenda the referral on admission requirements was defeated by a vote of 19 against to 18 in favor. Thus, Chairman Johnson advised the A&AS Committee to consider the vote a charge to study the issue of admission requirements and academic quality.

Dr. Smith then asked Gary Patterson to present the response of the A&AS Committee to the referral on final examinations. Patterson read a resolution from the committee (full copy*), which cited, in paraphrase, the following problems:

1. The growing abuses in the optional status of the final examinations.

2. The large number of examinations given during the last week of classes, causing a burden on the student and interfering with his preparation for other classes.

3. The question of integrity for a sixteen-week semester if some students and faculty leave after 15 or even 14 weeks.

Patterson then moved that the following resolution be adopted:

Be it resolved that for all lecture courses of 300 or lower, a final exam shall be given during the regularly scheduled examination period, and that no one-hour examinations shall be given during the last week of classes.

After Leightly seconded the motion, Patterson clarified the resolution as including all lecture courses in the 300 series.
Then Wayne Cogell moved to divide the resolution into two issues:

1. That final examinations would be required for all lecture courses of 300 or lower.

2. That no hour examinations could be given during the last week of classes.

After Robertson seconded the motion to divide the resolution, discussion followed. Patterson stated that the two parts of the resolution are related: for instance, some faculty give semi-comprehensive examinations during the final week and then give no final or an optional one; some give a final but may, then, omit the hour examination; some give both the hour examination and the final. On the basis of reaction in his department to the resolution, Cogell presented the rationale for dividing the resolution: general opposition to the requiring of examinations, but some agreement that no examinations should be given during the last week of classes since examinations then, whether final or hour ones, prevent students from preparing assigned work for classes still meeting. He concluded with the idea that eliminating examinations during the last week of classes would clear up that unfairness and force the examinations into the sixteenth week. Ruhland spoke in favor of dividing the resolution on the basis that most of his department opposed requiring examinations as an infringement on the rights of the faculty, but were divided on the issue of eliminating examinations during the last week of classes. Ed Hornsey also spoke in favor of dividing the resolution, by stating opposition to the last part of the resolution; he stated that eliminating examinations during the fifteenth week would cause the last examinations to be given during the fourteenth week. The motion to divide the resolution carried.

The following Council members spoke directly in favor of part one of the resolution, that is, the requiring of final examinations:

1. Russell, after citing his own practice of giving 22 examinations during the semester so that he can evaluate his students without a final, stated, nevertheless, that most of his departmental colleagues favor making finals required.

2. Baird stated his belief that requiring of finals does not infringe on academic freedom, since the resolution does not stipulate final examinations as counting on the grade. He favored the resolution in order to give the student a last chance.

In addition to previous opposition to the requiring of final examinations, the following Council members spoke against the resolution:

1. Sidney Bennett said that most of his departmental members opposed the resolution for its method, though they acknowledged the need to remedy the situation.

2. Jim Pogue expressed his opposition to the resolution as restricting faculty freedom by requiring conformity to a set pattern; he did, however, advocate the need to maintain the integrity of the stated sixteen-week semester, suggesting that faculty have a choice of meeting classes or giving finals during the sixteenth week.
Discussion also included additional points of clarification, as well as comments and opinions on the resolution:

1. The resolution concerns lecture courses only; laboratory tests could be given during the last week of classes.
2. A take-home final would be excluded.
3. To Barr's question, whether the wording that final examinations "be given" means "offered but not required," Patterson replied that final examinations should be offered but not necessarily required, that the teacher would determine which students would be required to take them.
4. The resolution applies to teachers of undergraduates only; graduate courses are apparently exempt.
5. Graduate level courses should be the responsibility of the Graduate Faculty.
6. Although many students are happy to have classes dismissed, some students do want all opportunities due them for their money, and should thus receive sixteen weeks of work.
7. Students lose $12 for each class missed if cost of education and loss of wages for non-employment are figured.
8. Whether or not the resolution is passed, individual teachers still have the prerogative to give one test and base the entire grade on it.
9. The effectiveness of the resolution depends on the professional quality of the faculty member, except for the possible influence of chairmen and deans.

Several members of the Council brought up the question of accreditation in regard to the integrity of the sixteen-week semester. Dr. Smith informed the Council that North Central does not stipulate length of semester, and Jim Pogue elaborated on this accrediting agency—that it does not designate sixteen weeks for a semester, but does evaluate the University on whether it does what it states. Stuart Johnson commented on the requirements of ECPD: 120 weeks of instruction [fifteen weeks for eight semesters] are required, which may or may not include finals, depending on the individual inspector.

Jo Barr requested a report on student opinion. A student representative announced the result of a straw vote as 65 to 1 against the resolution, and suggested that the faculty not take action until the student referendum on the subject is completed. Robertson moved to table the motion until the results of the student referendum are available; Schowalter seconded the motion, and it carried.

V,8 CURRICULA Don Modesitt moved approval of Curricula Committee Report No. 4 (full copy*) containing (A) five new courses, (B) one deletion, and (C) 47 changes in credit hours, prerequisites, course titles, catalog descriptions, course numbers, and curricula. Dave Summers seconded the motion.
Two editorial changes were made:

1. Aerospace 281 (A.2) and Aerospace 280 (C.20) were changed to Aerospace Engineering 281 and Aerospace Engineering 280.

2. The new prerequisites for Geophysics 283 (C.12) were changed from "Math. 22, Geol. 51, or Geol. 50" to read "Math. 22 and Geol. 51 or Geol. 50."

To the question why Math. 201 was deleted as a prerequisite for Geophysics 385 (C.11), Modesitt replied that the reason could be found in the report to the Curricula Committee. The motion to approve Curricula Committee Report No. 4 carried.

Modesitt then presented to the Council Curricula Committee Report No. 5 (full copy*), with the following remarks:

1. A.1 presents guidelines for a minor—guidelines that are only suggested and flexible.

2. A.2 then presents a request from Dr. Eyer for a geology minor, with the stipulation that no course could be included in the minor which serves as a requirement in the major.

3. Section B presents changes in credit hours, prerequisites, and catalog description for Petroleum Engineering 257.

Modesitt moved approval of Report No. 5, and was seconded by Cogell.

Several Council members questioned the reason for or the significance of a minor. Modesitt responded that the recognition of a minor enables a student who has the necessary hours in a field to have his transcript validate his proficiency in that field. In addition, Dean McFarland made the following comments to explain the reason for a minor: if a student has six or eight hours in a field, he might be encouraged to take the number necessary for a minor and thus gain expertise in another field; multiple graduate degrees are becoming common; an increasing number of students are interested in dual fields as an aid to acquiring jobs. Barr, however, said that the merit of a minor is dubious and that the Board of Curators has never approved minors.

Robertson questioned the exclusion from the minor of any courses required for the student's major, on the basis that a student might have to take as many hours for a minor as for a major. He agreed with Modesitt that a minor in mathematics would particularly reflect this problem since many hours of mathematics are required in other curricula, but said that other fields would have the same problem. Thus, he recommended that the word guidelines be modified by the word suggested. Modesitt indicated that that was, indeed, the intent of the proposed guidelines. Dunipace brought forth another question: whether a department is obligated to offer a student a minor upon request. Jim Pogue offered a clarification on this last question: that a department without a minor is not obligated to give an individual student a minor upon request; in fact, a department must declare a minor in order to give one that is officially recorded on the transcript. Another point about the minor was clarified by Chairman Johnson: that the major department does not grant the minor to its student. Troy Hicks noted that the proposal for a minor does not require a department to offer one, that it only gives the guidelines for a department to follow if it wants a minor.
Robertson moved to table Section A, the minor proposal, to await additional explanation at the next meeting of the Council. Garver seconded the motion, and it carried. Chairman Johnson clarified the vote as tabling both the guidelines for the minor and the specific request for a minor in geology. Then the original motion to approve Curricula Committee Report No. 5 (now consisting only of Section B on changes in Petroleum Engineering 257) carried.

V,8 PERSONNEL. Chairman Johnson called on Wayne Cogell for a report on the referral to the Personnel Committee of the Central Administration evaluation procedure for administrators (V,7.3). Cogell reported that the evaluation procedure from Dr. Unklesbay is a tentative one that has been distributed to each chancellor to develop and administer. Stating that the committee had found the evaluation unsatisfactory, lacking concreteness on responsibilities, Cogell concluded that the committee would wait for further development of the procedure before offering its final opinion. Responding to a comment from the floor that the administrative evaluation would not be used to discontinue any person in a position, Cogell said he understood that the purpose of the evaluation would be to improve a person in his position. Jim Pogue added that, although the evaluation would probably not discontinue a person initially, it would ultimately have an effect.

Chairman Johnson announced that there was no report from the Faculty Conduct Committee on a referral to it on grievance procedures (V,7.3).

ANNOUNCEMENTS. Chairman Johnson announced that the Chancellor had received a memorandum from President Ratchford calling for the appointment of a faculty committee to examine the tenure regulations in connection with the new grievance procedure and with affirmative action. Johnson called for the election of a faculty member to serve on this University committee, which would hopefully conclude its work this spring. Schowalter moved to elect Orrin K. Crosser, Chemical Engineering Department, as the member and Ralph S. Carson, Electrical Engineering Department, as the alternate, since they are already elected UMR members on the University tenure committee. The motion was seconded by Gary Patterson and carried.

Chairman Johnson made several brief announcements:

1. At the January meeting of the Council Samir Hanna's name was inadvertently omitted from the membership of the committee appointed to study restructuring of the academic administration. That committee will have a report for the Council at the March meeting and will also present its report directly to the Chancellor.

2. At the March meeting a questionnaire to obtain faculty opinion on spring break and St. Pat's break will be distributed to Council members for their departments (November 6, 1975, minutes, V,4.2). Any additional questions may also be submitted.

Robertson asked whether the students were also taking a survey about the spring semester vacations. Chairman Johnson replied that he did not know whether or not the present referendum included this issue.

3. Classes will not meet on April 15 (designated by students as their free day), 16, 19, and 20 (spring break).
4. The rap session with President Ratchford and members of the Board of Curators will be held on Wednesday, March 3, from 2:15 to 4:15 in the Mechanical Engineering Auditorium.

Chairman Johnson called on Paul Ponder, one of the UMR representatives on a University Fee Structure Task Force, for a report. After distributing copies of proposed alternatives in the incidental fee structure (full copy*), Ponder informed the Council that the task force (with Mel George as chairman) is composed of students, faculty, and administration from the four campuses. He identified the charge to the task force as considering changes to improve the fee structure (incidental fee, out-of-state tuition, and miscellaneous fees) without reducing the total income. In reference to the hand-outs, Ponder cited the alternatives explained there as illustrative of the most popular approach: incidental fees based on the number of credit hours. In addition, he cited another suggested approach: a variable fee based on class level, that is, one fee for freshmen and sophomores, and higher fees for the junior-senior level and for the graduate level. He noted that the professional student fees would be separate and remain a flat and higher fee as at present. Ponder commented that the alternative incidental fees based on student credit hours would result in higher incidental fees for UMR students; he cited the average load at UMR for freshmen and sophomores as 14 hours, the average for juniors and seniors as 16 hours, and graduate as 12 hours. According to Ponder, the general effect of the change would be a decrease in cost for part-time students and an increase for full-time students. He also noted that the UMR representatives (Fred Rambow, Paul Williams, Bob Lewis, and himself) are generally opposed to the changes. He concluded by asking Council members to submit their opinions of the alternative fee structures in writing and signed before the next task force meeting on March 5.

Several members of the Council expressed opposition to the proposed changes in the fee structure. Dean McFarland made the following points: the concept of the public institution is to allow undifferentiated opportunities; a higher fee without higher stipends would hinder recruitment of graduate students; resident students have a greater commitment to the University in dormitory expenses, etc., than part-time students. Patterson expressed his concern that UMR would lose graduate students if they have to pay $510, compared to $300 for undergraduates (according to one proposal), especially out-of-state students who would have to pay out-of-state tuition as well as the incidental fee. A student representative reported that some graduate students would leave UMR if the fees are raised. Dean Planje criticized the fee changes as favoring part-time and non-resident students. Robertson stated his concern that the next step would be to set fees on the basis of cost of academic programs, so that English majors and engineering majors, for instance, would pay different rates.

Next Chairman Johnson called on Harold Fuller for a report on the Financial Exigency Committee. Informing the Council that the committee has held two meetings, Fuller stated that the members have been informed on procedures concerning financial exigency at other institutions. The committee, he reported, has determined that the Board of Curators would have the authority to declare a financial exigency and to determine which campuses and departments would be involved. Also, the committee has requested, from each campus contingent, input to be used for formulating measures both to indicate and to prevent a financial exigency. He relayed to the Council comments by Jackson Wright, the lawyer for the Board of Curators: that faculty member
dismissed for financial problems at other colleges lost their cases; that according to the legal definition of tenure, tenure is given a person in a particular department and on a given campus. Fuller said that, since tenured faculty could be dismissed and since our regulations on tenure do not adequately cover the situation, the committee is to establish procedures to implement an exigency, which would become part of the tenure regulations if approved by the Board of Curators. Concluding, he commented that the next meeting would deal with procedures for handling individual cases.

For a final announcement, Chairman Johnson called on Jim Pogue to summarize the status of the budget request in the legislature. Pogue reported that the House has approved a budget of 8.28 million, compared to the governor's 5.86, and that the budget is now being considered by the Senate. The University, he pointed out, is hopeful that the Senate may approve 10 million; however, he concluded, there is still the action of the governor to consider.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Pogue
Marilyn Pogue, Secretary

*Complete document filed with the smooth copy.

Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
MINUTES of the Academic Council meeting, March 25, 1976.

Chairman Jim Johnson called the meeting of the Academic Council to order at 1:35 p.m. on Thursday, March 25, 1976, in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building. After announcing Glen Haddock as a substitute for Lyle Pursell and Kent Roberts as a substitute for Stuart Johnson, Chairman Johnson called for approval of the minutes of the February 26, 1976, meeting. Wayne Cogell moved approval; Adrian Daane seconded the motion, and it carried.

V,9 FINAL EXAMINATIONS. Ken Robertson moved to untable the resolution on final examinations, which included two parts: 1) that final examinations would be required for all lecture courses of 300 level or lower, and 2) that no hour examinations could be given during the last week of classes (V,8.1). Russell seconded the motion to untable, and it carried. Since the resolution had been tabled to await the outcome of a student referendum on final examinations, Chairman Johnson called on a student representative for the results of the student vote. The student reported that, out of a total of 1320 votes, the result was 6.3% in favor and 92.5% opposed to mandatory finals in every course during final week and to a restriction on examinations during the last week of classes.

Baird questioned the wording of "mandatory finals" on the student referendum, that is, whether students interpreted the phrase as mandatory for the teacher to give a final or for all students to take the examination. Baird then clarified the intent of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee: that it is inappropriate for faculty to leave without providing students with the most opportunity in courses, but that the final examinations would not necessarily be mandatory for all students. Based on discussion at the last meeting of the Council, Chairman Johnson further clarified the resolution as requiring the faculty to give finals but allowing them the prerogative to decide whether students would need to take them.

Dr. Wayne Cogell then offered a substitute motion to the first part of the resolution: 1) that a two-hour period be assigned to each class during the sixteenth week of the semester as part of the regular schedule for the semester, and 2) that each faculty member be responsible for using that assigned class period, just as he is responsible for all other periods during the semester. The motion was seconded by Phil Leighly. Two members of the Council expressed the opinion that the substitute motion would have to supplant both parts of the original resolution.

Several members of the Council supported the substitute motion as providing the opportunity of sixteen weeks of work for the students and thus not short-changing them. At the same time, the faculty could use the period during the sixteenth week as desired; specific suggestions were for using that period to allow students to retake an earlier examination or for discussing a previous examination. Another Council member commented that the assigned period during the sixteenth week would not constitute a violation of faculty rights.

Part of the discussion supported the substitute motion as more reasonable than the original one, which called for final examinations to be given; for instance,
Modesitt cited a straw vote from his department showing 12 in favor of optional finals and 2 in favor of required finals. Modesitt also reported that vote as showing 10 in favor of part two of the resolution (prohibiting examinations during the last week of classes) and 4 opposed.

Opposition to the substitute motion included the following comments:

1. Without part two of the original resolution, the substitute motion does not solve the basic problem, that is, the last week of classes being used for examinations. A similar comment added that it is unfair to students if they have to study for finals given during the last week of classes. Still another comment voiced unfairness to faculty who are summarizing their courses during the last week of classes.

2. At present 90% of the final examinations are scheduled during the first half of final exam week; providing a period for all classes would prolong the final examination week.

3. Faculty would be forced to be present in class for a two-hour period during the final examination week; this would be a restriction on the faculty.

4. It would be difficult to enforce student attendance.

5. A senior would not study for final examinations if he already had a passing grade turned in.

6. The motion will not make the faculty responsible by describing what to do only in the sixteenth week and not during the earlier weeks; there should be mechanism within the department for faculty responsibility.

7. Personal experience was cited to show that some students at UMR have no final examinations required, with parents feeling short-changed as a result.

8. Faculty sentiment favors no restrictions on faculty, as indicated in a handout distributed just prior to the meeting (copy*).

Chairman Johnson called for the vote on the resolution substituting for part one of the original resolution. The substitute motion was defeated.

Chairman Johnson announced that the Council would return to its consideration of the original resolution, part one: that final examinations be required for lecture courses numbered 300 level and below. Schowalter moved an amendment to delete the stipulation of courses numbered 300 and below, thus changing the motion to require final examinations for all lecture courses. After the amendment was seconded by Schaefer, Baird answered a question from the floor about take-home finals, saying that the A&AS Committee had not intended for take-home finals to be excluded, that such finals could be given earlier and then received at the time of the final examination. The amendment was defeated.

The wording of the original resolution from the A&AS Committee on final examinations was clarified as given, not required. Cogell consented to the original wording for his motion at the February meeting to divide the resolution into two parts (V,8.1).
Then the first part of the resolution, that final examinations would be given for all lecture courses of 300 level or lower, was defeated by a vote of 16 to 12.

Chairman Johnson then opened discussion on part two of the original resolution: that no hour examinations could be given during the last week of classes. Schowalter said that passage of this motion would shorten the semester to fourteen weeks for some. Leighly moved an amendment, that no hour or final examinations could be given during the fifteenth week. The amendment was seconded but failed to carry. Clarification of the meaning of part two of the original resolution was requested, specifically whether the resolution prohibits final examinations as well as hour examinations from being given during the last week of classes. Baird responded that the intent of the committee was to exclude all examinations from the fifteenth week. One member of the Council questioned whether this interpretation applied to short quizzes also.

At this point Baird moved a substitute resolution: that whereas the semester is scheduled as sixteen weeks, all faculty would be responsible to use the time accordingly. Leighly seconded the substitute motion. Schowalter questioned the legality of this motion since it would substitute for part one of the resolution, a motion that had already been defeated. Bassem Armaly, parliamentarian of the Council, ruled the motion out of order. The vote was then called, and part two of the resolution (that no hour examinations be given during the last week of classes) was defeated.

Chairman Johnson informed the Council that the status of final examinations would remain unchanged. A few additional comments about the matter stressed the real problem as the fact that some faculty think their colleagues are not performing their jobs responsibly and that such a problem must be dealt with by department chairmen and deans, not by the faculty. Skitek stated the need for a motion requiring final examinations, if given, to be restricted to the sixteenth week. Rodger Ziemer, in expectation of having the minutes record Council support of the faculty's responsibility for sixteen weeks in the semester, requested a vote of the Council to learn the consensus on Baird's motion previously ruled out of order. Instead, Chairman Johnson requested that any additional resolutions be submitted in writing for future consideration.

V,9 RESTRUCTURING OF THE ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION. Schowalter moved that item IV.E.2 on the agenda, a report from the committee to study restructuring of the academic administration, be moved forward. The motion was seconded by Rhea and carried. Bill James, chairman of the committee, announced that part of the committee's report had been distributed with the agenda and that a second part describing implementation was distributed at the beginning of the present meeting (full copies of both reports attached). He identified the other members of the committee, as follows: Harold Fuller, Harvey Grice, George Clark, Robert Oakes, Samir Hanna, and John Vaughn. Reporting that the members of the committee had met with Chancellor Bisplinghoff, who was very attentive to both documents, James concluded with the committee's consensus that the Chancellor is attempting to move in the right direction.

The floor was then opened for questions or comments. In regard to l.f of the Recommendations for Implementation of Administrative Restructuring, which calls
for a minimum campus police force, Leighly cited several major universities which have smaller police forces in proportion to total enrollment than UMR has. A question from the floor concerned the meaning of the zero-base budget, which is recommended in point 5 of the Implementation report. James explained that, instead of a budget unit justifying increases, a unit's entire budget would have to be justified. To Planje's statement that such an approach to the budget is meaningless until the University adopts criteria for a unit, James suggested that the University might be forced to adopt criteria. To a query from the floor about point 3 of the Implementation report, which recommends a UMR budget committee with faculty representation, James replied that this would allow faculty input before the budget is established. Rhea suggested that a budget should start with the amount of money needed for a certain job; James agreed that that is the intent of the Committee's report, instead of having boundaries established first. Cogell then asked whether the intent of point 10 is opposed to previous Council recommendations for peer evaluation in promotion cases. James replied that point 10 still allows for evaluation committees in the department and on the campus level. However, he continued, since some faculty members who pass judgment are not actually peer evaluators, the evaluation that takes place on the administrative level requires a judgment that may differ from majority opinion. James concluded that the intent of the committee was to guarantee evaluation by persons with expertise, not necessarily members of the same department. To Ziemer's comment that it is idealistic to expect evaluation of a person in a specialized field, James replied that the greater weight would be on the department level. At this point Gerson suggested a halt in the discussion, since the issue of evaluation had been extensively debated by the Council in the past and was not important in the present consideration. Answering a question from the floor, James explained that the Implementation report is a supplement to, not a substitute for, the first report, which had been distributed with the agenda.

Chairman Johnson reminded the Council that the motion to establish a committee to study restructuring of academic administration (December 17, 1975, minutes) requested the report be presented to the general faculty. Schowalter moved to accept the committee's report, to delete it from the agenda, and to forward it to the general faculty for its April meeting. Summers seconded this motion. Russell inquired about the meaning of the motion, whether it meant the report would be implemented or just be recorded. Chairman Johnson explained that the general faculty would either endorse or reject the report. Robertson then recommended that the motion read receive instead of accept, since acceptance might be interpreted as total approval of a document. Cogell also favored a motion to acknowledge only that the report had been given, since some items in the report need, in his opinion, greater consideration. Accordingly, Schowalter changed his motion to the following: to receive the report, delete it from the agenda, and forward it to the general faculty. Armaly seconded this revised motion, and it carried.

CURRICULA (MINORS). Robertson moved to untable Curricula Committee Report No. 5, Part A, including guidelines for a minor and a request for a minor in geology (V,8.2). Cogell seconded the motion, and it carried. Informing the Council that the Curricula Committee is still receiving input on the minor guidelines, including opinions from department chairmen, Modesitt suggested that the item be carried on the next agenda.
V,9 ADMISSIONS AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS. Carol Ann Smith, chairman of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, reported on three agenda items that were previous referrals to that committee (V,7.3). First, she cited a memorandum from Harold Fuller concerning schedule conflicts with demonstration lectures in Physics 21, 23, 24, and 25. The committee, she continued, has suggested that Paul Smith inform department chairmen early in the scheduling process when the demonstration lectures would be given. After recommending that this item be dropped from the agenda, Dr. Smith reminded the Council that faculty may have access to the scheduling process at any point in order to check potential conflicts.

The second referral item was a policy for transfer of undergraduate credit within the University (copy*). Dr. Smith reported that the document is largely an informational booklet on residence requirements, GPA, credit by examination policies, etc., including individual campus rulings on these matters. She cited two changes proposed by the committee: 1) under the section on transfer of credits "baccalaureate degree" be changed to "bachelor of arts degree"; 2) the word normally be replaced by usually in the statement that credit for degree requirements on one campus transfers to the same program on another campus. Jim Pogue requested a copy of the changes; Dr. Smith then asked that the item be deleted from the agenda.

In regard to the third referral, on admission requirements, Dr. Smith announced that the committee is gathering information on academic quality of students.

V,9 CURRICULA. Don Modesitt summarized Curricula Committee Report No. 6 (full copy*) as containing one new course, three deletions, and eleven changes in credit hours, prerequisites, course title, and catalog description. Modesitt then moved to approve this report; the motion was seconded and carried.

V,9 PERSONNEL. Wayne Cogell reported from the Personnel Committee on four agenda items. First, in regard to an evaluation of administrators from Central Administration (referral to Personnel Committee for examination, V,7.3), Cogell read a memorandum from Jim Pogue, stating that the Chancellor would probably make plans for the evaluation shortly. Cogell recommended deletion of this item from the agenda.

Second, in regard to a referral on grievance procedures, Cogell reported that the committee found the EEO and Affirmative Action guidelines too legal to deal with; thus, the committee had forwarded the grievance procedures to the Provost, who might have another committee examine them. He suggested that concerns about the grievance procedures be addressed to the Provost. Cogell recommended that this charge to the committee be rescinded.

Third, Cogell announced that the Personnel Committee would present its final recommendations on retirement and staff benefits, in response to the UMC Task Force Proposal, at the April meeting of the Council. He also noted that Bill Brooks, UMR representative on the University Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee, would be present, and then requested that this item be continued on the agenda.
Fourth, Cogell informed the Council that, as chairman of the Personnel Committee and thus a representative of the Academic Council, he had served on the campus Tie committee for tenure and promotion. He read to the Council his report on the tenure and promotion procedures for 1975-76 (full copy*), which included the following ideas:

1. The October 1, 1975, Promotion and/or Tenure Policies and Procedures for Recommendation, which were followed, generally gave "fair and complete" reviews.

2. The appeals procedures were effective in presenting new material.

3. Chancellor Bisplinghoff forwarded to President Ratchford the following recommendations: 11 persons for tenure (no recommendation for tenure was denied, but one withdrew), with five of these for tenure only and six for tenure and promotion, including three persons changed from non-regular to regular; 11 persons (out of 13 proposed) for promotion to Associate; 8 (out of 15 proposed) for promotion to Professor.

4. Of four appeals, one was granted, two were denied, and one withdrew.

5. Criteria included both need for a person's professional specialization in the department and merit, with "demonstrated quality" necessary rather than the minimum standards in Policy Memorandum No. 16 being sufficient.

Cogell concluded his report with a recommendation: since some promotion and tenure files were not clear and complete, the campus review committee will prepare a model for departments to follow, specifically requiring outside letters of evaluation and greater input from research centers on the work of their members.

To a question on clarification, Cogell stated that the revised version of Policy Memorandum No. 16, requiring two areas, was used. Two points were raised in discussion. First, Summers, in reference to the need for greater input from research centers, said that the President's memorandum requires recommendations to come from the teaching departments, but that the chairmen are unfamiliar with the work of the research centers. In response, Cogell suggested that the directives do not prohibit input from the research centers to the departments. Second, Ruhland questioned Policy Memorandum No. 16 for stating qualifications which, even though attained, do not necessarily assure tenure and promotion. Several Council members replied that the qualifications are minimum only, that is, necessary but not sufficient, and that Policy Memorandum No. 16 requires demonstrated excellence. Summers expressed the opinion that evaluation should be made of actual effort which faculty put into papers, as well as of the quality of refereed journals.

V,9 FACULTY CONDUCT. George McPherson reported on a referral to the Faculty Conduct Committee (V,7.3) of the same grievance procedure previously reported on by the chairman of the Personnel Committee. McPherson identified the grievance procedure as one dealing with discrimination against a person because of race, religion, sex, etc., and thus related to Affirmative Action. He announced that examination of the grievance procedure by committee members had produced no substantial comment, but had brought forth a few recommended changes in the time limit for three stages of the procedure in order to ensure the greatest protection for the plaintiff (full copy of committee report*). He
indicated that the report, with the suggested changes, would be forwarded to the Chancellor. Robertson emphasized the need to examine the timetable in the procedure to protect the plaintiff. Chairman Johnson stressed the importance of having a proper grievance procedure in order for the University to receive federal grants. Jim Pogue stated that this grievance procedure, which was printed in Spectrum, can be endorsed or rejected by this campus; however, he indicated, if the procedure meets legal and moral responsibilities, with appropriate changes, it could be a useful document for UMR to adopt. Chairman Johnson requested that the Council be informed of changes made in the procedure. Consenting to this request, Pogue also stated that the grievance procedure would become part of the Affirmative Action statement, which in its entirety would then be distributed to department chairmen. In conclusion, Pogue said that it will be necessary to designate a committee to hear grievances—perhaps the EEO committee or the Personnel Committee.

Chairman Johnson then opened the floor for announcements:

1. Gabe Skitek announced that the spring Challenge programs would be continued under a new name: UMR Spring Open House. To a question on attendance in 1976, Skitek informed the Council that about 40 students attended, but that the figure was probably low this year because of some difficulties in planning the event.

2. Ralph Schowalter reminded the Council that the April meeting of the Academic Council was approved for the election of officers. He asked that nominations for chairman-elect, secretary, and parliamentarian be submitted by April 14. He informed the Council that a nomination would require a second and consent of the nominee.

3. Chairman Johnson asked Council members to distribute the questionnaires on spring breaks (V,4.2), which would be available after the meeting, in their departments. (The forms, he noted, should be returned to the Academic Council office.

4. Chairman Johnson announced that President Ratchford, at the March 18 luncheon with members of the Executive Council and RP&A Committee, had requested recommendations from the faculty on the use of a 1 to 2 percent S&W increase, which could be possible if the legislature appropriates a larger budget for the University than recommended by the governor.

Johnson asked for Council opinion on using the S&W increase for merit raises, for across-the-board raises, or for supplementation of benefits, such as medical benefits.

The following opinions were expressed: 1) no income tax would be paid on money used for medical benefits; 2) about one-half of present medical benefits are nontaxable; 3) a past faculty questionnaire showed a vote of 2 to 1 in favor of raises in salary instead of retirement benefits; 4) putting the money into benefits rather than in S&W would be valuable for public opinion; 5) the raise in salary, even 1 to 2 percent, would be better for faculty with low salaries; 6) the funding of catastrophic insurance or higher hospital room benefits might be considered; 7) such an addition to staff benefits would be continued; 8) the consideration is staff benefits, not the retirement fund; 9) this percentage increase applies to academic staff only; 10) since the Board of Curators has been reluctant to fund staff benefits, the use of S&W money is a dangerous precedent; 11) even a small percentage increase in a salary will increase the base for future years.
Results of the first vote were as follows:

a. Across-the-board raises--dollars, (2) percentage (3)
b. Merit raises (9)
c. Staff benefits (10)

A second vote was taken on just merit raises and staff benefits, with the majority of the members voting for staff benefits.

5. Chairman Johnson announced that the Chancellor's Council has considered a problem with library ordering: that at present the library places all faculty requests on a priority list and eventually orders all of them. Johnson cited a memorandum from Bryan Williams, which listed by priority the current faculty requests for books, reference works, and large sets, amounting to over $60,000 (copy*). He indicated that there is a concern about library orders, some quite high in cost, that are submitted by individual faculty and placed by the library on a priority list without any review process of need.

From the floor came a question about the function of the library committee. Jim Pogue replied that the library committee cannot really evaluate all individual library requests; he suggested that the main responsibility for evaluating need would have to be done on the departmental level.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Pogue
Marilyn Pogue, Secretary

*Complete document filed with the smooth copy.

Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
MEMORANDUM TO: Members of the Graduate Faculty  
FROM: Robert H. McFarland

At the request of the Graduate Faculty, April 22, 1976, I am writing you to make you aware of a situation which exists relative to international students. As of May 5, 1975, Dr. James Tracey presented to Chancellor Bisplinghoff a series of recommendations:

1. No more than 10% of the total UMR student body shall be composed of International students.

2. A maximum of approximately 25% of the graduate student body shall be International students.

3. A maximum of approximately 5% of the undergraduate student body shall be International students.

4. International students from a single country shall compose no more than 1% of the total UMR enrollment.

5. Consideration should be given to the addition of an administrative assistant in the Admissions Office to coordinate International student quotas, admissions and records.

6. International students shall qualify for admission on an individual basis and not as a block or contractual group.

7. All International students shall be required to take a communication skills placement test at the beginning of their first semester on campus. Students with serious deficiencies in this area will be enrolled in a remedial, communication skills, non-credit university course, which shall commence after the testing process is complete.

8. The three School Deans, the Graduate Dean, the Director of Admissions and the Foreign Student Advisor should be charged with developing and coordinating a definitive set of procedures for administering the above policies.

After receiving the advice of the Academic Council, Chancellor Bisplinghoff asked the C.O.D. to implement these recommendations.
Memorandum to the Graduate Faculty
April 22, 1976

In subsequent actions under item 8, the "Committee" made recommendations to C.O.D. for provision next year of a placement test and remedial work as indicated. They also, acting on information that we presently are admitting students at a TOEFL level of 500, (admittedly too low) recommended that this be raised to 550 which is the level most used by other Universities including UMC. 600 was rejected as too selective. The arbitrary selection of 550 was made with the understanding its use would have to be monitored and adjusted to correspond to needed competency in English communications.

I prepared a draft paper November 25 for use in Admissions and Employment of International Students (copy attached). It differs from previous documents only in terms of the positive tones of the first page, and the mention of the 75th percentile (550) TOEFL. This was discussed by both the Committee of Departmental Chairmen, and the Graduate Council, and were "favorably received". Minutes went to all Graduate Faculty.

In subsequent actions, this was endorsed successively by both C.O.D. and the Chancellor for implementation.

A discussion of the total issue was given the Graduate Faculty April 22 leading to their recommendation that this information and more be communicated to the Graduate Faculty.

Within the past two weeks, we have completed students admissions data for the fall semester (delayed due to unavailable student lists). Of the 122 international graduate students that could be identified only 43 had TOEFL scores. Of these only 30 had scores greater than 500.

The reasons for these apparent lapses between catalog admissions guides for international students are many. Some just appear. Some are admitted with only identification of "first class" or "honors". Some have been admitted for the purpose of attending English Language Institutes (ELI's). Some have attended another American school for a year. LAPAU and AFGRAD students are screened normally in native languages.

Unfortunately, none of these alternatives, including a 500 TOEFL can provide assurances that a student can adequately communicate. Organized cheating was detected last year and stopped, at least for now, on the TOEFL. Students are urged to go to ELI's but some never finish and may not improve enough even though they do finish. The skills placement test is a good idea and may be the only solution. At the same time, it leaves the judgement of the student to a point in time where he has made an appreciable investment. All ethics suggest that a student should prepare fully for our requirements before he leaves home.

In some instances GRE scores are terribly important. Verbal
and TOEFL (includes verbal and oral skills) scores should indicate somewhat at the same levels. Poor quantitative scores may result from lack of reading skills or quantitative ability. Advanced scores are the only normalizer data we have on a multitude of unlike institutions.

Students, highly skilled in terms of mental aptitudes, or as indicated by transcripts, may not be able to communicate orally. At least one department with major experiences with international students has already chosen 550 as its future base, for it has recognized that students unprepared in English require major additional effort on the part of faculty. I hope other departments will follow suit.

I have recently written Mr. Johnston the attached memo, April 12, (attached) expressing my current recommendations for procedures in the Admissions Office. I am content that we use the range 500-550 with tightened admissions administration for the Graduate School for a period while we together determine whether this alone will provide for the quality change that the Tracey Committee envisioned. In the meantime, the Advisory Committee and Scholarship Committee of the Graduate Faculty Council can prepare any formal international admissions changes that need be made.

Toward that end, I am providing a ballot presented at the Graduate Faculty meeting to obtain your individual recommendations.

enclosures

RHM:bes
MEMORANDUM TO: The Graduate Faculty

FROM: Robert H. McFarland

Enclosed are the minutes of the Graduate Faculty of April 22, 1976 and three ballots seeking your vote. Please consider the attached descriptive material with each ballot and return your indicated wishes so they may be tabulated by May 3.

Note that ballots are checked to prevent xerox duplication. Xerox copies will be discarded.
MINUTES OF MEETING
(Subject to approval)

April 22, 1976
3:30 p.m. M. E. Auditorium

MEMBERS PRESENT:


1. The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Dean R. H. McFarland.

2. The minutes of the meeting of December 5, 1975 were read and approved.

3a. Membership Committee - Dr. Grimm presented the list of nominees whom the committee has recommended for membership in the Graduate Faculty:

M. D. Anderson  Electrical Engineering
D. J. Bushnell  Engineering Mechanics
R. K. Clifford  Metallurgical Engineering
J. B. Nelson  Engineering Management
H. J. Pottinger  Computer Science

All nominees were elected unanimously.

It was reported that a change in Membership Rules is required because of the Doctoral Faculty requirement that a candidate be a member of the Graduate Faculty. Two changes were proposed:
1) change the Graduate Faculty Membership Rule number 5, shown below, or 2) delete Rule number 5. It was approved to vote on the Membership Rule change by mail ballot.

5. He shall be a member of an academic department or discipline authorized to award graduate degrees on at least one campus of the University of Missouri or an academic department that is actively developing
Minutes of the Graduate Faculty
April 22, 1976 meeting

graduate degree programs.

3b. Research Committee - Dr. Amos reported the committee has considered several topics which include research incentive funds, a central machine, and indirect cost recovery. Discussion followed supporting the need for research incentive funds.

3c. Scholarship Committee - Dr. Arnold reported that all 25 Chancellor's Fellowships are expected to be filled. The Fellowship will provide $250 per semester for four semesters.

Graduate student data sheets were distributed which summarizes our graduate students by undergraduate grade point and department. Dean McFarland made comments about the collection of the data and that more detailed information is available in the Graduate Office.

3d. Advisory Committee - no report.

4. The list of graduate degree candidates for the May 9 commencement, subject to corrections, was approved.

5. Dean McFarland summarized the guidelines for admission and employment of international graduate students as related to the Tracey Committee report. Dr. Davis then presented a resolution that concurs with the Tracey Committee report that the English Language capability of international students needs improvement. The resolution will be voted by mail ballot.

6. Dr. Paul Stigall was elected again as secretary of the Graduate Faculty for 1976-77.

7. The new Graduate Catalog was available this semester.

8. The Computer Science Ph.D. program is to the Coordinating Board.

9. The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Paul D. Stigall
Secretary

PDS:bes
April 28, 1976

OFFICIAL MAIL BALLOT
UMR GRADUATE FACULTY

We concur with the Tracey Committee report that the English Language capability of international students needs improvement and request that the Graduate Office take the necessary action to move toward that improvement. That action should include:

1) Require complete admissions information on international students prior to admissions as per graduate rules.

2) Monitor more closely English Language Institute graduates.

3) Raise TOEFL base scores as and if needed to achieve the Tracey Report objectives.

4) Provide on campus English Language Institute (ELI) training as needed for students who inadvertently arrive without needed proficiency.

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

Comments:
April 28, 1976

OFFICIAL MAIL BALLOT

UMR GRADUATE FACULTY

The possibility of Doctoral Faculty status is extended to all campus Graduate Faculty who meet the general criteria in departments and disciplines for which there exists a Doctor's degree program irrespective of campus.

Item 5 in UMR's membership rules requires:

"He shall be a member of an academic department or discipline authorized to award graduate degrees or an academic department that is actively developing graduate degree programs."

The two conditions provide a conflict at UMR which affects the humanities and social science departments.

The Graduate Faculty, April 22, recommended two possible solutions be submitted by mail ballot to the Graduate Faculty for resolving the problem.

[ ] 1) Delete item 5 in the campus membership rules.

[ ] 2) Replace item 5 with

"He shall be a member of an academic department or discipline authorized to award graduate degrees on at least one campus of the University of Missouri or an academic department that is actively developing graduate degrees programs."

RHM:bes
C. The qualifications for Membership of the Graduate Faculty shall be:

1. The candidate shall hold the highest degree ordinarily awarded in his field. Exception can be made on the recommendation of the Membership Committee of the Graduate Faculty or upon two-thirds vote of the Members present and voting.

2. He shall hold a position of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor at the University of Missouri-Rolla.

3. He shall have demonstrated high quality creative work in teaching, research, industry, government, public service, or private practice for normally at least two years prior to the date of application for membership.

4. He shall have shown evidence of activity in research or in creative or scholarly work beyond that comprised in earning his own higher degree. Such evidence may consist of:

   a. Appropriate publication in a refereed journal, or proceedings of technical or research conferences where the participants have been selected by a program committee.

   b. An active research program which has either received support on the basis of a research proposal judged by competent scholars, or which the Membership Committee of the Graduate Faculty, after careful consideration, evaluates to be of high quality. (If the program has been active for several years, it must have resulted in publications to be admissible as evidence.)

   c. Creative teaching and development of new courses at the graduate level, which may include the authorship of textbooks.

5. He shall be a member of an academic department or discipline authorized to award graduate degrees on at least one campus of the University of Missouri or an academic department that is actively developing graduate degree programs.
MEMORANDUM TO: Members of the Academic Council

FROM: Professor R. E. Schowalter, Chairman, Rules, Procedures, and Agenda Committee

RE: Council elections.

April 20, 1976

At the April 29, 1976, meeting of the Academic Council, the following names will be placed in nomination for the respective offices and committees:


   Nominees

   Chairman - P. Darrell Ownby
   Chairman-elect - Wayne C. Cogell
   Secretary - Marilyn Pogue
   Parliamentarian - Gary K. Patterson

2. Election of Council members to Standing Committees:

   4.522 Student Affairs

   Nominees

   Faculty members - Armaly, Bassem F.
   Schaefer, Rodney A.

   Student members - Hayworth, Carl H.
   Leitterman, Dennis W.

A ballot will be circulated at the April 29, 1976, meeting of the Academic Council.
PLEASE NOTE CHANGE OF MEETING PLACE.

Academic Council

105 Parker Hall
Rolla, Missouri 65401
Telephone: (314) 341-4871

April 21, 1976

MEMORANDUM TO: UMR Faculty

RE: AGENDA for the Academic Council meeting, Thursday, April 29, 1976, at 1:30 p.m. in the MECHANICAL ENGINEERING AUDITORIUM.

I. Address by President C. Brice Ratchford.

II. Approval of the minutes of the March 25, 1976, meeting of the Academic Council.

III. Unfinished business.

IV. Reports of administrative responses to actions approved by the Academic Council.

V. Reports of standing and special committees.

A. 4.512 Admissions and Academic Standards
   1. Admissions requirements.
   *2. Guidelines for Admission and Employment of International Graduate Students.

B. 4.516 Curricula
   *1. Curricula Committee Report No. 7 (1975-76)
   2. Report No. 5 (part A) Feb. 26, 1976, V,8.2
      Mar. 25, 1976, V,9.3.

C. 4.519 Personnel
   *1. UMR Retirement Recommendations.

D. 4.521 Rules, Procedures, and Agenda
   *1. Academic Council elections.
   2. Approval of June 17, 1976, as date for regular meeting of the Academic Council.

E. 4.522 Student Affairs
   *1. Approval of Student Organization Constitutions.
   *2. Withdrawal of Recognition from Student Organizations.

F. Report from M.A.F.H.E.

VI. New business.

VII. Announcements

A. Announcement concerning year-end reports of standing committees.
B. Acknowledgement of past-chairpersons of UMR Faculty Standing Committees.

4.511 Academic Freedom Robert Gerson
4.512 Admissions & Academic Standards Carol Ann Smith
4.513 Public Occasions Gabriel G. Skitek
4.514 Budgetary Affairs Harold Q. Fuller

an equal opportunity institution

Continued
4.515 Computer  Otho R. Plummer
4.516 Curricula  Donald E. Modesitt
4.517 Facilities Planning  Robert H. McFarland
4.518 Library  Michael D. Patrick
4.519 Personnel  Wayne C. Cogell
4.520 Publications  B. Ken Robertson
4.521 Rules, Procedures, & Agenda  Ralph E. Schowalter
4.522 Student Affairs  Gary K. Patterson
4.523 Student Awards & Financial Aids  Jerry R. Bayless
4.524 Student Scholastic Appeals  Carl R. Christiansen

*Supplementary material sent to Academic Council members.
MEMORANDUM TO: UMR Academic Council
FROM: UMR Curricula Committee
RE: Committee Report No. 7 (1975-76)

April 19, 1976

The following requests have been made to the UMR Curricula Committee and, after consideration, are herewith recommended to the Academic Council for approval:

A. New courses

   Prerequisites: C.Sc. 253 cr C.Sc. 293
   Catalog Description: An introduction to basic topics in interactive computer graphics. Graphic display and input devices, picture generation, 2-D transformations, windowing and scaling. Interactive techniques, positioning, point, command languages, and data structures for computer graphics.
   Justification: There are many areas in science and engineering in which the technology of computer graphics can be applied. Computer graphics applied to computer aided design has been an active area of research at UMR for several years. There is currently no course being taught at UMR in which the student is exposed to this subject.

2. Electrical Engineering 403, Power System Reliability, Lecture, 3 credit hours.
   Prerequisites: Math 343 or EE 343.
   Justification: This course is being requested to add depth to the current power curriculum offerings. It involves a timely research area requiring advanced graduate-level training. Adequate enrollment is expected from the level of student interest in this research area. A proposal is currently being negotiated for a cooperative graduate program with ESPOL, Ecuador, which will require incorporation of this course into the graduate program.

   Prerequisites: EE 357.
   Catalog Description: Study of transmission system insulation, distributed constant lines, terminations, multiple reflections, lightning performance, characteristics of sustained and switching overvoltages, surge voltages due to system faults, energizing and reclosing of circuit breakers. Methods of reducing overvoltages to acceptable levels.
Justification: This course is a planned addition to the current power course offerings to add depth to the research areas of the electrical engineering department in a timely area of research interest. Adequate student enrollment is available through normal graduate students and from a special cooperative program being negotiated with ESPOL, Ecuador. This cooperative graduate program will require addition of this course to the program.

4. Economics 301, Special Topics, Variable credit; Prerequisites, None.
Standard description.
Justification: It is necessary from time to time to offer new courses. It best to test these courses under an experimental number to allow for maximum flexibility. If a course tests out favorably we may then want to give it a permanent place in the curriculum.

5. Computer Science 293, Software Systems Survey I,
Credit Hours: Lecture 1½, Laboratory 1½, Total 3.
Prerequisites: FORTRAN proficiency.
Catalog Description: Survey of the behavioral features of general purpose digital computers, instruction sets, assembler language programming, basic concepts of software and program production systems, data structures and the use of available facilities. Cannot be used for any computer science degree.
Justification: To expand the service/survey offering to a two-course sequence and employ a laboratory environment for the acquisition of basic skills. This will permit the survey material to be treated more adequately while allowing sufficient time for the assimilation of techniques.

6. Computer Science 301, Special Topics in Computer Science, Lecture 1-3 Cr. hrs.
Prerequisites: Consent of instructor.
Catalog Description: Study of new topics in computer science. These topics may subsequently be developed into a continuing course.
Justification: There are many new areas developing in the computer science field that do not fit into current courses, do not justify the 401 level, and/or may or may not develop into a course at a future date. Present examples are computer graphics and computer communications, which are being developed into courses.

Catalog Description: This course will lead to the preparation of a dissertation.
Justification: Apparently this course was inadvertently omitted several years ago when the environmental and planning engineering program was established as there is no record of this course being added.
8. Petroleum Engineering 208, Fundamental Digital Applications in Petroleum Engineering, Lecture, 2 Credit Hours.
Prerequisites: C.Sc. 73; Petr. 241
Catalog Description: Applications of FORTRAN solutions to engineering problems including selected topics dealing with fluid flow, PVT behavior, matrices in engineering solutions, translating curves to computer solutions, predictor-corrector material balance solutions and applications using batch and time-sharing devices.
Justification: Computer solutions are used widely in the oil industry; it is definitely an advantage for the young engineer to be able to apply basic computer skills to problems in his field. This course has been taught as Petr. 200.

Prerequisites: C.Sc. 73, Math. 22, Petr. 241.
Catalog Description: Simulation of actual reservoir problems using both field and individual well models to determine well spacing, secondary recovery prospects, future rate predictions and recovery, coning effects, relative permeability adjustments and other history matching techniques.
Justification: Use of reservoir simulation as an engineering tool is now common throughout the petroleum industry. The simulator can supply the answers to reservoir problems too complex and lengthy for hand calculations. This course has been taught as Petr. 301.

Prerequisites: Chem. 241, Petr. 241.
Catalog Description: An overview of current advanced recovery methods including secondary and tertiary processes. An explanation of the primary energy mechanism and requirements of these methods and an analysis of laboratory results and their subsequent field applications.
Justification: Tertiary oil recovery techniques are being investigated throughout the industry; research engineers are studying and adapting these mechanisms to many different field projects. This course has been taught as Petr. 401.

B. Deletions
Justification: Deactivation of the Air Force ROTC Department.

C. Changes: Credit Hours (CH); Prerequisites (P); Course Title (CT); Catalog Description (CD); Course Number (CN), Other.
1. Engineering Management 202,
   CT change from "Special Problems" to CoOp Engineering Training.
2. Physics 371, Quantum Electronics, Lecture 3 credit hours.  
   P from Phys. 207, 211, 361 to Phys. 107 or Phys. 207.  
   CD - Present: A study of the application of quantum mechanics and  
   transport phenomena in recently developed energy conversion techniques,  
   such as the laser and the maser.  
   Proposed: The generation of coherent radiation by LASER and interaction  
   of laser radiation with matter. Topics include stimulated emission,  
   population inversion, optical cavity, and properties of the laser medium.  
   Applications of lasers to communications, holography, spectroscopy, and  
   laser-induced fusion.  
   Justification: These changes describe the course as it is presently  
   taught, and revise the prerequisites to a level needed by the student.

3. Computer Science - B.S. degree requirements.  
   From Physics requirement--Physics 21, 22, 25, 26.  
   To Physics requirement--Physics elective: Any two course sequence  
   of physics courses chosen from Physics 21, 22, and 25,26, or Physics  
   23 and 24 or Physics 30 and 40, or any other physics sequence as  
   approved by the department.

4. Geology & Geophysics - Curriculum revision.  
   CD - Present:  
   Proposed: Geophysics curriculum--An additional requirement concerns  
   the mathematics G.P.A. "A 2.0 overall G.P.A. is required in mathematics  
   courses taken as a part of the geophysics curriculum. See attached sheet  
   for complete proposed geophysics curriculum.  
   Justification: The curriculum has been revised to reflect the current type  
   training needed by geophysics majors.

5. Ceramic Engineering  
   CN from 407 to 307.  
   Justification: While the coverage remains the same, the level has been  
   lowered so as to permit seniors to take the course. The graduate program  
   is increasingly having to gear itself to M.S. level research activity  
   and so the course has been re-oriented to M.S. students also.

   CH from Lecture 3, Laboratory 0, Total 3 to Lecture 1½, Lab. 1½, Total 3.  
   P from FORTRAN proficiency to C.Sc. 293 or consent of instructor.  
   CT from Software Systems Survey to "Software Systems Survey II".  
   CD - Present: Survey systems programming principles, including data  
   structures, Boolean Algebra, machine and assembler languages, use and  
   characteristic of software elements (assemblers, loaders, compilers,  
   and operating systems). Characteristics, definition and use of languages  
   such as FORTRAN, PL/1, ALGOL, and JCL. Cannot be used for BS in Computer  
   Science.
Proposed: Survey of the foundations of computer software systems necessary to an advanced level of proficiency in the use of computers and the development of that proficiency. Cannot be used for BS in Computer Science.

Justification: To expand the service/survey offering to a two-course sequence and employ a laboratory environment for the acquisition of basic skills. This will permit the survey material to be treated more adequately while allowing sufficient time for the assimilation of techniques.

   P from C.Sc. 253 or C.Sc. 303 to C.Sc. 253 or C.Sc. 293.
   Justification: Due to changes in the service/survey offering submitted herewith.

   P from C.Sc. 303 or C.Sc. 253 to C.Sc. 293 or C.Sc. 253 and 283.
   Justification: Due to changes in the service/survey offering submitted herewith.

   P from C.Sc. 303 or C.Sc. 253 and 283 to C.Sc. 293 or C.Sc. 253 and 283.
   Justification: Due to changes in the service/survey offering submitted herewith.

    P from C.Sc. 303 or equivalent to C.Sc. 283 or 293 and EE 211.
    CT from Diagnosis of Digital Computers I to "Fault-Tolerant Computing I".
    CD - Present: This course will be concerned with the reliability and maintainability of digital computers. Topics to be covered include: methods of deriving and minimizing tests for fault diagnosis of digital circuits, fault simulation, simulators for digital computers, methods of diagnostic data generation, fault identification and location, current and future developments.

    Proposed: Reliability, maintainability, and availability of digital computers. Test generation and minimization, fault classes, fault masking, fault identification and location, fault simulation techniques, and redundancy.

    Justification: This change is a more up-to-date description of the concepts presented in the course.

11. Computer Science 432, Diagnosis of Digital Computers II.
    CT from Diagnosis of Digital Computers II to "Fault-Tolerant Computing II".
    Semester offered: Present: Spring; Proposed: Spring-even
    Justification: This change is a more up-to-date description of the concepts presented in the course.

P from None to Senior standing or consent of instructor.

CD Present: The study of management's responsibilities to society arising from operating extraction, mfg. & trans. systems. Emphasis is on the application of mgt. and economic techniques to evaluate various alternatives of potential or existing methods for correction or alleviation of environmental problems prior to preparing environmental impact statements required by the National Policy Act.

Proposed: A contemporary understanding of the legal, administrative, and societal activities leading toward improved environmental mgt.; and the role and responsibilities of engineers. Investigates the National Environmental Policy Act, court decisions, administrative orders, and procedures used by federal agencies to prepare environmental impact statements.

Justification: New course description more representative of the material covered.

13. Civil Engineering 303, Engineering Astronomy.

Laboratory Credit change: from Lecture 2; Laboratory 1, Total 3 to Lecture 3, Laboratory 0, Total 3.

Justification: This subject matter can be more adequately covered with the indicated change.


Laboratory Credit change: from Lecture 2, Laboratory 1, Total 3 to Lecture 3, Laboratory 0, Total 3.

Justification: This subject matter can be more adequately covered with the indicated change.

D. Course Numbering Guideline

In order to achieve a more consistent system to the numbering of specialty type courses, the following guidelines are recommended. Departmental action should be taken promptly in order to include changes in the new catalog of courses. These numbering changes may be accomplished in a memorandum to the Curricula Committee, and the subsequent committee approval.

100 Special Problems & Readings. Problems on specific subjects or projects in the department. Variable credit.

101 Special Topics (title variable). This course is designed to give the department an opportunity to test a new course for ONE semester. Variable title; variable credit.

200 Special Problems & Readings. Problems on specific subjects or projects in the department. Variable credit.
201 Special Topics (title variable). This course is designed to give the department an opportunity to test a new course for ONE semester. Variable title; variable credit.

202 Co-op Engineer Training. This course will provide continuous registration for co-operative work periods. Variable credit.

210 Seminar. Discussion of current topics. Variable credit.

300 Special Problems & Readings. Problems on specific subjects or projects in the department. Variable credit. (This course may be used by all bachelor degree granting curricular designations.)

301 Special Topics (title variable). This course is designed to give the department an opportunity to test a new course for ONE semester. Variable title; variable credit. (This course may be used by all bachelor degree granting curricular designations.)

310 Seminar. Discussion of current topics. Prerequisite: senior standing. Variable credit. (This course may be used by all bachelor degree granting curricular designations.)

400 Special Problems & Readings. Problems on specific subjects or projects in the department. Variable credit. (This course may be used by all graduate degree granting curricular designations.)

401 Special Topics (title variable). This course is designed to give the department an opportunity to test a new course for ONE semester. Variable title; variable credit. (This course may be used by all graduate degree granting curricular designations.)

410 Seminar. Discussion of current topics. Variable credit. (This course may be used by all graduate degree granting curricular designations.)

491 Internship. Students working toward a Doctor of Engineering degree will select with the advice of their committees, appropriate problems for preparation of a dissertation. The problem selected and internship plan must conform to the purpose of providing a high level engineering experience consistent with the intent of the Doctor of Engineering degree.

493 Oral Examination. After completion of all other program requirements, oral examinations for on-campus students may be processed during the first two weeks of an academic session or at any appropriate time for off-campus students upon enrollment in 493 and payment of an oral examination fee. All other students must enroll for credit commensurate with uses made of facilities and/or faculties. In no case shall this be for less than 3 semester hours for residence students.

495 Continuous Registration. Doctoral candidates who have completed all requirements for the degree except the dissertation, and are away from the campus must continue to enroll for at least one hour of credit each registration period until the degree is completed. Failure to do so may invalidate the candidacy. Billing will be automatic as will registration upon payment.
E. Program for a Minor in Geology.

The following list represents those courses which will constitute a good basic minor in the geology and geophysics department. They include:

1) Geol. 51 (4 hours)  Physical Geology (prereq. Chem. 3)
2) Geol. 52 (2 hours)  Historical Geology (prereq. Geol. 51 or 56 or Ge.E. 50)
3) Geol. 111 (3 hours) Crystallography & Mineralogy (prereq. Chem 3 or 8 or Geol. 113 (3 hours) Physical Mineralogy & Crystallography)
4) Geol. 220 (3 hours) Structural Geology (prereq. Geol. 51 or Ge.E. 50)
5) Geol. 223 (3 hours) Stratigraphy (prereq. Geol. 51 & 111 or 114)

Other courses at the 200 or 300 level which might be substituted include:

1) Geol. 254 (2 hours)  Map and Airphoto Interpretation.
2) Geol. 275 (3 hours)  Introduction to Geochemistry.
3) Geol. 292 (3 hours)  Metallic Mineral Deposits.
4) Geophy. 283 (3 hours) Introduction to Geophysical Prospecting.

Other courses for the minor in the department might be substituted by special permission providing there was adequate background by a student within the specialty area.

This minor program includes:

1) Basic geology.
2) Basic mineralogy.
3) Structural geology.
4) Stratigraphy & sedimentation.

This allows a very basic understanding of process related geology. Other courses may be added as they are approved.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Donald E. Modesitt
Chairman
MEMORANDUM TO: Members of the Academic Council

FROM: Admissions and Academic Standards Committee

The Admissions and Academic Standards Committee met April 8, 1976 to consider procedures for a faculty response to the proposed "Guidelines for Admission and Employment of International Graduate Students" dated January 13, 1976 (copy attached). Dean McFarland and Dr. Jim Johnson were present for part of the meeting to provide background and information. (Copy of the Committee report to Jim Johnson is attached.)

The Committee proposes the following for Council action:

Recognizing that the matters raised by "Guidelines for Admission and Employment of International Students" (January 13, 1976), hereafter Guidelines, concern the Graduate Faculty and that that faculty has not considered these matters; and

mindful of the charge to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee; the fact that admissions policies are a faculty perogative; and the fact that the Academic Council, of which the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee is a standing committee, is the only legislative body of the UMR Faculty; and

that some matters contained in the Guidelines are changes that fall within the purview of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, to wit (1) requirement of the TOEFL, with no indication of the acceptability of present alternatives; (2) a required minimum TOEFL score of 75 percentile (approximately 550 TOEFL); (3) Admission quotas for international students for Schools and Departments

Be it resolved....
that the Guidelines be referred to the Graduate Faculty to be raised at a Graduate Faculty meeting for discussion, possible amending and approval or disapproval by vote, before being referred to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee through Academic Council; and

that the Guidelines not be implemented (and the Registrar and Admissions Officers be instructed not to implement) until all of the above steps have been taken and the Academic Council has finally reviewed and approved these Guidelines.
MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Jim Johnson

FROM: Admissions and Academic Standards Committee

April 19, 1976

The Admissions and Academic Standards Committee would like to thank yourself and Dean McFarland for attending the April 8th meeting of the A & AS Committee to discuss procedures for a faculty review of "Guidelines for the Admission and Employment of International Students" dated January 13, 1976.

Let me recap the matters before us. The Guidelines speaks to both Admissions and Employment of International Students. In what follows, the reference to Guidelines should be taken to refer only to the three admission policy changes recommended in that document: (1) the requirement of the TOEFL with no indication of the alternatives presently allowed in the Graduate Bulletin; (2) the upgrading of the minimum acceptable TOEFL score to the 75 percentile (approximately 550 TOEFL) from the present 500 TOEFL; and (3) admission quotas for international students by School (not to exceed the national ratio of international/domestic students) and by Department (not to exceed 35%). It is our understanding that the Guidelines represents a pastiche of (1) a document (passed by the Committee of Deans, October 6, 1971) that speaks to admission and employment quotas of International students, (2) a rework of the May 1975 report by an Ad hoc Committee chaired by Jim Tracey that speaks to admission quotas and other matters including a recommendation to upgrade TOEFL (rejected by the CDOC and the Academic Council [November 6, 1975]) and (3) a decision by Dean McFarland to set the cut-off TOEFL score at the 75 percentile. The document thus contains admission policy changes that have not received faculty review either at all, or in this form.
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In discussion after you left, the Committee reached agreement on the following.

First, the Committee is unwilling to review the admission policy changes contained in the Guidelines without the appropriate faculty having been consulted and having had an opportunity to debate, amend and vote on these Guidelines.

Second, the Committee also believes, after consideration of the arguments presented, that the Guidelines should be referred back to Academic Council.

The Committee will present a resolution to Academic Council asking for ratification of both of these matters.

Let me clarify the reasons for our position. The Committee does not find convincing the claim that there are two distinct faculties on this campus, one charged with undergraduate affairs and the other with graduate affairs. Nor does the Committee find convincing the claim that it is inappropriate for Academic Council to review action on admissions policy by the Graduate Faculty. Nor does the Committee believe that the Graduate Council as presently constituted represents a body that the Committee could responsibly delegate the review process to. The setting of admissions policy is a faculty responsibility and prerogative. The Academic Council is the only legislative body of the UMR faculty and the A & AS Committee is specifically charged in the Bylaws with this review procedure. Nor does this review procedure, the Committee believes, infringe any charge to the Graduate Faculty; no more than review by Academic Council of new programs and curricula changes, or admission policies of the schools (which are explicitly given responsibility for admission requirements in the Bylaws) constitute on infringement.

We believe that the Bylaws have allowed for the A & AS Committee to function as a review body which acts from the perspective of the whole campus and with the benefit of the whole campus in mind. As noted, the A & AS Committee will ask the Academic Council to ratify its reading of the Bylaws.

cc: Chancellor Bisplinghoff
Dean Robert McFarland
Dean Paul Ponder
Mr. Robert Lewis
Professor Bernard Sarchet
Dr. B. Wixson
Provost Jim Pogue
GUIDELINES FOR ADMISSION AND EMPLOYMENT
of
INTERNATIONAL GRADUATE STUDENTS
January 13, 1976

1. Introduction

Acknowledging a mix of graduate students to be desirable, but that an excessive ratio of international students produces unfavorable reactions from many quarters to an institution, philosophies and guidelines are here in given to govern both admission and employment of International Students.

2. Premises

a) Of the international students selected for the UMR Graduate School, the highest academic aptitude and abilities will be sought.

b) Of these, geographic distribution is desirable.

c) No student will be encouraged to make an investment in education at UMR unless there is substantial evidence he will be successful.

d) Domestic minority and female students will continue to be actively recruited and nothing here in should be construed to lessen our affirmative action commitments.

3. Admissions

a) Admissions of international students will be subsequent to receipt of official transcripts, graduate record examination scores, and TOEFL scores.

b) Minimum acceptable TOEFL scores is the 75% ile.

c) International students will not normally be admitted for employment by the University during their first year. Exceptions may be made for students who clearly demonstrate aptitudes in the top 10% ile on TOEFL and quantitative GRE scores, and are personally known by the faculty to be fitted for the appointment. The GRE verbal and/or advanced test scores must be reasonably consistent with these aptitudes.

4. Employment of International Students

a) While continuing to acknowledge a mix of students to be desirable, the respective Schools will make a
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determined effort to further increase American graduate population to the degree that the foreign national/total graduate student ratio by Schools does not exceed the national average. In no instance should a department's ratio exceed 35%.

b) Foreign nationals will not generally be appointed to teaching assistant positions using S&W appropriations with the exception of a person with a combination of a high grade point average, a demonstrated high aptitude, and fluent English. The number of such appointments will be held to a reasonable minimum.

c) The ratio of foreign national students funded on non-appropriated funds (contracts, grants, industrial, developmental, traineeships, etc.) to all graduate students so funded will not exceed, on the FTE basis, the graduate student population ratio of the School. This is to be managed on a School basis, but no department should exceed 50%. Exceptions to this may occur as a result of late cancellations of acceptances by U.S. students, late initiation of a research project, or other situations where appointments in excess of the figure are appropriate and in the best interest of the faculty member and the specific project.

d) Foreign national students appointed on University funds as research assistants should not, for any department, be more than 25% (FTE basis) of all graduate students in this category. It should be noted, however, that the restriction of teaching assistantships for foreign nationals result in a relative non- availability of American students to work on research programs to the point that the desired ratio may not be practical.

e) Limiting appointments of international students to a semester by semester basis is not a policy requirement, but may be utilized in certain situations where American students are not immediately available; continuity is essential to satisfactory performance of the research; and the appointment of the foreign national results in a significant increase above the desired FTE ratio.

f) Responsibility for the management of international populations and appointments will be assumed by the School's Dean. Periodic reviews of the effectiveness of the management procedures will be made by the Graduate School.

g) In order for the respective units to monitor and maintain control, research center appointments will be co-signed by the Department Chairman of the Graduate
Student's discipline.

h) The Schools continue to accept responsibility for the recruitment and appointment of all graduate assistants within the budgetary confines and general policies relative to quality. Commitments for these appointments will normally be made as much as a year in advance based on previously allotted positions. One measure of the effectiveness of this recruitment will be the foreign/domestic student ratio. A second and most important measure will be the academic abilities of the students recruited.
UMR Faculty Personnel Committee's
Recommendations on Retirement Plan:

Recommendations approved by Academic Council (Dec. 4, 1975):

1. That there be annual adjustments for inflation to the maximum extent possible.

2. Retirement benefits for academic staff will be calculated on the basis of 11/9ths of the 9-month salary for the best five consecutive years out of the last ten.

Recommendations to be considered by Academic Council (April 29, 1976):

1. The University of Missouri should continue regularly to utilize the services of a Consulting Actuary before making retirement plan decisions. When the Consulting Actuary, as he did in 1972, recommends an upward adjustment in the funding percentages, such recommendations must be implemented without delay. We therefore strongly recommend the adoption of a straight uniform 7½% funding percentage in order to make the retirement fund more actuarially sound. (This would generate $800,000. There are two types of actuarial soundness:
   First, the principle will pay the benefits due persons as they retire over the years. The plan has no problems in this capacity.
   Second, the principle will pay the benefits even if UM ceased to exist. The present plan would not suffice. If funded at 7½%, it would.)

2. The original concept of a basic retiree income of 50% of the average of the high five out of the last ten years with 30 years of service was and continues to be a valid objective. We recommend that the consulting actuary be authorized to prepare a cost study of this basic formula adjustment to determine the cost of the adjustment and the funding percentages required to make this objective a reality.

3. The present self-administered Retirement Plan should be continued along the same basic concepts as when it was implemented on June 15, 1956.

4. The UMR representatives to the U-Wide Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee should report to the Academic Council at least two times during an academic year about the status of the Retirement and Staff Benefits Plan and that the chairperson of the U-Wide Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee should be asked to participate.

5. Present faculty members should consider the advantages of individual tax sheltered plans, especially in view of the fact that "95 professors (full) receiving University of Missouri retiree incomes for the year ending 30 June 1974 received an average of $5486."

6. The Academic Council should convey the approved recommendations to the U-Wide Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee; the UMR representatives on the committee should report back to the Academic Council the committee's responses to these recommendations.
Memorandum To: Members of the Academic Council

From: G. K. Patterson, Chairman, Student Affairs Committee

Re: New Student Organization Constitutions and Withdrawal of Recognition

The attached constitutions for the Intramural Managers Association and the Sport Parachute Club have been approved by the committee and acceptance by the Academic Council is recommended.

The following organizations are delinquent in submitting required officer lists for the spring semester:

History Club - Jack Ridley, faculty advisor
Christian Science Organization - Sam Clemence, faculty advisor
Fellowship of Christian Athletes - Jerry Kirksey, faculty advisor

The committee recommends that recognition be withdrawn from these groups.

Gary K. Patterson
Associate Professor

GKP:ch
MEMORANDUM TO: Graduate Faculty

FROM: Robert H. McFarland

RE: Result of recent ballot

May 11, 1976

This memo is to report the results of the balloting that has been recently performed by the Graduate Faculty.

1) The ballot relative to international students and the need for improving their English language aptitudes was endorsed by a ratio of nearly three to one. Enough comments, however, were made concerning the use of resources to provide ELI training that I am assuming the responsibility of discussing that further for information only.

We presently have courses presented students through extension that perform at least at the minimal level suggested in item 4. These have been "self supporting". Recommendations for expanding these services within the Department of Humanities for both graduate and undergraduate students have assumed that they will remain self supporting. Assuming summer administration of the program, an international student presently pays fees of $405 for 5 hours or more credits. Thus, he pays up to $81/credit hour which is in excess of the $54 level we presently require of guaranteed extension programs. These latter fees have normally covered all instructional costs.

Dean Daane and Dr. Knight and a committee are studying the economics and merits of a proposal to establish summer work (next year) for international students, but their decision will undoubtedly be influenced by the resources available. With numbers expected of 60-100, it is conceivable that a "profit" could result.

2) At this time, 103 graduate faculty members have responded to the change of rules ballot with more than half favoring the second alternative. This is substantially the same as the first only the first is a deletion of the rule.

This leaves the Graduate Office with a dilemma. Our Rules and Regulations require a majority of the Graduate Faculty to vote a rules change. Technically, the change...
is defeated as less than half the graduate faculty voted. But, in the spirit of the selection of Doctoral Faculty, when qualified, irrespective of location, the present rule must be ignored as it has been for the past two years.

For this reason, I would urge that whose of you who have not voted to take the time and effort to do it now.

3) Dr. Davis received a majority of votes cast by the Doctoral Faculty and is returned for a two year term on the Doctoral Council.

RHM:bes
MINUTES of the Academic Council meeting, April 29, 1976.

Chairman Jim Johnson called the meeting of the Academic Council to order at 1:35 p.m. on Thursday, April 29, 1976, in the Mechanical Engineering Auditorium. Chairman Johnson introduced Dr. A. G. Unklesbay, Vice-President for Administration, who had agreed to address the Council in the place of President Ratchford. Then Dr. Unklesbay introduced the following guests: Melvin D. George, Vice-President for Academic Affairs; Dr. Donald Holm, Chairman of the Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee; Jackson Wright, UM legal counsel; and Lee Belcher, Assistant to the President for Employer Relations.

Reporting first on the University budget, Dr. Unklesbay said that the University had initially requested a budget of 19.2 million dollars, which included an 8% raise in S&W; an 8% raise in E&E, excluding fuel and utilities; funds for staff benefits to compensate for inflation; and greater support for certain programs. Although the Coordinating Board for Higher Education recommended only 8.9 million, the General Assembly 7.6 million, and the governor 5.85 million, Dr. Unklesbay concluded by saying that UM, unlike some other midwestern state universities, does have some flexibility in terms of reallocating money.

Second, Dr. Unklesbay reported that President Ratchford, though basically opposed to an increase in student fees, is now considering an increase of $30 per semester because of inflation and the lack of funds. Dr. Unklesbay asked for discussion, which included the following questions and Dr. Unklesbay's replies (unless otherwise indicated):

1. What will be the effects of the UMC vote of no-confidence in President Ratchford?
   Uncertain of the effects, but certainly the vote is demoralizing for the President.

2. Might the governor reduce the UM budget by an amount corresponding to the 3 million dollars raised by a $30 fee increase?
   This could happen; one year the legislature did penalize the University for having raised fees the preceding year.

3. Does the governor rationalize his lower recommendation for UM as opposed to the figure recommended by the Coordinating Board for
Higher Education?

The governor's position is not that UM will receive all the budget money it needs, but that UM will receive all the support the legislature has to give.

4. Have all state agencies had the 3% of the current budget withheld?

Yes.

5. Has there been a decision about granting faculty raises?

No, because the governor has not made a decision yet.

6. Does the governor not acknowledge the ranking of Missouri as only 40th in the nation in support of higher education, but as 15th in per capita income?

The governor's only reply is that no more money is available.

Mel George added that the Coordinating Board figures in the large percentage of funds for private education in Missouri and concludes that Missouri support of higher education is not too bad.

7. Is income for private colleges in other states included for the ranking?

Mel George replied that the ranking makes a distinction between private and public institutions, but that he has seen comparisons which do include both private and state colleges, and in those Missouri does rank better.

8. Is it true that state employees will receive a 5 to 6% raise in salaries?

The figure given is 6%, including 5% for salaries and 1% for fringe benefits. For UM, 1-1/2 million would be necessary for a 1% salary increase; the governor is aware that his recommendation of 5.85 million is insufficient for a 5% increase in salaries for UM.

9. Are UMR faculty salaries lower than those on the other three campuses?

Not convinced that this is true. Indeed, the UMKC faculty claims that their salaries are the lowest in the UM system. It is difficult to compare average salaries just within UM; it is necessary to consider the range of high and low salaries, for a few low salaries can quickly lower the average. However, comparison of average salaries on a national scope is more reliable. According to the AAUP national average, UM ranks in the 5th, or lowest, category for all ranks of faculty in Category I institutions.
10. How do salaries of administration at UM rank?

Worse than faculty salaries on a national comparison.

11. What is the objective of the legislature in regard to low budget recommendations for UM?

To appropriate the money that is available without raising taxes.

12. Where does the fault lie?

With a low state income and a legislature that does not want to raise taxes.

13. Is the legislature concerned about a particular area of UM operation?

Such a concern has not been indicated.

14. What is the present status of Role and Scope, which was formulated to save money by eliminating programs? Has Role and Scope been given up?

Not totally, in the sense that the elimination of programs has been left to the individual campuses, some of which have reduced or eliminated programs to reallocate money for new programs. The purpose of Role and Scope is more to reallocate money than to provide an actual savings.

15. What is the message of the legislature?

The University should run its operation with the budget given it. The University, Dr. Unklesbay noted, has indeed not shut down, nor even restricted enrollment or eliminated major programs, but, of course, has continued to operate by internal sacrifices.

Mel George added that a reason given by some members of the Coordinating Board is that the University, unlike other state agencies, has ways to generate its own income.

16. What will UM do to eliminate programs?

Unknown at this time.

17. In regard to eliminating programs, why is engineering found on two campuses?

There is no proof that it would be more economical to combine the two programs, for each campus already has facilities for diverse, non-duplicative, engineering programs.
18. Are the governor and legislature opposed to the spending of money in extension programs?

Some legislators believe too much is spent on extension work, but some believe too little is spent.

19. How does the funding formula of the Coordinating Board work?

Mel George replied by describing this year's formula: the base is instruction by discipline, with 50% added for support costs, such as library, administration, and physical plant. He explained that the University is working toward having the hospital recognized separately.

20. Does the formula recognize different levels of education?

Doctoral degree programs, explained George, are figured separately, and a different formula is applied to junior colleges. Otherwise, he continued, the average cost of a program in state institutions throughout Missouri is used as the base in the formula. UM undergraduate costs, he noted, are higher than those at the state colleges. In conclusion, George said that UM would like to work with other universities on a funding formula, and that, since the Coordinating Board has somewhat endorsed this, he hoped that next year's formula would be more adequate for the University.

21. A comment was made that the Post-Dispatch reported the average annual salary for instructors in the junior colleges in St. Louis as $20 thousand.

The figure may be correct, for, although the junior colleges have on staff many low-paid instructors, there are high-paid departmental supervisors. Furthermore, the junior colleges have large credit hours with small faculties, since an instructor may spend 25 to 40 hours a week in actual class contact. Dr. Unklesbay expressed his disapproval of that high a workload and reminded the Council that the junior colleges receive their funds from local taxes and bonds. He cited, for instance, the University's unsuccessful attempt to acquire $19 million, whereas both St. Louis and Kansas City junior college districts pass $50 million each.

22. Lack of legislative support for higher education is a common complaint, but why is UM particularly unsuccessful in acquiring money from the legislature.

We should study how other states have been successful. For instance, Kansas state-supported universities received zero salary increases for two consecutive years and then received a 10% increase last year and an 8% increase this year.
23. Is the University trying to convince the legislature that a teaching load of only 7 or 8 hours is usually necessary in the University?

Yes, the University has outlined the activities of the faculty, stressing research, thesis supervision, etc., in addition to actual class time. A movie, entitled What is a Professor, has also been made to illustrate faculty work. Dr. Unklesbay stated his viewpoint that a specified number of hours for faculty workload is meaningless, that he would prefer chairmen and deans to certify each faculty member's load.

24. Does a higher average salary at other universities indicate greater merit?

This correlation is generally true, but it is necessary to look at differences before placing too much emphasis on an average salary.

Following the discussion period with Dr. Unklesbay, Chairman Johnson returned to the agenda by announcing the following substitutions: August Garver attending for Lyle Pursell; Alfred Crosbie for Bassem Armaly; Kent Roberts for Stuart Johnson; Nolan Aughenbaugh for David Summers; William Tranter for Rodger Ziemer; and Ken Robertson substituting as parliamentarian for Armaly. Chairman Johnson then called for approval of the minutes of the March 25, 1976, meeting. Gary Patterson moved approval; Wayne Cogell seconded the motion, and it carried.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL ELECTIONS. Ralph Schowalter moved to bring forward in the agenda the Academic Council elections (V,D.1). Ken Robertson seconded the motion, and it carried. After announcing that David Rentzel would be placed in nomination as a faculty representative on the Student Affairs Committee in place of Rodney Schaefer, Schowalter moved approval of the nominations on the ballot (full copy*); Patterson seconded the motion, and it carried. Schowalter then distributed the ballots for the election, and the Council returned to the agenda.

ADMISSIONS AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS. The first agenda item was a report from Carol Ann Smith on a referral to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee on admissions requirements (V,7.3c). She informed the Council that the committee was not satisfied with the data it had gathered so far on the quality of incoming students, but that it would study the matter further and try to have a report ready for the fall. Next, she reminded the members of the Council that in October, 1974, the Council had approved an amendment to the University admissions policy: that Missouri resident students graduating in the upper half of their classes would be admitted without reference to test scores. She informed the Council that UMKC
has not ratified this amendment. Gary Patterson explained that this amendment replaced a statement restricting admission to students in the upper 25% of their classes. The following points were made during discussion:

1. SAT scores have declined; SAT claims that the test has not become more difficult.

2. In response to a question from the floor, Dr. Smith said that the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee might recommend raising the 50% figure, although raising the percentage would have denied entrance to only 8 to 11 students.

3. The catalog prescribes the upper 25%, although the Board of Curators approved the upper one-third in 1972. Using the upper half for admission versus using the upper one-fourth to one-third plus SAT scores probably makes little difference in admissions.

4. Admitting students as low as the upper half is not injurious to the University's academic quality as long as the University maintains high internal standards.

5. Kansas has an open admissions policy by state law; thus, the introductory classes in English, physics, and mathematics are used to screen student quality, with 40% of physics students, for instance, failing. This type of policy is questionable in regard to providing an undesirable educational experience.

6. As is true everywhere, grades have inflated at UMR. Harold Fuller reported that the median grade for graduates is now over 3.00.

7. The cause of the grade inflation for juniors and seniors was questioned.

Concluding the discussion, Patterson suggested that the Academic Council, if it is concerned about grade inflation, should issue a separate charge to the committee to study the problem.

Dr. Smith next reported on a document, Guidelines for Admission and Employment of International Graduate Students, which was referred to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. She began by clarifying the intention of the committee's report to the Academic Council (full copy*), as follows: The committee was not concerned with the substance of the Guidelines, but with the procedures for reviewing the document; thus, the issue
is a matter of interpreting the By-laws—whether the Academic Council has the prerogative to review admission policies of the Graduate School. Concluding, she stated that the committee, believing that the By-laws give that prerogative, is asking the Council to ratify its reading of the By-laws by passing the resolution in the report:

Be it resolved that the Guidelines be referred to the Graduate Faculty to be raised at a Graduate Faculty meeting for discussion, possible amending, and approval or disapproval by vote, before being referred to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee through Academic Council;

and that the Guidelines not be implemented (and the Registrar and Admissions officers be instructed not to implement) until all of the above steps have been taken and the Academic Council has finally reviewed and approved these Guidelines.

Patterson moved approval of the committee's resolution, and Schowalter seconded the motion. Phil Leighly, raising a point of order on the basis that the Academic Council has no jurisdiction over the Graduate Faculty, moved an amendment of the committee's resolution, as follows:

...that the Guidelines be referred to the Graduate Faculty to be raised at a Graduate Faculty meeting for discussion, possible amending, and approval or disapproval by vote, and that the Academic Council be informed of this action.

Discussion followed on the relationship between the Graduate Faculty and the General Faculty (and/or Academic Council).

The following arguments were presented as evidence that the Graduate Faculty is not responsible to the General Faculty:

1. Leighly set forth as the key to the authority of the Graduate Faculty the phrase from .0403.0402 of the Faculty By-laws on the responsibilities of the Graduate Faculty: "...to make regulations concerning eligibility and requirements for graduate degrees ..." He proposed that "eligibility" means authority over admission of graduate students, not eligibility for graduate degrees.

2. The Graduate Faculty has been in existence since 1965, but the Academic Council only since 1970.

3. Dean McFarland stated that the Graduate School, specifically created in 1965 to be responsible for the needs of
graduate students, is different from the other schools because it has an independent set of By-laws approved by the Board of Curators. Further, he noted that the Graduate School occupies a separate section, .0403, in the By-laws, whereas the other schools do not. He said that, since the Graduate Faculty and the Academic Council have parallel positions in the By-laws (.0403 and .0404 respectively), the Graduate Faculty would not be subject to the Academic Council. Finally, he commented that the Academic Council, according to the By-laws, is subject to the review of the General Faculty, but that there is no statement showing review of the Graduate Faculty by the General Faculty.

The following arguments were presented as evidence that the Graduate Faculty is responsible to the General Faculty:

1. The prior existence of the Graduate Faculty is not precedence.

2. In the UMR By-laws .03 is the General Faculty, and .04 is Faculty Organizations, which contains this statement: "The Faculty is organized into Departments, Schools, Colleges, the Graduate School, Academic Council, and Standing Committees." Thus, the Graduate School and the Academic Council are both within the General Faculty. Furthermore, the Graduate School is thus placed on the same level as the schools, which are subject to the General Faculty.

3. The Academic Council is described in the By-laws (.0404.01) as "the legislative and policy-making body of the General Faculty." However, there is no statement about the Graduate Faculty that refers to legislative ability.

4. In the By-laws parallel powers are given to the schools, and all these are subject to the Academic Council as the legislative element in the faculty.

5. The UMR By-laws, passed in 1971, would supercede the establishment of the Graduate School in 1965.

6. UMR has a single faculty; thus, the Graduate Faculty is a unit within the General Faculty.

7. The General Faculty is the ultimate authority on campus.

Although the parliamentarian had suggested referring the committee's motion to the General Faculty, Chairman Johnson ruled to allow both the motion and the amendment. After
being seconded by Fuller, the amendment was clarified as substituting for the motion from the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, with the effect of eliminating the need for Academic Council approval of the Guidelines. The amendment, however, was defeated. Then the question was called on the motion from the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee; the motion carried.

V,10 CURRICULA. Don Modesitt moved approval of the Curricula Committee Report No. 7 (full copy*):

A. ten course additions
B. deletion of 19 courses in Aerospace Studies
C. fourteen changes in credit hours, prerequisites, course titles, catalog descriptions, and course numbers
D. a new campus-wide course numbering guideline for such courses as special problems, special topics, seminars, etc.
E. a minor in geology

Cogell seconded the motion. Modesitt explained that the Curricula Committee had decided to reintroduce the geology minor separate from the guidelines for minors, and Jim Pogue added that the geology minor had been carefully reviewed. A question was raised about Economics 301's having no prerequisites listed. Modesitt indicated that the consent of the instructor is implied for 300 and 400 level courses even though no prerequisites are specified.

The motion to approve Curricula Committee Report No. 7 carried.

V,10 Modesitt then introduced a second item, Curricula Committee Report No. 5 (Part A), containing the guidelines for a minor and the request for a geology minor (tabled February 26, 1976, V,8.2, and untabled March 25, 1976, V,9.3). The Curricula Committee, Modesitt explained, had decided not to reintroduce guidelines for a minor, requesting instead that a department submit its minor program, like a new course, to be acted upon by the Curricula Committee. Robertson moved to delete Report No. 5 (Part A) from the agenda, and Cogell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

V,10 PERSONNEL. Cogell brought from the Personnel Committee a report containing its final recommendations on retirement and staff benefits, originating as a response to the UMC Task Force Proposal (referral to the Personnel Committee, V,1.7). He identified two parts to the report (full copy*): the two recommendations approved by the Academic Council in December, 1975 (V,5.6); and the recommendations to be considered at the present meeting (revisions of recommendations tabled in December, 1975, V,5.6).
Cogell moved approval of Recommendation 1 (corresponding to C in the tabled report): that the University implement actuarial recommendations for upward adjustments in funding percentages and that the University adopt a 7-1/2 funding percentage to make the retirement fund more actuarially sound. Ownby seconded the motion. Bill Brooks, a UMR representative on the University Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee, informed the Council that Recommendation 1 is now followed, with the only delay in implementation being budget restrictions. Thus, he continued, Council action would be an affirmation of current practice. The motion carried.

Cogell announced that he would not move approval of Recommendation 2, which calls for an actuarial cost study to determine funding necessary to provide a retiree income of 50% of the average of the high five out of the last ten years with 30 years of service. Cogell explained that Don Holm, Chairman of the University Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee, had identified this recommendation as unacceptable to IRS. Bill Brooks added that IRS requires the word consecutive for the five years. Furthermore, Brooks informed the Council that the UMC proposal was misleading in requesting a 50% retiree income, since the retirement plan at present, with the change to 35 years of service, can provide 53% retiree income.

Cogell moved approval of Recommendation 3 (originally D in the tabled report): that the present self-administered retirement plan should be continued. Jim Pogue seconded the motion, and it carried.

Cogell moved approval of Recommendation 4: that the UMR representatives to the U-wide Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee report to the Academic Council at least two times a year about the status of the retirement and staff benefits plan and that the chairman of the U-wide committee be asked to participate. Skitek seconded the motion. Reminding the Council that the original recommendation (F in the tabled report) had called for the establishment of a UMR committee on retirement and staff benefits, Cogell explained that the recommendation had been changed because of the complexity of the retirement material. The motion carried.

Cogell moved approval of Recommendation 5: that faculty members consider the advantages of individual tax-sheltered plans since retiree income is inadequate. After Cogell suggested the use of the CREFT portfolio, Jim Pogue seconded the motion. Opposing the motion, Ruhland said that the goal should be making the retirement program adequate. Cogell
agreed, but stated that the faculty should nevertheless be advised about the present limitations of the retirement program. The motion carried.

Finally, Cogell brought to the floor of the Council Recommendation 6: that the Academic Council convey the approved recommendations to the U-wide Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee and that the UMR representatives on the committee report to the Council the responses of the U-wide committee. In accord with a comment that some of the recommendations are internal matters only, Cogell amended Recommendation 6 to the effect that the two recommendations approved in December and recommendations 1 and 3 passed at the present meeting would be conveyed to the U-wide committee. Cogell then moved approval of Recommendation 6 as amended; the motion was seconded, and carried. Bill Brooks announced that he would report to the Council.

RULES, PROCEDURES, AND AGENDA. Schowalter moved approval of June 17, 1976, as the date for a regular meeting of the Academic Council. Jim Pogue seconded the motion, and it carried. Schowalter requested that every Council member who will not be able to attend the summer meeting arrange for a substitute.

STUDENT AFFAIRS. Gary Patterson, Chairman of the Student Affairs Committee, moved approval of constitutions for two student organizations: UMR Intramural Manager's Association and UMR Sport Parachute Club (full copies*). After the motion was seconded, Robertson questioned the severity of a one-semester suspension for an infraction of intramural rules. Patterson made the following explanation:

1. The rule on suspension is a formalization of present practice.
2. The committee thought that the students in intramurals want the control that a suspension rule gives.
3. The suspension rule requires a 2/3 majority vote.

The motion approving the two constitutions carried.

Patterson then moved approval of a request from the Student Affairs Committee to withdraw recognition from three student organizations for being delinquent in submitting required officer lists for the spring semester: History Club, Christian Science Organization, and Fellowship of Christian Athletes (full memorandum*). Cogell seconded the motion. Though Patterson explained that the organizations have been notified several times of their delinquency, Schowalter suggested that the three organizations be given another extension of time, until May 8, at which time recognition would be
withdrawn if they were still delinquent in submitting officer lists. Patterson accepted the revision, and the revised motion carried.

M.A.F.H.E. Ken Robertson, UMR representative on a faculty advisory committee for higher education, reported that at the last meeting of this committee he had successfully enlisted the support of the other members in censuring the Coordinating Board for Higher Education. As a result, Robertson continued, this faculty committee will meet with the Coordinating Board in September, 1976, and will have greater representation on the Board's planning committees.

ANNOUNCEMENTS. Chairman Johnson reminded the Council that the chairmen of standing committees should submit their annual reports. Chairman Johnson then acknowledged the work during the past year of chairmen of the UMR standing committees, as listed on the agenda, noting one correction, that Jim Pogue was chairman of the Curricula Committee instead of Don Modesitt.

Ralph Schowalter announced the results of the election: officers of the Academic Council elected were Darrell Ownby as chairman, Wayne Cogell as chairman-elect, Marilyn Pogue as secretary, and Gary Patterson as parliamentarian; elected to the Student Affairs Committee were Bassem Armaly and David Hentzel as faculty members and Dennis Leitterman as a student member.

After commenting on the valuable experience he had gained from serving as chairman of the Academic Council, Jim Johnson commended the Council as a place for administration and faculty to work together, and then turned the chairmanship over to Darrell Ownby. Schowalter then read the following resolution of appreciation:

1. A vote of appreciation to Jim Johnson for his very fine leadership as the Academic Council chairman during the year 1975-76.
2. A vote of appreciation to all other officers for their efforts during the past year.

Schowalter moved approval of this resolution; Cogell seconded the motion, and it carried.

Chairman Ownby requested Academic Council committees to elect their chairmen for 1976-77 before the end of this school year and to notify the Council office of meeting dates so that student members can be notified.

Chairman Ownby then informed the Council that President Ratchford had requested faculty opinion on the proposed fee increase of $30.
Jim Johnson moved that the Council express approval of the fee increase contingent on the legislature's not reducing the budget a corresponding amount. The motion was seconded. As a substitute motion, Hornsey moved approval of a student resolution (full copy*) that endorses the fee increase, but only in conjunction with an increased appropriation from the legislature and with a reduction in administrative costs. After the substitute motion was seconded, a quorum was called. When Chairman Ownby declared that a quorum did not exist, the meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Pogue
Marilyn Pogue, Secretary

*Complete document filed with the smooth copy.

Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
MEMORANDUM TO: UMR Academic Council
FROM: UMR Curricula Committee
RE: Curricula Committee Report No. 8 (1975-76)

June 3, 1976

The following requests have been made to the UMR Curricula Committee and, after consideration, are herewith recommended to the Academic Council for approval:

A. New Course Additions:

1. History 222, The Making of Modern France. Lecture, 3 credit hours.
   Prerequisites: History 102
   Justification: Major and non-major elective complementing History 220 and History 327. (Offered in Fall, 1975, as an experimental course with enrollment of 21 students. Favorable student response for making this a "permanent" course.)

2. History 175, American History I. Lecture, 3 credit hours.
   Prerequisites: None requested.
   Catalog Description: A survey of the history of the American colonies and United States from colonial times through the Civil War.
   Justification: History 175 along with History 176 (see next item, A-3) would form part of the BA program, as History 60 is not considered sufficient. Also, transfer student credit will be more acceptable for similar courses which were not transferable as History 60. An optional course for science and engineering students per the statutory history-constitution requirement.

3. History 176, American History II. Lecture, 3 credit hours.
   Prerequisites: None requested.
   Catalog Description: Survey of the history of America since the Civil War.
   Justification: (Please refer to A.2, History 175.)

4. Ceramic Engineering 111, Ceramic Materials Laboratory I, Characterization of Materials. Laboratory, 1 credit hour.
   Prerequisites: Sophomore standing.
   Justification: Reorganization of the ceramic engineering laboratory program to better meet the needs for ceramic engineers entering industrial operations and laboratories.

5. Ceramic Engineering 122, Ceramic Materials Laboratory II, Rheology and Plastic Behavior. Laboratory, 1 credit hour.
   Prerequisites: Ceramic Engineering 111.
   Justification: (Similar to A.4).

6. Ceramic Engineering 231, Ceramic Materials Laboratory III, Fabrication Methods and Mechanisms. Laboratory, 1 credit hour.
   Prerequisites: Ceramic Engineering 122.
   Justification: (Similar to A.4).
7. Ceramic Engineering 242, Ceramic Materials Laboratory IV, Thermal Processes and Properties. Laboratory, 1 credit hour.
   Prerequisites: Ceramic Engineering 231
   Justification: (See A.4).

   Laboratory, 1 credit hour.
   Prerequisites: Ceramic Engineering 242.
   Justification: (See A.4).

   Laboratory, 1 credit hour
   Prerequisites: Ceramic Engineering 351.
   Justification: (See A.4).

    Lecture, 3 credit hours.
    Prerequisites: Math. 22, Phys. 25.

    Lecture, 3 credit hours.
    Prerequisites: Psych. 50.
    Justification: To enable area teachers to fulfill the new state requirements of House Bill 474, 1974.

B. Deletions:

1. Electrical Engineering 284, Electronics.
   Justification: Insufficient enrollment for several years.

   Justification: Insufficient enrollment.

   Justification: Dropped earlier (not in current catalog) due to insufficient enrollment, but no prior action record of drop can be found.

   Justification: (Similar to B.3).

C. Course Changes: Credit Hours (CH); Prerequisite (P); Course Title (CT);
   Catalog Description (CD); Course Number (CN).

1. Psychology 330, Physiological Psychology.
   CN to Psych. 230.

2. Psychology 256, Introductory Learning.
   CN and CT to Psych. 240, Theories of Learning.
   P from Psych. 50 or consent of instructor to Psych. 50.

3. Psychology 251, Personality Theory.
   CN to Psych 260.

4. Psychology 159, Social Sciences.
   CN and CT to Psych. 270, Social Psychology.
5. Psychology 320, *Psychology of Mental Retardation.*
   CN to Psych. 358.

   CN to Psych. 362.

7. Psychology 351, *Group Dynamics.*
   CN to Psych. 372.

8. History 303, *Medieval History I.*
   CN to Hist. 323.

9. History 304, *Medieval History II.*
   CN to Hist. 324.

    CN to Econ. 311.

    CN to Econ. 351.

    CN to Econ. 360.

    CN to Econ. 370.

    CN to Econ. 380.

    CT to Problems in Economic Policy.

16. Psychology 51, *General Psychology II.*
    CN to Psych. 52.

17. Psychology 150, *General Experimental Psychology.*
    CN to Psych. 140.
    CH from Lecture 2 to Lecture 3.

18. Psychology 151, *General Experimental Psychology Laboratory.*
    CN to Psych. 141.

    CN to Psych 210.

    CN to Psych. 220.
   CN to Psych. 250.  
   CT to Developmental Psychology  
   CD to An introduction to the study of the developing child from infancy through adolescence.

   CN to Psych. 290.

   CN to Psych. 364.

   CN to Psych. 366.

   CN to Psych. 370.  
   P to Psych. 270 or consent of instructor.

   CN to Psych. 386.  
   P to Consent of instructor.

27. Psychology 392, *Practicum in College Teaching*.  
   CN to Psych. 388.  
   P to Psych. 386.

   CN to Psych. 300.  
   P to Consent of instructor and head of Psychology.  
   CT to Special Problems and Readings in Psychology.

   CT to Continuous and Discrete Systems I.  
   CD to Mathematical methods of system analysis. Characterization of both continuous and discrete time signals and systems. Analysis of system response in time and frequency domains.

30. Electrical Engineering 267, *Circuit Analysis II*.  
   CT to Continuous and Discrete Systems II.  
   P to EE 265.  
   CD to Continuation of EE 265.

   CT to Circuit Analysis I.  
   CD to Circuit elements, signals, Kirchhoff's Laws, network theorems, mesh and nodal analysis, transient and complete response of RL, RC, and RLC circuits. (Math. 21).
32. Electrical Engineering 63, Digital Electronics.
   CT to Circuit Analysis II.
   CD to Analyses of steady state AC circuits, phasor, notation, polyphase
   circuits, complex frequency and frequency response, magnetically
   coupled circuits. (Math. 22, EE 61).

33. Metallurgy 355, Metallurgical Thermodynamics II.
   CD to Continuation of Met. 281. Equilibrium calculations with stoichiometry
   and heat balance restrictions. Phase transformations, solution
   thermodynamics, partial molar properties, and EMF cells. Applica­
   tions of thermodynamics to extractive process and physical metallurgy.

34. Geological Engineering 341, Engineering Geology and Geotechnics.
   CH from Lecture 2, Lab. 1 to Lecture 3, Lab. 1.

35. Petroleum Engineering 131, Drilling and Production Practices.
   CT to Drilling Practices and Well Completions.
   CH from Lecture 3 to Lecture 3, Lab. 1.

36. Mining Engineering 251, Mine Hygiene and Safety Engineering.
   P to Min. 225 or Consent of instructor.

37. Electrical Engineering 201, Power Circuits and Machines.
   CN, CT to EE 205, Electrical Machines. P to EE 63.
   CD to Polyphase synchronons and induction machines; transformers; D-C
   machines; single phase motors. Introduction to theory, circuit
   models and applications. (EE 63).

38. Electrical Engineering 203, Power Systems
   CN to EE 207.
   P to EE 205
   CD to Power system components and transmission lines; power system
   theory and per unit values.

39. Electrical Engineering 220, Electrical Engineering Laboratory II.
   CD to Laboratory introduction to electronic circuits, operational
   amplifiers, analog computation, and the organization of
digital computers.

40. Electrical Engineering 230, Electrical Engineering Laboratory III.
   CD to Laboratory introduction to microwave devices, waveguides, antennas,
   and associated measurement techniques; solid state electronic
   devices; control components and systems; D.C. machines; polyphase
   A.C. machines; and transformers.

41. Electrical Engineering 240, Electrical Engineering Laboratory IV.
   P to EE 211, 212; Preceded or accompanied by EE 243.
   CD to Laboratory introduction to logic and switching circuits, basic
   principles of communication theory, including filters, linear
   and angle modulation, detection.

42. Electrical Engineering 273, Fields and Waves II.
   P to EE 271; Preceded or accompanied by MA 258.
43. Electrical Engineering 289, *Circuits and Devices for Digital Applications.*  
   P to MA 22, Phys. 24 or Phys. 25.

   P to EE 231.

   P to None.

   P to MA 258, EE 265.

47. Electrical Engineering 243, *Communications Systems.*  
   P to EE 265.  
   CD to Signals and their spectra; signal filtering; amplitude, angle  
   and pulse modulation; multiplexing; noise in communications systems.

48. Electrical Engineering 271, *Fields and Waves I.*  
   P to EE 61.

   P to EE 281.

   P to EE 205 or Consent of instructor.

   P to EE 253 or Consent of instructor.

52. Nuclear Engineering 1, *Introduction to Nuclear Engineering I.*  
   CH from 1/2 to 1 credit hour.

53. Nuclear Engineering 2, *Introduction to Nuclear Engineering II.*  
   CH from 1/2 to 1 credit hour.  
   CT

   CN to NE 204.  
   CT to Nuclear Radiation Measurement.

   CN to Petr. Engr. 320.

D. Other Action Requests:

(NOTE: Some of the following action requests are of such a length as to pre­  
clude their reproduction in full in this report. Complete copies are  
available for your review in the Provost's Office, 212 Parker Hall.)

1. B.A. requirements for Social Sciences and Humanities.  
   Justification: The proposed requirements intend to make for a more uniform  
   and standard set of requirements. No change is proposed in the total  
   number of credit hours required.

2. B.S. requirements for Social Sciences.  
   Justification: The proposed requirements are intended to make the degree
more congruent with that at other universities. The present proposal continues to specify 130 total credit hours, with 33 hours in mathematics and natural science, but these credits are not "in addition to credit received for algebra, trigonometry, and basic military."


Justification: Proposal to establish minor programs to meet student demands and recognition in the areas of history, economics, psychology, and sociology. Programs to follow approved guidelines.


Justification: Reorganization of laboratory program (See A, 4 through 9). Ceramic Engineering 252, 204, and 1 credit hour from 259, will be successively dropped in sequence with new laboratory introductions. A net gain of 1 credit hour will result.


Justification: To accommodate Ge.E. 275 in the 1st semester, junior year, change Engl. 1 to an entrance requirement, change Petr.E. 131 from 3 to 4 credit hours, and Ge.E. 341 from 3 to 4 credit hours.


Justification: Substitute Ge.E. 50 for Geol. 51. Change credit hours for Petr. E. 131 from 3 to 4. Change credit hours of free electives from 6 to 5. Change credit hours of Petr.E. technical electives from 11 to 12.

7. Curriculum change for Aerospace Engineering.

Justification: Addition of 3 credit hours of basic science and drop 3 credit hours of electives.


Justification: Addition of 3 credit hours of basic science and drop 3 credit hours of "free" electives.


Justification: Change in course numbering for Nuc.E. 201 and 202 and credit hours for Nuc.E. 1 and 2; Phys. 102 replaced by new course, Nuc.E. 203. Met. 213 replaced by 3 credit hours of Nuc.E. or Met.E. electives. No change in credit hours (132).

E. Other committee Action and Points of Information.

1. A summary of committee actions will be sent to all department chairmen. This will be done promptly after each committee meeting, and will contain the statement: "Please note that you should check these numbers (actions) against your catalog to insure necessary changes."

2. The compliance with the recommended guidelines for course numbering has progressed satisfactorily. Departmental cooperation has been excellent. Econ. 100 and 101 will change to 110 and 111 respectively effective January, 1977. This will, hopefully, avoid major changes in curricula.
at present since most departmental curricula carry Econ. 100 and/or 101 as requirements.

3. Dr. Unklesbay has confirmed that a departmental minor does not need any action other than campus approval, and that it may be recorded on the student's transcript.

4. Any changes desired in acceptance of CLEP credit must be made at least one year in advance so as not to misinform new students who read the distributed booklets describing CLEP options.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald E. Modesitt, Chairman  
UMR Curricula Committee
SUMMARY of items acted upon or discussed at the Academic Council meeting, June 17, 1976.

Curricula Committee Report No. 8 approved.
McFarland report from the Graduate Faculty, including TOEFL, and discussion on English proficiency of international students.

Announcements:
Report from the Facilities Planning Committee is available.
Copies of budget requests are available.
Report on the poll concerning spring breaks.
Ph.D. in Computer Science authorized.
Report from the Financial Exigency Committee to be distributed.
MINUTES of the Academic Council meeting, June 17, 1976.

Chairman Darrell Ownby called the meeting of the Academic Council to order at 1:35 p.m. on Thursday, June 17, 1976, in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building. After announcing two new members, Dr. William Brooks replacing Dr. Sidney Bennett from Engineering Management and Dennis Leitterman, graduate student representative, Chairman Ownby listed the following proxies: Al Crosbie substituting for Lyle Rhea, Kent Roberts for Stuart Johnson, Paul Stigall for Javin Taylor, Lon Pearson for Wayne Cogell, Ron Rollins for Dave Summers, Don Oster for Jo Barr, George McPherson for Gabe Skitek, and Ed Beckemeyer for Rodney Schaefer. Chairman Ownby then requested approval of the minutes of the April 29, 1976, meeting. Dennis Leitterman moved that the minutes be approved; Jim Pogue seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

V,11 ADMISSIONS AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS. The agenda carried two items from the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee:

1. Admissions requirements—a referral to the committee (V,7.3c) to study the quality of entering students and the requirements for admission.

2. Guidelines for Admission and Employment of International Graduate Students. The Council passed a resolution at the April 29, 1976, meeting (V,10.3), that the Guidelines not be implemented until the Graduate Faculty has voted on the document and the Academic Council has approved the document after review by the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee.

Chairman Ownby announced that the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee would present a report at the September meeting.

V,11 CURRICULA. Don Modesitt moved approval of Curricula Committee Report No. 8 (full copy*), containing 11 course additions, 4 course deletions, 55 course changes, and 9 requests in regard to degree requirements, minor programs, and curriculum requirements. Phil Leighly seconded the motion, and it carried.

When Chairman Ownby opened the floor to new business, Dean McFarland announced that he was prepared to report from the Graduate Faculty on item 2 on the agenda under Admissions and Academic Standards (Guidelines). Ralph Schowalter reminded the Council that the report from the Graduate Faculty, according to the resolution approved on April 29, 1976, was to be reviewed by the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee first. Chairman Ownby suggested that the Council could hear a report from Dean McFarland without taking any action.

After distributing copies of his April 22, 1976, memorandum to the Graduate Faculty and an April 28, 1976, ballot to the Graduate Faculty (full copy of both documents*), Dean McFarland reported that on April 22, 1976, the Graduate Faculty discussed problems in regard to admitting international graduate students, specifically the matter of TOEFL scores. He stated that 500 had been
the required score on TOEFL for admittance for several years, but that 550 had been recommended. Continuing, Dean McFarland reported the results of a ballot mailed to members of the Graduate Faculty, which contained four actions to improve the English language capability of international students, including point 3: "Raise TOEFL base scores as and if needed to achieve the Tracey Report objectives." Dean McFarland announced that 72 votes favored the four points, 27 were opposed, and 3 made other comments.

In the discussion which followed, Leighly asked whether UMR has ever exceeded the percentages in points 1-4 of the memorandum to the Graduate Faculty (identified on full copy as recommendations from the ad hoc Tracey committee, V, 4, 9). McFarland replied that the international students comprised about 40% of the graduate student body in 1968 and that one semester one department had 13 graduates, all international. At that time, he continued, President Weaver said that an 80-90% international enrollment in one department was unacceptable in terms of justifying a program to the state legislature. However, McFarland indicated, during the last several years the international students have comprised about 27% of the graduate enrollment (point 2 recommending a maximum of 25%). Continuing, McFarland identified the main concern now as the deficiency in English of some international students. He stated that many international students may be on campus without TOEFL scores, explaining that this can occur if a student transfers from a college without TOEFL requirements or if a student is admitted on the basis of attending one of the ELI programs elsewhere, some of which do not provide reliable screening. McFarland indicated that UMR could administer an institutional TOEFL and then require a course, if necessary. Patterson asked whether point 4 on the ballot to the Graduate Faculty (providing ELI at UMR) could be funded, for he had heard of a course being cancelled for lack of funds. McFarland replied that a course for international students has been offered through the Humanities Department and Extension, taught on a cost basis; furthermore, he noted that such a course could be operated through Extension since the international students comprise as much as 7% of the undergraduate student body and pay out-of-state fees. Dean Daane added that this program, operated through Extension, is self-supporting and that staff does not have to be on pre-contract, but that, if demand continues, it might be possible to have a regular program during the summer or the regular term. Armaly asked whether an institutional TOEFL would be required following the classes. Daane replied that it might not be necessary at UMR, if the teachers verify the students' proficiency in English.

Chairman Ownby then called on Jim Pogue for a report on the status of the budget. Dr. Pogue said that he would summarize major points concerning three budgets, 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78. He also offered to answer questions about the budget (All discussion and answers are his comments unless otherwise indicated.).

Budget for 1975-76.

1. The only increase in the 1975-76 budget was a 4.56% increase for S&W.

2. The Physical Plant absorbed the inflationary increase in fuel by attrition of personnel.
3. The 3% of the UMR budget subject to the Governor's recall, approximately $327,000, was generated internally from fees from increased enrollment and from the wages of non-academic personnel placed on six-month involuntary leaves, beginning January 1, 1976. Even though the 3% was returned to the campus on June 11, the leaves are permanent effective July 1. Of the 22 persons placed on involuntary leave, all but 1 FTE in ITV and two .5 FTE secretaries have been re-employed in other positions as they became vacant. The 1. FTE position in ITV will remain a permanent reduction, but the employee and the secretaries will be eligible for other positions as they become vacant.

4. The 3% returned by the Governor must be encumbered by July 1, and any orders must be delivered and paid for within 90 days of July 1. The 3% is being expended in the following ways:

a. The library is receiving $41,000, which will make it current on requested acquisitions. Only a limited amount could be used toward the purchase of periodicals because of the time limit on the fund.

b. The final payment to the Ketchum Company, which had been hired to establish a development program, will be made--$3,200.

c. Equipment for laboratories and furnishings in Fulton Hall (not available during the remodeling) and in the mine will be purchased--$98,860.

d. The remainder, approximately $185,000, will be used to purchase special equipment ($175,000 of the 3% must be used for special equipment because equipment money was given up previously). Of the $185,000, $25,000 will be expended on equipment for a central machine shop, located in the present machine shop quarters in Mechanical Engineering. There was some discussion on the location, concluding with Dean McFarland saying that ME would like the machine shop to be moved but that the shop will remain in that building for the present.

Question: Are changes possible in the lists of priorities for special equipment?

Answer: On June 10 the deans were asked to check the priorities on their lists again. Dean Daane said that the fall lists have been revised and that changes could be made within the lines of the priorities submitted last fall. Kent Roberts mentioned that some items might not be available within the time limit but could be placed high on the priority list next year.

Question: What happens to any money left in this special equipment fund if the equipment cannot be delivered in 90 days?

Answer: Since any remaining money cannot be carried over, the special equipment fund is overcommitted by approximately $50,000 in case some units cannot acquire their requests within the time limit.
Question: If all the special equipment requests are met, does the over-committed money come from the 1976-77 special equipment fund, thus depleting it?

Answer: Yes. Dean McFarland added that all the requests, however, are for necessary equipment that will thus be available for use without delay.

Question: Why was not the returned 3% used for faculty appointments and student assistants?

Answer: The money was originally allocated for E&E, and, although it could have been reallocated for S&W, it was decided to use it for large equipment purchases to make certain that no problems arose from not expending it by July 1.

Question: Will the Governor withhold the 3% next year?

Answer: That is unknown.

Question: Will the library have sufficient money in next year's budget?

Answer: There will be the same dollar amount as for 1975-76, plus a 4% increase. This will not cover inflationary increases, but at least the library will not begin the year with back requests.

5. FM is now operating on a reduced programming schedule, and ITV will be discontinued.

Question: Could ITV have been continued with reduced personnel?

Answer: No, certain jobs must be filled for ITV to operate.

Question: How many faculty were lost and gained during 1975-76?

Answer: Of some 12-15 faculty lost from attrition, only the following positions have been authorized for filling to date: 1 in Arts and Science, 3 in Engineering, and 1 in Mines and Metallurgy.

Budget for 1976-77.

1. A new committee, Resources Management and Planning, has been established, with the Provost as chairman and the membership composed of the head of each budget jurisdiction, the chairman and chairman-elect of the Academic Council, and the chairman of the Budgetary Affairs Committee. The membership of the committee is not definitely fixed as such, and the committee, hopefully, will continue to function during the year to help in the planning of the budget.

2. The Board of Curators has designated a 4% merit and market increase in S&W for the academic staff. Each academic budget unit will receive 4% of its S&W as an increase, and the director of each unit will administer the 4%.

Question: What are the guidelines for the salary increases?

Answer: Merit and market are the only guidelines given. One example of market would be a comparison of UMR salaries with those of other institutions. However, the administration of these guidelines is the responsibility of each budget head, e.g., dean.
Question: Does the 4% increase also apply to administration?
Answer: Yes.

3. Grant release and leave money (total amounts) will remain with each budget director to administer.

Question: If a faculty member leaves, will 4% of his salary be included in figuring the 4%?
Answer: Yes, if he is on appointment on May 17th.

4. Graduate assistants will receive an increase of approximately 4%, rounding off their salaries at $8,000.

Question: Were GTA's reduced during the past year?
Answer: No.

5. A 4% increase will go to E&E; again the 4% will be assigned to the budget center to be administered.

6. Salaries of faculty on joint appointment will be changed from the unit where the appoint is to the unit where the academic title is.

Question: Why was this change made?
Answer: There can be problems with either method. On one hand, the departmental head is not as familiar with a faculty member's work in the research center as is the director of the center. On the other hand, a larger pool of money is available in a department for a research member to participate in. Also, there have been cases of faculty on joint appointment receiving no salary increase because both the department and the research center assumed the other responsible. With this change, the departmental head will be responsible for making salary increase recommendations in consultation with the research director. Dean McFarland added that under Memorandum 18 the research center directors and the department chairmen, even in previous years, have together been responsible for determining salaries. Furthermore, he noted that a small group of faculty does not allow the bases of market and merit to operate properly.

Question: Will increases in salary be given to the non-academic staff?
Answer: Yes, 4% or a $300 minimum increase.

7. UMR will start the 1976-77 school year with a balanced budget, but with little left for emergencies. There will, however, be a contingency fund. Income from increased enrollment will be placed in this fund. In addition, there will be two holding accounts (academic containing $171,000 and non-academic) to balance shrinkage.

Question: What is shrinkage?
Answer: Shrinkage is the difference between the money budgeted and available money. For 1976-77 the amount of $281,140 has been overcommitted. This amount will be covered on paper by the holding accounts, into which all vacancies that are not reallocated will go.
Question: Will not these accounts, if established in the beginning, leave a surplus at the end of the year?

Answer: There could be a surplus, but this might be better. In 1975-76 $950,000 in shrinkage had to be generated during the year, that is, after all money was already committed.

8. The increase in the total UM budget for 1976-77 is approximately $10 million ($7.5 million from appropriations and additional money from the $30 fee increase, higher out-of-state fees, and increased enrollment). Specific increases in the UMR budget are the following:

a. The 4% increase for S&W, or $600,000.
b. An inflationary E&E increase of $99,974.
c. An inflationary increase for fuel and utilities of $121,000.
d. An increase in the medical program of $84,000.
e. An increase of $71,000 in the retirement fund to cover past-service liability.

The total increase over the UMR budget for 1975-76, which was $17,195,000, is $950,000, coming from state appropriated dollars and from UMR fee income. The increase in the medical program (not approved yet by the Board of Curators) is to accommodate several changes in the medical program. One, there will be a semi-private room allowance rather than the $45 and $60 room rates. This change will be an improvement for persons in urban hospitals. Two, a maximum of $250,000 for each member will be instituted to replace the limits of $15,000 annual or $50,000 lifetime, with a maximum of $1,000 out of pocket. There will be some readjustment of rates for individuals, some lowered and some raised.

Question: Is not the $50 deductible a defect in the medical plan, since it forces an individual to bother with making minor claims?

Answer: The Retirement and Staff Benefits Committee would like to eliminate deductions or change to $100 deductible for all, but these plans cost money. Bill Brooks reminded Council members that $50 and $200 deductible is on each person.

Question: For what is the salary adjustment money to be used?

Answer: Originally there was a request for $500,000 for adjusting primarily UMKC non-academic salaries to those of the urban market and another $500,000 requested as a result of the Hayes study. Now there is one request for $500,000 based on the Hayes study and the market adjustment. In terms of an explanation, not a justification, the Hayes study is an analysis of the salary scale of non-academic middle management, such as administrative assistants, registrars, and budget officers; it attempts to determine job descriptions and salary inequities and levels.

Question: Why did the Chancellor say that academic salaries could not be adjusted?

Answer: Academic salaries can be adjusted, but only with Board approval.
Question: How do salaries on the four campuses compare?
Answer: UMKC has published the following data on average salaries for 1975-76:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMKC</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMSL</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All campuses</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget for 1977-78.

UMR has a brief request of three priorities:

1. In order to adjust UMR salaries to an average of those in neighboring institutions, a 6% increase in S&W will be requested, amounting to $897,087. In addition, UMR will ask that UM request for S&W an additional increase of no less than 6%. For 1978-79, UMR will request another 6% in addition to whatever UM requests.

2. An increase of 8% for E&E, approximately $273,000, will be requested.

3. A request of $280,000 will be made for energy study and research--for staff, faculty, and E&E for a Center for Non-renewable Resources.

Concluding announcement: Thomas Jefferson Residence Hall has to date 452 paid applicants, out of a capacity of 515-520; this number of applicants will be sufficient to pay the expenses of the dormitory.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

1. Dean McFarland announced that the Facilities Planning Committee has prepared a report on capital improvements. Copies are available from committee members or from Joe Wollard.

2. Chairman Ownby announced that copies of all budget requests are available to faculty in the Academic Council office.

3. Chairman Ownby, referring to a summary of the faculty poll on spring breaks (full copy*), reported that 59% of the responses from faculty favored one spring break and that 47% favored the one spring break to correspond to the Rolla Public School vacation. He suggested that the Council might want to adopt a resolution concerning spring break at the next meeting.

4. Chairman Ownby announced that the Coordinating Board at its June meeting approved the Ph.D. in Computer Science at UMR and that Interim President Olson has authorized the Chancellor to implement the degree.
5. Harold Fuller said that a report from the Financial Exigency Committee would be distributed to faculty with the minutes of this meeting. Any suggestions about the report should be made to the UMR members of the committee before the next meeting, to be held in September.

6. Chairman Ownby suggested that Academic Council members should report to their departments. He also suggested that UMIFAC representatives should report to the Academic Council.

The meeting adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Pogue
Marilyn Pogue, Secretary

*Complete document filed with the smooth copy.

Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
April 28, 1976

OFFICIAL MAIL BALLOT
UMR GRADUATE FACULTY

We concur with the Tracey Committee report that the English Language capability of international students needs improvement and request that the Graduate Office take the necessary action to move toward that improvement. That action should include:

1) Require complete admissions information on international students prior to admissions as per graduate rules.

2) Monitor more closely English Language Institute graduates.

3) Raise TOEFL base scores as and if needed to achieve the Tracey Report objectives.

4) Provide on campus English Language Institute (ELI) training as needed for students who inadvertently arrive without needed proficiency.

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

Comments—

an equal opportunity institution
MEMORANDUM TO: Members of the Graduate Faculty

FROM: Robert H. McFarland

At the request of the Graduate Faculty, April 22, 1976, I am writing you to make you aware of a situation which exists relative to international students. As of May 5, 1975, Dr. James Tracey presented to Chancellor Bisplinghoff a series of recommendations:

1. No more than 10% of the total UMR student body shall be composed of International students.

2. A maximum of approximately 25% of the graduate student body shall be International students.

3. A maximum of approximately 5% of the undergraduate student body shall be International students.

4. International students from a single country shall compose no more than 1% of the total UMR enrollment.

5. Consideration should be given to the addition of an administrative assistant in the Admissions Office to coordinate International student quotas, admissions and records.

6. International students shall qualify for admission on an individual basis and not as a block or contractual group.

7. All International students shall be required to take a communication skills placement test at the beginning of their first semester on campus. Students with serious deficiencies in this area will be enrolled in a remedial, communication skills, non-credit university course, which shall commence after the testing process is complete.

8. The three School Deans, the Graduate Dean, the Director of Admissions and the Foreign Student Advisor should be charged with developing and coordinating a definitive set of procedures for administering the above policies.

After receiving the advice of the Academic Council, Chancellor Bisplinghoff asked the C.O.D. to implement these recommendations.
Memo to the Graduate Faculty
April 22, 1976

In subsequent actions under item 8, the "Committee" made recommendations to C.O.D. for provision next year of a placement test and remedial work as indicated. They also, acting on information that we presently are admitting students at a TOEFL level of 500, (admittedly too low) recommended that this be raised to 550 which is the level most used by other Universities including UMC. 600 was rejected as too selective. The arbitrary selection of 550 was made with the understanding its use would have to be monitored and adjusted to correspond to needed competency in English communications.

I prepared a draft paper November 25 for use in Admissions and Employment of International Students (copy attached). It differs from previous documents only in terms of the positive tones of the first page, and the mention of the 75thile (550) TOEFL. This was discussed by both the Committee of Departmental Chairmen, and the Graduate Council, and were "favorably received". Minutes went to all Graduate Faculty.

In subsequent actions, this was endorsed successively by both C.O.D. and the Chancellor for implementation.

A discussion of the total issue was given the Graduate Faculty April 22 leading to their recommendation that this information and more be communicated to the Graduate Faculty.

Within the past two weeks, we have completed students admissions data for the fall semester (delayed due to unavailable student lists). Of the 122 international graduate students that could be identified only 43 had TOEFL scores. Of these only 30 had scores greater than 500.

The reasons for these apparent lapses between catalog admissions guides for international students are many. Some just appear. Some are admitted with only identification of "first class" or "honors". Some have been admitted for the purpose of attending English Language Institutes (ELI's). Some have attended another American school for a year. LAFAU and AFGRAD students are screened normally in native languages.

Unfortunately, none of these alternatives, including a 500 TOEFL can provide assurances that a student can adequately communicate. Organized cheating was detected last year and stopped, at least for now, on the TOEFL. Students are urged to go to ELI's but some never finish and may not improve enough even though they do finish. The skills placement test is a good idea and may be the only solution. At the same time, it leaves the judgement of the student to a point in time where he has made an appreciable investment. All ethics suggest that a student should prepare fully for our requirements before he leaves home.

In some instances GRE scores are terribly important. Verbal
and TOEFL (includes verbal and oral skills) scores should indicate somewhat at the same levels. Poor quantitative scores may result from lack of reading skills or quantitative ability. Advanced scores are the only normalizer data we have on a multitude of unlike institutions.

Students, highly skilled in terms of mental aptitudes, or as indicated by transcripts, may not be able to communicate orally. At least one department with major experiences with international students has already chosen 550 as its future base, for it has recognized that students unprepared in English require major additional effort on the part of faculty. I hope other departments will follow suit.

I have recently written Mr. Johnston the attached memo, April 12, (attached) expressing my current recommendations for procedures in the Admissions Office. I am content that we use the range 500-550 with tightened admissions administration for the Graduate School for a period while we together determine whether this alone will provide for the quality change that the Tracey Committee envisioned. In the meantime, the Advisory Committee and Scholarship Committee of the Graduate Faculty Council can prepare any formal international admissions changes that need be made. Should more urgent action be called for, I invite the Graduate Faculty to initiate the special meeting provision of our rules.

I also invite your advice or comments.

enclosures

RHM:bes
MEMORANDUM TO:  UMR Faculty

RE:  Recent faculty opinion poll relative to Spring Breaks.

Following are the tabulated results of the responses received:

responses received: 211

Favoring one spring break (St. Pats Holiday) 26

Favoring one spring break (Corresponding to the Rolla Public School vacation) 100

Favoring two spring breaks (One over the St. Pats Holiday and the other to be either at mid-term or corresponding to the Rolla Public School vacation) 82

Results of the vote concerning dates for a second spring break:

At mid-term 5
Corresponding to Rolla Public School vacation 61

Other choices 6

Forty-eight persons indicated interest in either having a longer Thanksgiving vacation or designating a fall break in addition to the Thanksgiving holiday.

Other suggestions included:

Spring breaks should correspond to those on other UM campuses.
No break should be taken at Thanksgiving--instead a mid-term fall break should be designated.
There should be two 1-week vacations, 1 spring and 1 fall, with no single holidays.
There should be a longer break between semesters.

mhs
Committee on Financial Exigency Policies
Statement on Financial Exigency

Financial exigency is a crisis of such proportions that, should it occur, the University's educational missions of teaching and research would be severely damaged and its overall educational services to the people of Missouri would be greatly diminished. Hence, the University community has a major obligation to try to prevent a financial exigency and to do the sound planning that would enable the University, in the event of such a crisis, to preserve its educational functions to the greatest extent possible. It is appropriate, therefore, that this statement begin with a section on preventive planning.

Effective preventive planning can help to guarantee the preservation of the basic missions of the University, including the unique roles which it serves in the state's higher education system. These basic missions are:

- On-campus instruction and research, including graduate and professional programs, of which the University has many that are the state's sole public programs.
- Off-campus instruction.
- Other research.
- Public service.

At each level of operation, the administration and faculty must continue to establish priorities among these missions as a basis for sound resource allocation. These priorities will obviously vary in specificity.

In any attempts to prevent financial exigency or in planning for coping with it, the needs and welfare of students, who will be profoundly affected by the resultant change in University structure and procedures, are considerations of high order. Such efforts must also take into account the vital contribution to the University's operation which is made by nonacademic staff personnel.

I. PREVENTIVE PLANNING
   A. Warning Signs

As an integral part of ongoing preventive planning procedures, the University community must always be alert to signals which warn that
a financial exigency may be near. The following items are examples only of some indicators of possible financial problems of such magnitude to warrant immediate attention by campus budget committees, Chancellors, and the President and his staff. These examples are certainly not mutually exclusive, and are not listed in any rank order of importance.

a. State appropriations insufficient to meet contractual commitments.

b. A substantial loss of students on one or more campuses.

c. Mandated increases in costs or functions which are not equaled by funding resources.

d. A progressive attrition of funds.

e. An absolute decline in dollar income from one year to the next, without corresponding program or student reduction.

f. A large ratio of firm commitments to uncommitted funds in the S&W portion of the budget.

g. A budget that is inflexible because of firm commitments, with the concurrent inability to respond to emergencies; for instance, a very high ratio of S&W to E&E funds.

h. A significant increase in the student-faculty ratio.

Whenever such indicators are observed, the preventive planning activities suggested in this document must be intensified.

B. Resource Committees

Faculty must be meaningfully involved through regular ongoing mechanisms with the total University fiscal situation, including the very important element of long-range planning. Meaningful faculty participation will help to protect not only the central educational functions of the University, but also the general morale of the faculty.

Appropriate committees, including faculty, at the University-wide and campus levels shall be established to advise in educational planning, appraisal of resource needs, fiscal conditions, and allocations of resources. Primary responsibility for projections of fiscal resources and their allocation is expected to rest on the campuses, with necessary support and coordination functions being provided by University central administration offices. Hence, it is especially important that each campus have such a resource/planning committee, including faculty members designated by a representatively elected faculty governance body, to be informed and to be involved with the Chancellors and their
staffs in dealing with campus fiscal planning and allocation. Similarly structured advisory committees should also be considered within major campus sub-units. Except for required faculty membership, the composition of such committees is a prerogative of the campus or sub-unit.

In support of this faculty involvement in fiscal resource projections, it is essential that appropriate data be made available. Information about anticipated levels of support, program needs, facilities, enrollment projections, etc. must be readily accessible. Existing offices shall be encouraged to coordinate their efforts to insure the regular and timely provision of such forecasting data related not only to program but to anticipated fiscal resources.

C. Effective Use of University Resources

A careful examination of resource use must be undertaken by these resource committees on a regular basis to insure that the University's basic missions are supported as adequately as possible. As a part of this review, the University will expand its efforts in the area of performance audits. For instance, we must examine resource use and productivity in administrative offices as well as in faculty loads, in physical plant as well as in research centers. We must, for example, look carefully at real estate holdings, at the efficiency of certain seasonal offices, at bidding and purchasing operations, as well as at faculty staffing patterns. These are simply suggestions of areas for which ongoing performance audits should be instituted. Each campus is urged to set up a regular procedure by which resource committees can systematically examine such issues, and faculty and staff should suggest areas that should be included. The intent of any audit is simply to insure that the University's resources are being wisely used in support of the central educational missions of the University. To that end, expert advice from outside the University may be employed in some cases.

D. Possible Retrenchment Steps to be Taken if Exigency is Threatening

As a consequence of ongoing performance audits, the appropriate planning and fiscal resource allocation committees can, as warning signals of financial stress are detected, carefully consider some steps that might be taken to improve the University's financial situation.
This is not the place to make an exhaustive list of such possibilities; however, they might include:

- The reduction or elimination of some administrative and support services.
- Modifications of the retirement system, including the encouragement of voluntary early retirement.
- The reduction or elimination of some academic programs.
- Professional development programs to enable faculty to accommodate to the changing needs of the University.
- Reduction of nontenured faculty.
- Adjustment of faculty workloads, so long as the faculty can remain professionally active.
- Limiting enrollments.
- Decreased numbers of courses and frequency of offerings; increased class size, etc.
- Conversion to nine-month appointments of some eleven-month staff.
- Increased utilization of short-term nontenurable positions.
- The closing of some facilities.

Some of these actions would have quite serious impact upon the quality of the University's educational mission and must be carefully weighed against the severity of the economic situation. The University, as a University, must not be sacrificed in order to avoid hard decisions about retrenchment or exigency. What is crucial is that all such possibilities be considered carefully and thoughtfully by appropriate faculties and administrative officers, having access to the best possible data, both of a financial and programmatic nature.

E. External Relations

The University always attempts to maintain full communication with state officers, alumni, and the public about its financial situation. During any period of retrenchment or financial exigency, however, it will be especially important for a coordinated effort to be made to (a) solicit special alumni and other private gifts to minimize educational cutbacks; (b) seek full public understanding of the University's crisis, including an explanation of the significance of the phrase "financial exigency" and
the impact of planned reductions.

The President's Office will be responsible for initiating such activities when required.

II. DEFINITION OF FINANCIAL EXIGENCY

The term "financial exigency" appears in the University of Missouri tenure regulations among the reasons for which a tenured faculty member can be terminated. In the following paragraph, financial exigency is defined, for the protection both of the institution and the faculty involved.

Financial exigency is a financial crisis which threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and which cannot be alleviated by means less drastic than the release of one or more tenured members of the faculty. That is, the financial problems must be so great that after all other avenues have been explored and all other possible preliminary steps have been considered (see Section I.D.), there is no reasonable alternative and no balanced way to maintain a quality University-level institution except to release one or more tenured faculty members on one or more campuses as part of a total retrenchment process. Financial exigency precludes faculty expansion during the period of crisis in any area on any campus through new positions filled from outside the University, except in circumstances so extraordinary that serious distortion of the academic program would otherwise result. The appointment of a faculty member with tenure will not be terminated in favor of retaining a faculty member without tenure, in the same department or comparable unit, except in extraordinary circumstances where serious distortion of the academic program would otherwise result.

III. DECLARATION AND TERMINATION OF A FINANCIAL EXIGENCY

A condition of financial exigency is formally declared by the Board of Curators upon recommendation of the President. There are two alternative procedures required for such a recommendation:

A. Any of the Chancellors may determine that a financial crisis exists on his campus sufficient to conclude that a financial exigency is imminent.

1. Any Chancellor so concluding must present his views with full supporting documentation (including any relevant information developed by the campus resource committees) to a joint meeting of his major administrative officers and an appropriate standing
committee consisting entirely of faculty, designated in advance by the faculty governance body. This standing committee, whose name may vary from campus to campus, is henceforth referred to in this document as the campus exigency committee.

2. In accord with campus procedures to be adopted, responses and recommendations from administrative officers and the campus exigency committee shall be presented to the Chancellor.

3. If after reviewing and/or acting upon these recommendations the Chancellor still concludes that a declaration of financial exigency for the University is required, he must transmit his recommendations along with those of the campus exigency committee to the President.

4. The President shall present the Chancellor's recommendations, those of the campus exigency committee, and his own recommendations to a joint meeting of the Academic Planning Council and an appropriate standing committee consisting entirely of faculty, designated in advance by the campus faculties or faculty governance bodies, henceforth referred to as the University Exigency Committee. Such presentation must occur within ten days of receipt of any Chancellor's recommendation for a declaration of financial exigency for the University.

5. The Academic Planning Council shall meet as it deems appropriate and advise the President. The University Exigency Committee shall meet, investigate, and recommend in writing to the President whether or not financial exigency should be declared. Any minority recommendation in which at least one-third of the University Exigency Committee concur shall be forwarded to the President along with the majority's view.

6. If, upon receipt of advice from the Academic Planning Council and the written recommendations from the University Exigency Committee, the President concludes that financial exigency should be declared, he shall announce that conclusion and the amounts (if any) to be reduced in each campus budget directly to the entire University of Missouri community, making public his reasons along with the recommendations of the University

1Presently the Intercampus Faculty Council
Exigency Committee majority and any minority views endorsed by one-third of the members. If, however, the President decides, upon consideration of the foregoing recommendations, that a state of financial exigency need not be declared, he shall so inform in writing the Academic Planning Council, the University Exigency Committee, and the Chancellor and campus exigency committee on the campus where the request originated.

B. The President of the University also may initiate a recommendation that financial exigency be declared. If he wishes to do so, he must, after consultation with the University Exigency Committee, notify the Chancellor and campus exigency committee on each campus on which tenured faculty members might have to be terminated. After giving these campuses 21 days to respond, having provided appropriate information about the anticipated crisis, the President shall then follow steps 4 through 6 under A above.

During a period of financial exigency, the President shall continually review the resources of the institution with appropriate faculty and administrative groups and the Board of Curators, and shall make periodic reports to the University community. In addition, the University Exigency Committee (or its designees) will be sent agendas and be invited to participate in all meetings of the Academic Planning Council, and the chairman of the University Exigency Committee shall attend all meetings of the Finance Committee of the Board of Curators during the period of financial exigency. Each Chancellor will insure that campus exigency committees have access to adequate financial information during such a period.

A period of financial exigency automatically expires at the end of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the exigency is declared or when the end of the exigency is declared by the Board, whichever comes sooner. If the President believes that the period of financial exigency must be extended, he must institute the same procedures described above in order to renew it.

IV. PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED IN RELEASING FACULTY DURING FINANCIAL EXIGENCY

In the process of considering whether or not a financial exigency must be declared, the University Exigency Committee and the campus exigency committees will have examined carefully the magnitude of reductions which will have to be made and will have established criteria for selection of programs in which tenured faculty will have to be released. However, specific programs in which tenured faculty might be released should not be decided upon before the formal declaration of financial exigency by the Board. In this way, an objective view of the University's financial situation can perhaps be more easily attained.
Within 15 days after the declaration of financial exigency, the Chancellor on any campus to be affected shall, using the criteria developed by the campus exigency committee, recommend the specific programs in which tenured faculty may have to be released. In so doing, he shall present his views with supporting documentation to a joint meeting of the administrative officers and the campus exigency committee. These groups shall jointly hold hearings, under procedures established by them in advance, to receive written and oral evidence relating to the proposed reductions, following which these groups will confer separately and prepare independent recommendations to the Chancellor. These recommendations must be submitted within 15 days after receipt of the Chancellor's original program recommendations.

After receipt of recommendations from the administrative officers and the campus exigency committee, the Chancellor shall forward those recommendations about programs to be eliminated or reduced, together with his own views, to the President. The President shall present all campus recommendations transmitted to him, together with his own, to a joint meeting of the Academic Planning Council and the University Exigency Committee for review and advice. Either of those groups may respond in writing to the President within seven days of that meeting. Following that period, the President shall announce to the affected campuses his decisions about which programs are to be reduced or eliminated.

Within each unit to be reduced or eliminated, the Chancellor, in consultation with the campus exigency committee and appropriate administrative officers, shall announce the amount of reduction required. In most cases this will involve specifying a dollar amount to be recovered from the unit, but the Chancellor may, if he wishes, specify a minimum number of persons to be released from the staff.

Except in extraordinary circumstances where a serious distortion of the academic program would otherwise result, the appointment of a tenured faculty member will not be terminated until all nontenured staff have been released. Further, within either of these categories of staff, in recommending persons for release, consideration shall be given to seniority in terms of (1) academic rank, (2) length of service in rank at the University of Missouri, and (3) total length of service at the University of Missouri. If a departure is made from seniority (as herein defined), the administrator of the unit must be prepared to demonstrate that adherence to seniority would result in the serious distortion of the
academic program. Individual units may, at the discretion of the Chancellor, establish additional (but not contradicting) criteria for selection of individuals in advance of any such selection.

Using the criteria of the previous paragraph, the Chairman, Director, or Dean in each of the affected units shall recommend individuals to be released as a part of the unit's overall reduction. This recommendation is presented to the next higher authority, up to and including the Chancellor, with review by the campus exigency committee. Each Dean or Director shall notify each of the individuals who have been identified for release, and that individual shall be given seven days to respond before the Chancellor transmits his recommendations to the President, who will make the final determination.

Any individual designated for release by the Chancellor may appeal to his campus faculty tenure committee, as designated in Article .52 of the University Tenure Regulations, before the recommendation is transmitted to the President. The appeal may be based only on the grounds that financial exigency has not been demonstrated, or that procedures specified in this document have not been followed, or that a departure from seniority as a criterion for release of individuals was not justified. Procedural due process shall be followed in such appeal in that counsel may be present if desired, opportunity must be provided to call and confront witnesses, and a verbatim record with identified exhibits shall be maintained. The recommendations or findings of faculty committees on the issues of the appeal may be introduced. In case of appeal, the finding of the faculty tenure committee shall accompany the Chancellor's recommendation to the President.

Termination of a tenured faculty member under these procedures will take effect no less than one calendar year from the date of the President's designation of the individual, through certified letter delivered to the latest home address on file with the University. In the case of nontenured staff, termination will take place at the end of the current contract period, if possible, but not less than three months from the date of the President's designation of the individual, through certified letter delivered to the latest home address on file with the University.

Before terminating an appointment because of a financial exigency, the University, with faculty participation, will make every effort to place the faculty member concerned in another suitable position within the University
system. In particular, if a faculty member is to be terminated, and during the period of financial exigency there is an opening in the same discipline on another campus, it shall be the responsibility of the President's office to communicate with the hiring campus about the availability of the terminated faculty member. The hiring campus shall carefully review the qualifications of the faculty member in question and, if he meets the criteria established by the hiring department for the position, he shall have the right of first refusal. In all cases of termination of appointment because of financial exigency, the place of the faculty member concerned will not be filled by a replacement within a period of three years following termination, unless the released faculty member has been offered reinstatement and a reasonable time in which to accept or decline.

V. DISCONTINUANCE OF PROGRAMS

If the discontinuance of a program would require the release of one or more tenured faculty members, the procedures must conform to those outlined in IV. No decision to discontinue formally a program or a department of instruction will be made except based essentially upon educational considerations, as determined primarily by the appropriate faculty or committee thereof.
MEMORANDUM TO: UMR Faculty

RE: AGENDA for the Academic Council meeting, Thursday, June 17, 1976, at 1:30 p.m. in G-5 of the Humanities-Social Science Building.

I. Approval of the minutes of the April 29, 1976, meeting of the Academic Council

II. Unfinished business

III. Reports of administrative responses to actions approved by the Academic Council

IV. Reports of standing and special committees

A. 4.912 Admissions and Academic Standards

1. Admissions requirements, January 29, 1976, V, 7.3c.
2. Guidelines for Admissions and Employment of International Graduate Students, April 29, 1976, V, 10.3.

B. 4.516 Curricula

1. Curricula Committee Report No. 8, 1975-76.

V. New business

VI. Announcements

A. Status of the budget. Jim Poe

B. Results of the faculty poll on spring breaks. Darrell Ownby

*Supplementary material sent to Academic council members.
Memorandum:   UMR Faculty
        From:    Academic Council

A petition has been received requesting that a special meeting be called "mainly concerned with restructuring of academic administrative offices". In accordance with this request, a meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, 17 December, 1971, at 1:30 p.m. in the Mechanical Engineering Auditorium.

All Academic Council members and faculty are urged to attend. Those wishing to make a presentation, who notify the Academic Council office in advance, will be allotted time. Others may make presentations as time permits.
Jim,

I have collected some signatures (there are probably 4 members of A.C.) and hope it would be possible to call for a meeting sometime next week. My proposal is mainly concerned with restructuring of academic administrative efforts.

Sincerely,

4:00 pm.

Thurs., Dec. 11, 1975
The financial situation at the University of Missouri calls for an immediate restructuring of the administration which, in the last few years, has proliferated almost beyond control. We, the undersigned, call for a special session of the Academic Council at UMR to plan for the immediate restructuring of administrative offices on our campus and to recommend to the Board of Curators an urgent restructuring, with the proper re-allocation of funds, of the U-Wide administration.

Samantha F. Hanna
Ahmed Khamal
O. Vincent Jones
Rafael Luehr
M. F. Nigdelby
Delbert
R. Redington
M. W. Wehr
M. Neureil
A. Croahi
Clark R. Barker
Robert Davison
W. P. Legley, Jr.
W. A. Adams
James R. Wiel
Chadwick Johnson
James W. Jones
Irvin Hicks
A. D. Jonas
Herbert R. Alem
J. P. Metzner
Lenny Reeves

[Signatures]