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TO THE READER:

This binder contains three sections per meeting. The agenda, with all corresponding material sent prior to the meeting, is the first section. In the second section, the Minutes, with all attachments (including those sent with the Agenda), are located. The last section contains meeting summaries, pertinent memoranda, and, where necessary, a more detailed version of the Council Minutes.

In addition, I have prepared various items which may be of interest to you, the Reader. Located directly behind this preface are the following listings and indices (in order of appearance): the 1988-89 Academic Council meeting dates; the Voting and Non-Voting Members of the 1988-89 Academic Council; a Summary of the 1988-89 Referrals; the Index for the 1988-89 Minutes; and the Attachment Index both by subject and by meeting date.

Collis M. Brotherton
Office Secretary
14 July 1989
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Personnel Committee - Drug Abuse Policy/ Procedures for Establishing Rank and Tenure III.D.1
SA - UMR Volleyball Club Constitution III.F

March 23, 1989

XVIII, 5

BA - Agenda for Action Resolution III.A.1
BA - 89/90 Budget Priorities Resolution III.A.2
BA - 90/91 Budget Request Resolution III.A.3
Curricula Committee - Report #5, 1988-89 III.B
Personnel Committee - Conflict of Interest Policy/Academic Freedom and Outside Teaching Assignments III.C

April 20, 1989

XVIII, 6

Academic Freedom Committee (AF) - Institutional Review Boards III.A
BA - Fee Structure Inequities III.B
Curricula Committee - Report #6, 1988-89 III.C
Personnel Committee - Smoking/Non-Smoking Policy III.D
RP&A - By-Laws Revisions III.E
SA - Table Tennis Club Constitution III.F

June 15, 1989

XVIII, 7

1989/90 Budget Report - M. Jischke II.C.1
Blue Ribbon Committee - Teacher Evaluation Report II.C.2
UMR Salary Increase Distribution Policy - M. Jischke II.D.1
Outside Teaching Assignments Policy - J. Park II.D.2
UMR Smoking Policy - M. Jischke II.D.3
AA - Assessment Day Resolution III.A
A&AS - Admission Performance Standards III.B
BA - Aerospace Engineering Ph.D. III.C.1
Curricula Committee - Report #7, 1988-89 III.D.1
Curricula Committee - Aerospace Engineering Ph.D. III.D.2
Personnel Committee - Sexual Harassment Procedures III.D.2
RP&A - 1989-90 Meeting Dates III.F
Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee - Professorial Academic Rank Qualifications Policy Revision III.H.2
September 22, 1988 President’s Address – O. Crosser
Special Meeting Chancellor’s Address – M. Jischke
Resolution – RP&A
Resolution – C. Adams
Resolution – Four Chairs Committee
1988 - 1989 MEETING DATES

Rules, Procedure and Agenda Committee

August 23, 1988          January 19, 1989
September 29, 1988       March 7, 1989
November 15, 1988        April 6, 1989

June 1, 1989

Meetings were held in various conference rooms throughout the Campus at 1:30 p.m.

Academic Council

September 8, 1988        February 2, 1989
October 13, 1988         March 23, 1989
December 8, 1988         April 20, 1989

June 15, 1989

Meetings were held in Room G-5 of the Humanities-Social Sciences Building at 1:30 p.m.

General Faculty

September 6, 1988
November 29, 1988
April 25, 1989

Meetings were held in the Aaron Jefferson Miles Auditorium at 4:00 p.m.
University of Missouri Board of Curators

July 28-29, 1988 ------------------ Hannibal

September 15-16, 1988 -------------- Columbia

November 3-4, 1988 -------------- Columbia

December 1-2, 1988 -------------- Columbia

January 26-27, 1989 ------------ Saint Louis

March 9-10, 1989 -------------- Columbia

May 4-5, 1989 ------------------ Rolla

June 22-23, 1989 -------------- Saint Joseph
VOTING MEMBERS OF THE 1988-89 UMR ACADEMIC COUNCIL

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

Fannie Woods/John Huguley
Aerospace Studies

W. Lance Haynes
Applied Arts & Cultural Studies

Frank Blum
Chemistry

D. Vincent Roach
Chemistry

Howard D. Pyron
Computer Science

John Prater
Computer Science

Curtis H. Adams
Economics

Clyde G. Wade (Secretary)
English

Lance Williams
History & Political Science

Roger Brown
Life Science

A. Glen Haddock
Mathematics & Statistics

Jagdish K. Patel
Mathematics & Statistics

Sam Dent
Military Science

Richard Miller
Philosophy

Mark Mullin
Physical Educ. & Recreation

Allan Pringle
Physics

Paul Parris
Physics

Catherine Ann Riordan
Psychology

SCHOOL OF MINES & METALLURGY

Len Rahaman
Ceramic Engineering

C. Dale Elifrits
Geological Engineering

Geza Kisvarsanyi
Geology & Geophysics

Donald Askeland (President-Elect)
Metallurgical Engineering

Norman S. Smith
Mining Engineering

D. Ray Edwards
Nuclear Engineering

Daopu T. Numbere
Petroleum Engineering

an equal opportunity institution
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Ju-Chang Huang
Civil Engineering

Max Anderson/Jack J. Bourquin
Electrical Engineering

Thomas P. Van Doren
Electrical Engineering

Madison Daily/Colin Benjamin
Engineering Management

David Oglesby
Engineering Mechanics

Bruce Selberg/Don Cronin
Mechanical & Aerospace Engr.

John W. Sheffield
Mechanical & Aerospace Engr.

Charles D. Morris
Civil Engineering

Jerome Westphal (Parliamentarian)
Civil Engineering

Thomas J. Herrick
Electrical Engineering

Peter Schmidt
Engineering Management

Floyd Cunningham
Engineering Mechanics

Al Crosbie
Mechanical & Aerospace Engr.

Orrin K. Crosser (President)
Chemical Engineering

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

Martin C. Jischke
Chancellor

Marvin W. Barker
Dean of Arts & Science

Donald L. Warner
Dean of Mines & Metallurgy

Robert Davis
Dean of Engineering

John T. Park
Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Wendell Ogrosky
Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs

Harry J. Sauer, Jr.
Dean of Graduate Studies
NON-VOTING MEMBERS OF THE 1988-89 UMR ACADEMIC COUNCIL

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Kevin Gibson
Gregory Andrey

GRADUATE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Rodney Joel

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

Ronald Bohley, Director
Library & Learning Resources

David W. Dearth, Director
Computing Services

C. M. Heddinghaus, Manager
Institutional Research

Robert Lewis, Director
Admissions

Myron G. Parry
Registrar

Neil Smith, Vice-Chancellor
Administrative Services

Eugene Bae
Kyle Corum

Delbert E. Day
ICFC Representative

Kevin Edwards, President
Student Council

Lynn Waggoner, Director
Public Information

Thomas Coffman, Vice-Chancellor
Development & Alumni Affairs

Jim C. Pogue
ICFC Representative

Walt Eversman
ICFC Representative
Combining Faculty Conduct Procedures (Faculty Handbook Revision) for administrative response (January 21, 1988; XVII, 5; III.C.1). Report given by Chancellor Jischke (February 19, 1988; XVII, 6; II.E). REFERRED TO ACADEMIC DEANS. Revised version presented for Council review (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; II.D). Revisions accepted by Council (June 16, 1988; XVII, 9; IV.A). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Emeritus Designation for administrative response (November 19, 1987; XVII, 4; II.C). Report given by Vice-Chancellor Park (January 21, 1988; XVII, 5; II.D). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Ad Hoc Committee

Implementation of Assessment and Student Participation (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.4). Report received and acted upon by Council (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; V.E). Report received (November 19, 1987; XVII, 4; II.F). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Policy Recommendations Regarding Acquisition/Use/Information on Faculty Teaching Responsibilities (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; II.B.4). Report presented but tabled by Council (June 16, 1988; XVII, 9; III.E).

Academic Assessment

UMR Assessment Policy (June 16, 1988; XVII, 9; II.B). Recommendation presented and approved by Council (June 16, 1988; XVII, 9; III.A). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Academic Freedom

External Involvement in Academic Freedoms (October 22, 1987; XVII, 3; IV.B.1). Report received (November 17, 1987; XVII, 4; II.F). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Admissions and Academic Standards

Admissions Standards (August 22, 1985; XV, 1; IV.A). Admissions Performance Standards (February 18, 1988; XVII, 6; II.B). Overview Presented (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; III.A.1).

Excused Absence Procedure (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; II.B.1).
Admissions and Academic Standards, cont.

Graduation Requirements Study (April 17, 1986). Referred by J. T. Park. Council input sought (February 18, 1988; XVII, 6; III.A). Recommendation presented and approved by Council (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; III.A.2). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Recording Academic Actions on Transcripts (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; II.B.2). Recommendation received and approved by Council (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; III.A). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Revised Regulations for Removing a Student from Academic Probation (April 23, 1987; XVI, 8; IV.A.1).

Scholastic Deficiency in Freshman Engineering (March 19, 1987; XVI, 7; IV.A.1). Recommendation returned to Committee for reconsideration (April 23, 1987; XVI, 8; III.A.4). Recommendation presented and approved by Council (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; III.A). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Budgetary Affairs

FY89 Budget (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; II.B.1). Report received (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; III.B). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Study of Retirement Benefits Policy (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.3). JOINTLY REFERRED TO THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

Curricula Committee

CAPS and the Graduation Catalogue (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.1).

General Education Report (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; V.F.2). Announcement made (November 19, 1987; XVII, 4; II.B.2). Report received (January 21, 1988; XVII, 5; III.B.2). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Time Limitation of the Graduation Catalogue (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.2)

Library and Learning Resources

Library Periodical Subscriptions (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; II.B.2). Report presented and accepted by Council (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; III.D.2). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.
Library and Learning Resources, cont.

Library Use Policies/LUMIN (January 21, 1988; XVII, 5; II.B.3). Report presented and accepted by Council (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; III.D.1). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Personnel Committee

Combining Faculty Conduct Procedures (November 19, 1987; XVII, 4; IV.B.1). Recommendation received and acted on by Council (January 21, 1988; XVII, 5; III.C.1). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Confidentiality of Student Evaluation Reports (January 21, 1988; XVII, 5; II.B.2). Report presented and tabled by Council (January 21, 1988; XVII, 5; III.C.2). Recommendation received and action taken by Council (February 18, 1988; XVII, 6; III.D). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Emeritus Designation (April 23, 1987; XVI, 8; IV.A.2). Overview presented (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; III.C.3). Recommendation received and acted upon by Council (November 19, 1987; XVII, 4; II.C). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Integration of Research Dishonesty Procedures (March 19, 1987; XVII, 7; IV.A.2). Overview presented and motion to strike from agenda approved by Council (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; III.C.2). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Sabbatical Leave Policy (June 19, 1986; XV, 9; V.B.1). Overview presented (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; III.C.1).

Smoking/Non Smoking Policy (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; II.B.3). Report presented (June 16, 1988; XVII, 9; III.B).

Study of Retirement Benefits Policy (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.3). JOINTLY REFERRED TO THE BUDGETARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE. Overview presented (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; III.C.4).

Public Occasions

Assessment Day (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; V.F.3). Recommendation received and approved by Council (November 19, 1987; XVII, 4; II.D). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.
Public Occasions, cont.

Options to Extend Academic Days in the Calendar Year (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; II.B.3). Recommendation presented and acted upon by Council (June 16, 1988; XVII, 9; III.C). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Rules, Procedure and Agenda

Assessment Committees (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; V.F.1). Recommendation received and acted on by Council (October 22, 1987; XVII, 3; III.C.1). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Report of the Committee to Improve the University of Missouri (March 20, 1986; XV, 7; III.E & IV.B.2). Motion to strike from agenda approved by Council (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; III.D.1). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Semester Length/Time on Task (January 21, 1988; XVII, 5; II.B.1). Barton memorandum presented for information only (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; III.E.1).

Student Affairs

Grade Appeal Procedure/Policy (November 19, 1987; XVII, 4; IV.B.2). Report given to Council but returned to Committee for reconsideration (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; III.C).

Tenure

Proposed Tenure Regulations (August 27, 1987; XVII, 1; IV.B.1). Recommendation received and approved by Council (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; III.F). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.
SUMMARY
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
SEPT. 8, 1988

Election of Academic Council Officers: Elected to serve for the 1988-1989 year are Orrin K. Crosser, President; Donald R. Askeland, President-Elect; Clyde G. Wade, Secretary; and Jerome A. Westphal, Parliamentarian.

President’s Report: President Crosser brought the many accomplishments of outgoing President Lance Williams to the attention of an appreciative Academic Council.

Chancellor’s Report: Chancellor Jischke reported on (1) enrollment; (2) budget; (3) engineering in urban areas.

1. Enrollment is stabilizing. At the end of the second week of the current term, there were 4914 students enrolled, 167 fewer than last year. But the freshman class was 8% larger than the year before, and that class was 12% larger than the class which preceded it. There are 186 Bright Flight recipients this year—roughly one fifth of a class that appears to be the most able freshman class ever. (2) The budget for 1988-1989 is of necessity a conservative one, and UMR is in relatively good financial shape. While the tax collections of the state are running high thus far in the fiscal year, there is as yet no word on the fate of the 3% traditionally withheld by the Governor for possible emergency uses. If the 3% is returned to the campus, it will be used "to the extent possible" for salary supplements. Research monies last year reached a record $8,000,000. The campus fared well in regard to state monies for maintenance and repair ($850,000) and for engineering equipment ($850,000). In addition, UMR received $3.55 million to complete the State share of the Auditorium-Music-Alumni building in progress. (3) Chancellor Jischke emphasized the work of the Agenda for Action Committee charged with devising plans for making engineering education available for non-traditional students in the St. Louis area. Even before the charge was given to pursue engineering education in the urban areas, he pointed out, UMR had embarked upon a study of providing such education on a state-wide basis. A committee chaired by Dean Fannin explored making undergraduate education in Electrical Engineering, Engineering Management, and Mechanical Engineering available throughout the state by means of V-SAT (very small aperture terminal) which provides two-way video and audio data transmissions. The campus has submitted a budget request for FY90 that includes funds for this purpose.

Chancellor Jischke also took note of the relationship between student enrollment and the budget. The loss of 167 students represents a loss of approximately $320,000 dollars to the budget. Student occupation of campus housing is in relatively good shape. The new Director of Residential Life, Jim Murphy, arrived on campus June 1. Student occupancy in the residential halls is relatively good.

Chancellor Jischke expressed hopes that UMR will be named the Center for Advanced Technology in the manufacturing area.
Vice Chancellor's Report: Vice Chancellor of Alumni Development Affairs Thomas Coffman reviewed for the Academic Council his role. It is that of a vigorous fund raiser, or broker, for UMR.

Committee Reports: D. Ray Edwards (RPA) conducted two elections during the on-going meeting of the Council. Those elected to the Grievance Hearing Panel are Joe Keeton, Troy Hicks, H. O. McDonald, William Andrews, and Robert Laudon. Those elected to the Exigency Committee are Henry Metzner, Nicholas Tsoulfanidis, and Arlan DeKock. Robert Wolf was re-elected to the Long-Range Planning Liaison Committee. Jim Pogue reported for the ICFC (1) that the 10 Agenda For Action Committee reports should be available in a single draft about the middle of October; (2) that if the 3% withholding of funds by the state is released, the "first and majority claim will be for salaries"; (3) that a committee is to be appointed soon to review and make recommendations about staff benefits to the President by the middle of December; (4) and that preliminary data indicate the S & W increases for the current year ranged by campus from 2.3 to 3.00 percent.

Old Business: The proposed Policy for Evaluation of Faculty Instruction was untabled. After considerable discussion, the policy proposal was returned to the Ad Hoc Committee which drafted it.
REFERRALS SUMMARY FOR 1988-89

Academic Freedom and Institutional Review Boards for administrative response (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; III.A).

Academic Freedom and Outside Teaching Assignments for administrative response (March 23, 1989; XVIII, 5; III.C). Report given by Vice-Chancellor Park (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; II.D.2). REFERRED TO THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE.

Acquisition/Use/Information on Faculty Teaching Responsibilities Policy for administrative response (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; III.A). REFERRED TO THE BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE. Reports given by Walt Johnson (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; II.D) and (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; II.C.2). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Admission performance Standards for administrative response (October 13, 1988; XVIII, 2; III.B). Report given by Chancellor Jischke (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 5; II.B.2). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Agenda for Action Resolution for administrative response (March 23, 1989; XVIII, 5; III.A.1). Report given by Chancellor Jischke (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; III.A.1). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Assessment Results Use for administrative response (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.A). Report given by Chancellor Jischke (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; II.A.2). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Conflict of Interest Policy for administrative response (March 23, 1989; XVIII, 5; III.C). Report given by Chancellor Jischke (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; II.A.3). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Fee Structure Inequities for administrative response (October 13, 1988; XVIII, 2; III.C.2). Report given by Chancellor Jischke (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.B.1). REFERRED TO THE BUDGETARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE AND THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.C.1 and II.C.2).

90/91 Budget Request for administrative response (March 23, 1989; XVIII, 5; III.A.3). Report given by Chancellor Jischke (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; II.A.1). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Priorities for 89/90 Campus Budget for administrative response (March 23, 1989; XVIII, 5; III.A.2). Report given by Chancellor Jischke (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; II.A.1). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

an equal opportunity institution
Procedures for Establishing Rank/Tenure for administrative response (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.D.1). Report given by Chancellor Jischke (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; II.A.4). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Salary Increase Distribution Policy for administrative response (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.B.2). Report given by Chancellor Jischke (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; II.D.1). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Smoking/Non Smoking Policy for administrative response (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; III.D). Report given by Chancellor Jischke (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; II.D.3). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Ad Hoc Committee

Policy Recommendations Regarding Acquisition/Use/Information on Faculty Teaching Responsibilities (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; II.B.4). Report presented but tabled by Council (June 16, 1988; XVII, 9; III.E). Report untabled and returned to Committee for reconsideration (September 8, 1988; XVIII, 1; V.A). Revised report and substitute policy presented but tabled by Council (October 13, 1988; XVIII, 2; III.E). Report and substitute policy untabled. Substitution rejected and report approved by Council (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; III.A). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Academic Freedom

Academic Freedom and Outside Teaching Assignments Administrative Response (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; II.B.4).

Admissions and Academic Standards

Admissions Standards (August 22, 1985; XV, 1; IV.A). Admissions Performance Standards (February 16, 1988; XVII, 6; II.B). Overview Presented (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; III.A.1). Recommendation presented to and approved by Council (October 13, 1988; XVIII, 2; III.B). REMOVED FROM AGENDA. Referred again (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; II.B.1). Recommendation to reaffirm previous proposal approved by Council (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; III.E). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Excused Absence Procedure (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; II.B.1).

Revised Regulations for Removing a Student from Academic Probation (April 23, 1987; XVI, 3; IV.A.1).
Judiciary Affairs

Fee Structure Inequities - Student Rank (December 8, 1986; XVIII, 3; II.C.2). Overview presented (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.B). Recommendation presented to and approved by Council (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 5; III.B). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Salary Increase Distribution Policy (referred by Chancellor Jischke December 27, 1988). Recommendation presented to and approved by Council (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.B.2). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Salary Increase Distribution Policy Response (June 15, 1987; XVIII, 7; II.D.1). Report presented to Council (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; III.C.2). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Staff Benefits Planning Committee Report (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; II.B.3). JOINTLY REFERRED TO THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

Study of Retirement Benefits Policy (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.3). JOINTLY REFERRED TO THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE. Referral reconsidered by Rules, Procedure and Agenda Committee (September 29, 1988). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Curricula Committee

CAFS and the Graduation Catalogue (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.1).

Fee Structure Inequities - Course Co-listings (December 8, 1986; XVIII, 3; II.C.1).

Time Limitation of the Graduation Catalogue (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.2).

Personnel Committee

Academic Freedom and Outside Teaching Assignments (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; II.B.2). Recommendation presented to and approved by Council (March 23, 1989; XVIII, 5; III.C). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Conflict of Interest Policy (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; II.B.1). Recommendation presented to and approved by Council (March 23, 1989; XVIII, 5; III.C). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.
Personnel Committee, cont.

Drug-free Workplace Policy (December 6, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.C.2). Recommendation received and approved by Council (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.D.1). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Procedures for Establishing Rank and/or Tenure (December 6, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.C.4). Recommendation received and approved by Council (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.D.1). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Sabbatical Leave Policy (June 19, 1988; XV, 9; V.B.1). Overview presented (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; III.C.1). Recommendation presented by the Rules, Procedure and Agenda Committee and approved by Council (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; III.D.2). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Sexual Harassment Policy (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 5; II.C.2). Recommendation received and approved by Council (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; III.E). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Smoking/Non Smoking Policy (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; II.B.3). Report presented (June 15, 1988; XVII, 9; III.B). Overview presented (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.D.2). Recommendation presented and approved by Council as amended (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; III.D). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Staff Benefits Planning Committee Report (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; II.B.3). JOINTLY REFERRED TO THE BUDGETARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.

Study of Retirement Benefits Policy (June 25, 1989; XVI, 7; IV.A.3). JOINTLY REFERRED TO THE BUDGETARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE. Overview presented (September 24, 1987; XVII, 2; III.C.4). Referral reconsidered by Rules, Procedure and Agenda Committee (September 27, 1988). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Promotion and Tenure

Procedures for Establishing Rank and Tenure (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; II.A.4). Report presented to Council (June 13, 1989; XVIII, 7; III.H.1). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Qualifications for Professorial Ranks (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; II.C.1). Report presented (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; III.H.2). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.
Public Occasions

Spring Break Schedule (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; II.B.2).

Rules, Procedure and Agenda

Sabbatical Leave Policy (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; III.B.2). Previously referred to the Personnel Committee (June 19, 1988; XV, 9; V.B.1). Recommendation presented to and approved by Council (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; III.B.2). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Semester Length/Time on Task (January 21, 1988; XVII, 5; II.B.1). Barton memorandum presented for information only (March 24, 1988; XVII, 7; III.E.1). Referral considered by Rules, Procedure and Agenda Committee (January 19, 1989). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.

Student Affairs

Grade Appeal Procedure/Policy (November 19, 1987; XVII, 4; IV.B.2). Report given to Council but returned to Committee for reconsideration (May 5, 1988; XVII, 3; III.C). Revised document presented to and accepted by Council (October 13, 1988; XVIII, 2; III.E.1). REMOVED FROM AGENDA.
XVIII, 1 The September 8, 1988, meeting of the Academic Council was called to order at 1:34 p.m. by Prof. Lance Williams, retiring Academic Council President. It was noted that Prof. Jerry Bayless would substitute for Dean Robert Davis. Prof. Max Anderson, Electrical Engineering, was recognized as a new Academic Council member. A motion to approve the June 16, 1988, minutes was made by Prof. Richard Miller, seconded by Prof. D. Ray Edwards, and passed.

XVIII, 1 ELECTION OF 1988-89 OFFICERS. The following Academic Council members were nominated to the following Council offices by President Lance Williams: Prof. Orrin Crosser, President; Prof. Don Askeland, President-Elect; Prof. Clyde Wade, Secretary; and Prof. Jerome Westphal, Parliamentarian. Other nominations were sought from the floor. Hearing none, Prof. D. Ray Edwards moved that nominations cease and that the slate be elected by acclamation. The motion, seconded by Prof. Vincent Roach, carried. (Attachment II)

XVIII, 1 REPORTS AND RESPONSES.

A. RETIRING PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENT. Prof. Lance Williams indicated that the Library has adopted a new overdue materials policy. A memorandum from Circulation has been mailed.

B. PRESIDENT’S REPORT. President Orrin Crosser acknowledged the service of Prof. Lance Williams to the Council and thanked him for it. During Prof. Williams’ term as President, the By-Laws and Faculty Handbook were revised, the Academic Assessment and Four-Chairs Committees were established, distribution of the Board Review to campus mail boxes was begun, and a "more succinct version of the Council minutes" was initiated.

C. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT.

1. ENROLLMENT. Enrollment is stabilizing. At the end of the second week of the current term, there were 4914 students enrolled, 167 fewer than last year. But the freshman class was 8 percent larger than the year before, and that class was 12 percent larger than the class which preceded it.
There are 186 Bright Flight recipients this year--roughly one fifth of a class that appears to be the most able freshman class ever.

Chancellor Jischke also took note of the relationship between student enrollment and the budget. The loss of 167 students represents a loss of approximately $320,000 to the budget. Student occupation of campus housing is in relatively good shape. The new Director of Residential Life, Jim Murphy, arrived on campus June 1. Student occupancy in the residential halls is relatively good.

2. BUDGET. The budget for 1988-89 is of necessity a conservative one, and UMR is in relatively good financial shape. While the tax collections of the state are running high thus far in the fiscal year, there is as yet no word on the fate of the 3 percent traditionally withheld by the Governor for possible emergency uses. If the 3 percent is returned to the campus, it will be used "to the extent possible" for salary supplements. Research monies last year reached a record $8,000,000. The campus fared well in regard to state monies for maintenance and repair ($850,000) and for engineering equipment ($850,000). In addition, UMR received $3.55 million to complete the State share of the Auditorium-Music-Alumni building in progress.

3. ENGINEERING IN URBAN AREAS. Chancellor Jischke emphasized the work of the Agenda for Action Committee charged with devising plans for making engineering education available for non-traditional students in the St. Louis area. He pointed out that even before the charge was given to pursue engineering education in the urban areas, UMR had embarked upon a study of means to provide such education on a statewide basis. A committee chaired by Dean Fannin explored making undergraduate education in Electrical Engineering, Engineering Management, and Mechanical Engineering available throughout the state by means of V-SAT (very small aperture terminal) which provides two-way video and audio data transmissions. The campus has submitted a budget request for FY90 that includes funds for this purpose.
Chancellor Jischke expressed hopes that UMR will be named the Center for Advanced Technology in the manufacturing area.

D. INTRODUCTION OF VICE-CHANCELLOR FOR ALUMNI/DEVELOPMENT. Thomas Coffman described himself as a fund-raiser and a student—"I'm always looking for better ways to communicate the needs of higher education." He came to UMR because of its nationally recognized reputation and because he felt there was "a great deal more potential for funding at this institution."

Prior to the UMR move, Mr. Coffman was Vice-President for Institutional Advancement at Albion College, Michigan, and before that, he worked in alumni/development at Triton College. He holds a B. A. in Psychology from Heidelberg College and a M. Ed. from Bowling Green.

XVIII, 1 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

A. CURRICULA.
1. REPORT NO. 1, 1988-89. Prof. David Oglesby moved that his Committee's recommendation of two experimental courses, six course/curriculum changes, four new courses, and one course deletion be approved. The motion was seconded and passed.

B. RULES, PROCEDURE AND AGENDA.
1. ACADEMIC COUNCIL ELECTIONS. Prof. D. Ray Edwards verbally listed the nominees to the Campus Exigency, Grievance Hearing Panel and Long-Range Planning Liaison Committees. Nominations from the floor were requested and none were received. A motion to close nominations was made, seconded, and passed. Prof. Edwards moved that the electees be selected on the basis of plurality. The motion, which was seconded, carried, and the following are the election results:

   a. CAMPUS EXIGENCY COMMITTEE
      Nick Tsoullfanidis, Nuclear Engineering
      Arlan R. DeKock, Computer Science
      Henry Metzner, Engineering Management
b. GRIEVANCE HEARING PANEL
   William A. Andrews, Civil Engineering
   Robert C. Laudon, Geology/Geophysics
   L. Joe Keeton, Physical Education
   Troy Hicks, Mathematics/Statistics
   H. O. McDonald, Chemistry

c. LONG-RANGE PLANNING LIAISON
   Robert V. Wolf, Metallurgical Engineering

C. INTERCAMPUS FACULTY COUNCIL (ICFC).
   i. SEPTEMBER 2, 1988, MEETING. The ICFC meeting, as
   reported by Prof. Jim Pogue, consisted of a
   discussion by President Peter Magrath on the need
   for a tax initiative in Missouri and an
   announcement that the ten ‘Agenda for Action’
   Committee report drafts will be combined in one
   document by mid-October with probable
   presentation to the Board of Curators after the
   first of the new year. Also discussed were salary
   and wages which increased 2.3 to 3 percent per
   campus this year. If/when last year’s 3 percent
   withholding is returned, it is expected that the
   funds will be first earmarked for further
   salary/wage increase. Lastly, President Magrath
   will charge a committee with examining current
   UM staff benefits.

XVIII, 1 OLD BUSINESS.

A. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING ACQUISITION/USE/IN-
FORMATION ON FACULTY TEACHING EVALUATIONS. Prof.
Glen Haddock moved to remove the Ad Hoc Committee
report from the table. A second was received from
Prof. Thomas Herrick and the motion passed. Prof.
Clyde Wade moved to rescind his June 16th amendment of
section II.f. Prof. Glen Haddock seconded this motion
which was approved. Prof. Wade then moved to return
the document to the Ad Hoc Committee. Prof. Jerry
Westphal provided the second. In presenting a reason
for this motion, Prof. Wade stated that “too many
issues were being addressed in a very brief form” and
“rewriting was needed for better clarity and purpose.”
Following an undeterminable voice vote, the Council
passed Prof. Wade’s motion by a show of hands. After
Prof. Frank Blum’s inquiry concerning a possible
review of Vice-Chancellor Parks’ proposed faculty
evaluation document, Prof. Herrick, as a matter of correct form, directed the Chair to ask Vice-Chancellor Park for a report at the next Council meeting. (Attachment V.A).

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Clyde G. Wade
Secretary

Attachments: II
IV.A
V.A

*Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
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Orrin K. Crosser, President
Donald R. Askeland, President-Elect
Clyde G. Wade, Secretary
Jerome A. Westphal, Parliamentarian
MEMO TO: Members of the Academic Council

FROM: UMR Curricula Committee

DATE: September 22, 1988

SUBJECT: EC1 and CC1 Forms of September 22, 1988, Meeting

EC1's reviewed:

EC1 136, Engineering Management 301, Management of Quality Assurance. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisites: Senior or Graduate Standing in Engineering.


EC1 138, Civil Engineering 301, Geotechnical Engineering for Waste Disposal. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: CE 215 with grade of "C" or better.


EC1 146, Computer Science 301, Computer Systems Modeling. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisites: CSc 260 and EE 211.


EC1 152, Engineering Management 301, Interdisciplinary Problems in Manufacturing Automation. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: ME 355 or approved preparatory course in EE, ME, ChE or EMgt. Co-listed with ME, EE and ChE.

EC1 153, Chemical Engineering 301, Interdisciplinary Problems in Manufacturing Automation. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: ME 355 or approved preparatory course in EE, EMgt, ChE, or ME. Co-listed with ME, EE and EMgt.

EC1 154, Mechanical Engineering 301, Interdisciplinary Problems in Manufacturing Automation. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: ME 355 or approved preparatory course in EE, ChE, ME, or EMgt. Co-listed with EMgt, EE and ChE.

EC1 155, Electrical Engineering 301, Interdisciplinary Problems in Manufacturing Automation. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: ME 355 or approved preparatory course in EE, ME, ChE, or EMgt. Co-listed with ME, ChE and EMgt.

EC1 156, Computer Science 301, Introduction to Neural Nets and Applications. Approved 3 hours course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: Math 204 and Math 208; or Math 229. Co-listed with EE & EMgt.


EC1 158, Engineering Management 301, Introduction to Neural Nets and Applications. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: Math 204 and Math 208; or Math 229. Co-listed with CSci; EE.

EC1 159, Electrical Engineering 401, Tomographic Imaging. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisites: EE 341, or EE 345 or EE 347.

EC1 160, Electrical Engineering 301, Introduction to Optical Computing. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisites: Physics 107 and EE 273. (EE 211 and EE 221 are helpful but not necessary.)


EC 163, Mechanical Engineering 401, Heat Transfer in Manufacturing and Materials Processing. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: ME 325 or its equivalent.

EC 164, Civil Engineering 301, Elementary Earthquake Engineering. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: CE 215.

EC 165, Geological Engineering 301, Field Methods in Subsurface Hydrology. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: Senior or graduate standing.

EC 166, Metallurgical Engineering 401(A), Recent Developments in Chemical Metallurgy. Approved 2 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: Met 203.


EC 168, English 301, English Novel III. Approved 3 hours course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: English 1 and a semester of college literature.


Prerequisite English I.


CCI's reviewed:

CCI 2912, Mining Engineering 320, Material Processing by High-Pressure Water Jet. Co-list with ME 306. Approved new course with 3 hours credit. No prerequisite. Description reads: Methods of generating high pressure water jets; standard equipment, existing techniques and basic calculations. Application of water jets to materials cutting and mineral processing. Safety rules. The course will be supported by laboratory demonstrations.

CCI 2991, Basic Engineering 050, Engineering Mechanics - Statics. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Phy 23 or 21, preceded or accompanied by Math/Stat 22. Description reads: Application of the principles of mechanics of engineering problems to equilibrium. Topics include resultant, equilibrium, friction, trusses, center of gravity and moment of inertia.

CCI 2992, Basic Engineering 110, Mechanics of Materials. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: B.E. 50; Math/Stat 22. Description reads: Application of the principles of mechanics to engineering problems of strength and stiffness. Topics include stress, strain, thin cylinders, torsion, beams, columns and combined stresses at a point.

CCI 2993, Basic Engineering 120, Materials Testing. Approved new course. 1 hour credit. Prerequisite: Preceded or accompanied by B.E. 110. Description reads: Designed to assist in the teaching of Mechanics of Materials. Topics include strain measurement, testing machines and properties of materials.


CCI 2997, Electrical Engineering 062, PSPICE. Approved new course. 1 hour credit. Prerequisites: EE 61, co-requisite: EE 63. Description reads: An introduction to the application of analog CAD tools in electrical engineering - particularly PSPice. Other programs to be investigated may include CORNAP, SNAP, SPICE and SCEPTRE. Several short projects involving these programs will be assigned.

CCI 2998, Mechanical Engineering 306, Material Processing by Waterjet. Approved change in catalog description which reads: A course covering the basic high pressure waterjet theory and practice for industrial operation such: cutting, cleaning, excavating, disintegrating and metal machining with lubricoolant jet assistance. Emphasis on high pressure equipment design, generating high pressure, and safety rules. Course is supported by Lab demonstrations. (co-listed with Min Eng 320).

David Oglesby, Chairman
MEMO TO: Members of the Academic Council  
FROM: UMR Curricula Committee  
DATE: September 22, 1988  
SUBJECT: ECl and CCl Forms of September 22, 1988, Meeting

ECl's reviewed:


ECl 138, Civil Engineering 301, Geotechnical Engineering for Waste Disposal. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: CE 215 with grade of "C" or better.


ECI 146, Computer Science 301, Computer Systems Modeling. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisites: CSc 260 and EE 211.


ECI 152, Engineering Management 301, Interdisciplinary Problems in Manufacturing Automation. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: ME 355 or approved preparatory course in EE, ME, ChE or EMgt. Co-listed with ME, EE and ChE.

ECI 153, Chemical Engineering 301, Interdisciplinary Problems in Manufacturing Automation. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: ME 355 or approved preparatory course in EE, EMgt, ChE, or ME. Co-listed with ME, EE and EMgt.

ECI 154, Mechanical Engineering 301, Interdisciplinary Problems in Manufacturing Automation. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: ME 355 or approved preparatory course in EE, ChE, ME, or EMgt. Co-listed with EMgt, EE and ChE.

ECI 155, Electrical Engineering 301, Interdisciplinary Problems in Manufacturing Automation. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: ME 355 or approved preparatory course in EE, ME, ChE, or EMgt. Co-listed with ME, ChE and EMgt.

ECI 156, Computer Science 301, Introduction to Neural Nets and Applications. Approved 3 hours course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: Math 204 and Math 208; or Math 229. Co-listed with EE & EMgt.


ECI 158, Engineering Management 301, Introduction to Neural Nets and Applications. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: Math 204 and Math 208; or Math 229. Co-listed with CSci; EE.

ECI 159, Electrical Engineering 401, Tomographic Imaging. Approved 3 hour course for winter 1989. Prerequisites: EE 341, or EE 345 or EE 347.

ECI 160, Electrical Engineering 301, Introduction to Optical Computing. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisites: Physics 107 and EE 273. (EE 211 and EE 221 are helpful but not necessary.)


ECI 163, Mechanical Engineering 401, Heat Transfer in Manufacturing and Materials Processing. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: ME 325 or its equivalent.

ECI 164, Civil Engineering 301, Elementary Earthquake Engineering. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: CE 215.

ECI 165, Geological Engineering 301, Field Methods in Subsurface Hydrology. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: Senior or graduate standing.

ECI 166, Metallurgical Engineering 401(A), Recent Developments in Chemical Metallurgy. Approved 2 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: Met 203.


ECI 168, English 301, English Novel III. Approved 3 hours course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: English 1 and a semester of college literature.


Prerequisite English I.


CC1's reviewed:

CC1 2912, Mining Engineering 320, Material Processing by High-Pressure Water Jet. Co-list with ME 306. Approved new course with 3 hours credit. No prerequisite. Description reads: Methods of generating high pressure water jets; standard equipment, existing techniques and basic calculations. Application of water jets to materials cutting and mineral processing. Safety rules. The course will be supported by laboratory demonstrations.

CC1 2991, Basic Engineering 050, Engineering Mechanics - Statics. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Phy 23 or 21, preceded or accompanied by Math/Stat 22. Description reads: Application of the principles of mechanics of engineering problems to equilibrium. Topics include resultant, equilibrium, friction, trusses, center of gravity and moment of inertia.

CC1 2992, Basic Engineering 110, Mechanics of Materials. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: B.E. 50; Math/Stat 22. Description reads: Application of the principles of mechanics to engineering problems of strength and stiffness. Topics include stress, strain, thin cylinders, torsion, beams, columns and combined stresses at a point.

CC1 2993, Basic Engineering 120, Materials Testing. Approved new course. 1 hour credit. Prerequisite: Preceded or accompanied by B.E. 110. Description reads: Designed to assist in the teaching of Mechanics of Materials. Topics include strain measurement, testing machines and properties of materials.


CC1 2997, Electrical Engineering 062, PSPICE. Approved new course. 1 hour credit. Prerequisites: EE 61, co-requisite: EE 63. Description reads: An introduction to the application of analog CAD tools in electrical engineering - particularly PSPice. Other programs to be investigated may include CORNAP, SNAP, SPICE and SCEPTRE. Several short projects involving these programs will be assigned.

CC1 2998, Mechanical Engineering 306, Material Processing by Waterjet. Approved change in catalog description which reads: A course covering the basic high pressure waterjet theory and practice for industrial operation such: cutting, cleaning, excavating, disintegrating and metal machining with lubricoolant jet assistance. Emphasis on high pressure equipment design, generating high pressure, and safety rules. Course is supported by Lab demonstrations. (co-listed with Min Eng 320).

David Oglesby, Chairman
RESOLUTION
[FOUR CHAIRS]
(To be submitted to UMR Academic Council)
September 22, 1988

In contemporary society a strong university is essential for the economic, political and social well being of the state. Academic programs and services provided by the University of Missouri affect present and future generations of Missourians and will have a long-term impact on the state's economy and culture.

Our University has been seriously underfunded for at least a decade. To restore the strength and competitive position of the University of Missouri requires an immediate and substantial increase in state financial support and a permanent state commitment to greater investment in the University.

We, the faculty of the Columbia, Kansas City, Rolla, and Saint Louis campuses of the University of Missouri urge the Coordinating Board of Higher Education to recommend, and the Legislature, and Governor to fund fully, the University of Missouri's budget request for 1989-90.

We think it essential that the Board of Curators and the entire administration exert the greatest possible effort for the restoration of the University of Missouri's fiscal base, including appropriate compensation of its faculty and staff.
In contemporary society a strong university is essential for the economic, political and social well being of the state. Academic programs and services provided by the University of Missouri affect present and future generations of Missourians and will have a long-term impact on the state's economy and culture.

Our University has been seriously underfunded for at least a decade. To restore the strength and competitive position of the University of Missouri requires an immediate and substantial increase in state financial support and a permanent state commitment to greater investment in the University.

We, the faculty of the Columbia, Kansas City, Rolla, and Saint Louis campuses of the University of Missouri urge the Coordinating Board of Higher Education to recommend, and the Legislature, and Governor to fund fully, the University of Missouri's budget request for 1989-90.

We think it essential that the Board of Curators and the entire administration exert the greatest possible effort for the restoration of the University of Missouri's fiscal base, including appropriate compensation of its faculty and staff.
Attachment V.A

A COUNTER RESOLUTION TO COMMEND PRESIDENT C. PETER MAGRATH FOR HIS WILLINGNESS TO PROVIDE, BY EXAMPLE, FORTHRIGHT, DIRECT AND PERTINENT LEADERSHIP IN THE AREA OF PERSONAL FINANCIAL REMUNERATION. DURING THIS DECADE, IT HAS Become INCREASINGLY CLEAR THAT SOCIETY HAS DEEMED ALTRUISM DEAD, AND SELF-INTEREST IS PARAMOUNT. THE PRESIDENT HAS PROVIDED A STRIKING EXAMPLE OF SUCCESS IN THIS AREA AND SHOULD HAVE OUR STEADFAST APPRECIATION.
The recent salary increases for University Administrators gives misleading impressions to the legislature and the general public as to the resources available to the University.

This action, coupled with others, suggests to the faculty an insensitivity and lack of concern for staff and faculty efforts to achieve the real purpose of the University - namely, education.

Such action appears to jeopardize future efforts to achieve sufficient funding for the University.

In an attempt to moderate the deleterious effects on staff and faculty morale brought about by recent actions which have come to faculty attention through the media, the Academic Council of the University of Missouri-Rolla respectfully requests an accounting by the University administration of the rationale behind the announced salary increases for University administrators.

- Rules, Procedures & Agenda Committee

Lance Williams, Chr
Pete Hansen
Ray Edwards
Tom Herrick
Vince Roach
Orrin Crosser
Don Askeland
Clyde Wade
Jerry Westphal

22 Sept. 88
Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to speak to the Academic Council on the issue of faculty and staff salaries. Before I address the questions raised by the faculty, let me say that I understand fully the intense feelings and deep concerns that surround the salary issue for all members of the faculty and staff. I have heard clearly the anguish and frustration of those concerned with the well being of the University and its vital role in our state and I understand those feelings. I am in complete agreement with those who argue that the problem of salary competitiveness must be solved and solved quickly. The issue of salary and wage competitiveness is not new to this campus. It is a problem that, for many years, has been like a millstone around the neck of the University, affecting its service to our students and to the state. And efforts such as the Engineering Supplemental Fee have been made to attack this problem.
But the problem recurs as part of an even greater recurring problem—inadequate state support for higher education. With this comes a growing concern for the future well-being of our enterprise. And there is a special concern and a deeper pain and frustration for hardworking senior faculty and staff of the University, who have committed their lives and careers to this institution.

I believe there are three specific issues of direct concern to the faculty today and I am prepared to speak to two of them, namely what happened in the allocation of salaries on this campus for the FY 89 budget and what specific actions are being taken now to address the salary competitiveness problem. The third issue is one to which I cannot speak and it involves the decisions made by the Board of Curators on the salary increases awarded to the General Officers. I have heard the concerns that have been expressed both publicly and privately by faculty, staff, and administrators on this campus on this issue. But I cannot be responsible for a decision I did not make. I am sure you know that I do not recommend, I do not set, I do not negotiate my salary.
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I was evaluated and my salary was set by the Board of Curators in Executive Session after receiving a recommendation from the President. I was simply informed of my own salary some time after the decision was made, and I respect the decision of the Board. I deeply regret that everyone on this campus who received a good evaluation did not receive the salary increase they deserve.

Let me now speak to the other two issues, for they are issues for which I do bear responsibility. First, what happened on this campus in the allocation of salaries for FY 89? As you are aware, the budget-building guidelines required that the aggregate average increase for each employee category be at least 2%. To the extent that additional funds were available, such funds were to be allocated to address market and performance objectives. Thus 2% new funds were distributed to each division of the campus. It is worth noting that a campus reallocation of funds, in the amount of $177,617, was required to achieve this 2% target. Because of vacant positions and additional reallocations within divisions, the resulting aggregate average salary increase for all employees on
Attachment III

This campus was 2.2%. The distribution among the various categories of employees is as shown on the overhead. Note that this is preliminary data. It has been the practice of the campus to finalize these data in October after the September payroll is established.

Present chart
SALARY INCREASE DATA, FY 89
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Preliminary

(Final data available after the September payroll)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Individuals</th>
<th>Average Increase(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive/Admin./Mgrl.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Faculty</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts and Trades</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The above data do not include the Chancellor or those receiving promotions.
2. Fifteen individuals on the UMR campus received increases greater than 9%. This included 2 administrators, 6 faculty, 1 professional, 5 technical, and 1 office. None of these individuals reports to the Chancellor.
3. The average salary increases for Fall, 1988, on the campuses of the University of Missouri have been reported by UM System to be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ranked Faculty</th>
<th>All Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMKC</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMSL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Had UMR's projected enrollment not dropped by 197 students, the associated fee income would have funded an additional 1.0% increase in salary and wages for all faculty and staff.

4. If the 3% withholding of state funds is released by the Governor during this fiscal year, the campus intends to devote most, if not all, of these funds to compensation.

5. The campus had $2,700,905 in new funds available for FY 89, including $517,725 in reallocations and reductions and the 3% withholding. These funds were utilized as follows

   |                                         | $1,816,870 67.3% |
   | Compensation (incl. 3% withholding)    |                |
   | Mandatory increases for services & fee waivers | 410,397 15.2% |
   | Development                             | 150,000 5.6%   |
   | Discretionary Program Improvements      | 150,000 5.6%   |
   | Divisional reallocation                 | 173,638 6.4%   |

$2,700,905

which illustrates the priority given to compensation.
Over the past six years, the cumulative salary increase for ranked faculty has exceeded that for executive/administrative/managerial employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Faculty Inc(%)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec/Admin/Mgrl Inc(%)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I hope these data emphasize three points: compensation received a high priority within the funds available to the campus this year, the differences in the average increases among the categories of employees were small, and over the past six years—particularly the past three years for which I have been responsible—the salary increases for ranked faculty have, in fact, slightly exceeded those for executive/administrative/managerial employees.

Let me now turn to the actions we are taking to solve the problem of competitive compensation. First, we are working to recover the 3% withholding. State tax revenues for the first two months of the fiscal year are running ahead of projections. Thus there is reason to be hopeful. Second, at the direction and with the strong encouragement of the Board of Curators, the General Officers—especially the President—have been spending much time meeting with Missouri's corporate and civic leaders to build a sharper awareness that existing state resources are too low. Third, the University is working with a higher education coalition—Missourians for Higher Education—that is taking practical, and exciting,
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ACTIONS TO COMMUNICATE THE RESPONSE NEEDED. IT IS MY HOPE THAT WE WILL ACT ON THAT NEED IN THE NEAR FUTURE. FOURTH, THE BOARD OF CURATORS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE FY 90 BUDGET REQUEST SEEKING A 12.5% SALARY INCREASE AS A FIRST--BUT CRITICAL--STEP IN REBUILDING THE UNIVERSITY'S FINANCIAL BASE. SALARIES HAVE BEEN AND WILL REMAIN OUR CENTRAL PRIORITY. THE COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, IN RESPONSE TO URGING FROM THE UNIVERSITY, HAS AGREED TO RECONSIDER A CBHE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR A 6 TO 7% SALARY INCREASE FROM THE STATE FOR A HIGHER, PERHAPS 10%, INCREASE. THE CBHE MEMBERS HAVE RECEIVED THE UNIVERSITY'S MESSAGE OF FRUSTRATION AND COMMITMENT TO QUALITY HIGHER EDUCATION. THEY WILL GIVE IT SERIOUS ATTENTION.

WE ARE ALL NOW BEGINNING TO FOCUS ON THE KEY ISSUE WHICH IS ADEQUATE RESOURCES TO PROVIDE QUALITY HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE STATE OF MISSOURI. I BELIEVE IT IS IMPORTANT THAT WE DESCRIBE OUR CONCERNS FOR SALARY AND WAGE IMPROVEMENTS IN TERMS OF THE QUALITY OF THE TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE WE PROVIDE TO THE CITIZENS OF MISSOURI. CITIZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE BENEFITS WE PROVIDE--THE EXTENT TO WHICH WE SERVE THE
PUBLIC INTEREST--MUST COME BEFORE MISSOURIANS WILL INCREASE THEIR FINANCIAL SUPPORT. WE EDUCATE THE LEADERS, WE IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE. WE ARE ESSENTIAL TO THE ECONOMIC FUTURE OF MISSOURI. ONLY WHEN MISSOURIANS UNDERSTAND OUR IMPORTANCE TO THEIR FUTURE AND THE RISKS THEY INVITE BY INACTION WILL THEY PROVIDE THE ADDITIONAL FUNDING WE NEED TO SOLVE THE SALARY COMPETITIVENESS PROBLEM.

I AM HOPEFUL THAT MISSOURIANS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION WILL PERSUADE OUR FELLOW CITIZENS AND MISSOURI'S LEADERS, AS WELL, OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS RESOURCE ISSUE. IN MY TRAVELS AROUND MISSOURI, I FIND REASON TO BE HOPEFUL THAT WE CAN WIN THIS BATTLE FOR ADEQUATE FUNDING. I KNOW OUR CURATORS ARE COMMITTED TO THIS EFFORT.

WE MUST LEAD THE WAY. WE CAN HAVE GREAT INFLUENCE IF WE HARNESSE OUR INFLUENCE EFFECTIVELY. I BELIEVE MISSOURIANS CAN BE CONVINCED TO PROVIDE GREATER SUPPORT IF WE PRESENT OUR NEEDS AND OUR POTENTIAL EFFECTIVELY. IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT WE WORK TOGETHER TO BRING THE RIGHT MESSAGE TO THE PEOPLE OF MISSOURI.
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Whereas the salary offered to the faculty and staff of the University of Missouri is woefully inadequate, and whereas this is the cause of many people leaving, and this is causing a decline in faculty and staff morale and in the quality of education provided for the people of the State of Missouri.

Therefore be it resolved by the Faculty of the University of Missouri-Columbia that the following items be implemented.

1) At least 75 percent of the total new state and other monies added to the existing base in the fiscal year 1989-90 shall be applied to faculty and staff compensation at all campuses.

2) That new reallocation shall not be imposed on any campus or academic unit for the purposes of funding salary increases.

3) No new programs or any item from the Agenda for Action be funded until the mean salaries of faculty and staff equal the university stated goal of the mean of the Big-8/Big10 combined.

4) The President shall report to the faculty within 30 days plans for the implementation of this resolution.
Date: September 28, 1988

Memo To: Orrin Crosser, President, Academic Council

From: Catherine Riordan, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Policies

Re: Proposed Policy Statement

At the September 8th meeting of the Academic Council it was apparent that consideration of a detailed recommendation on teaching evaluation policies was premature. It would seem that two points need to be considered first: (1) Do members of the Academic Council believe that we, as the representatives of the faculty, should attempt to make recommendations to the administration concerning the evaluation of our teaching; and, (2) In general, are the issues addressed in policy proposed by the ad hoc committee close enough to the those that the faculty want to address that the Council should proceed with debate on the specifics of the proposal? If the Council would take a position on these two points, the advisability of proceeding with consideration of the committee's policy will be clear. For this reason, we would like offer the two resolutions that are attached and ask that they be voted upon by the council. If the first one fails, there would be no reason to offer the second or to go any further with the remaining documents. Should the first pass and the second fail, another committee and a new charge could be established.

Should both resolutions pass, we would like to offer the attached revision of the policy statement. The first page of that revision (Attachment A) is a general statement of policy. The second and third pages (Attachment B) include very specific recommendations. We ask that A be considered before before moving on to the specifics contained in B. Approval of A would not necessarily imply approval of B or any part of B.

Since we were an ad hoc committee and officially completed our charge on June 1, it may be inappropriate for us to offer these resolutions and revisions. However, by sending the policy back to the committee, the council seemed to be calling for additional input. We hope that this format will provide a more manageable task for the Council, so that, should a majority of the faculty want to make recommendations concerning policy, their voice can be heard. There is no way to avoid heated debates and significant compromise when grappling with issues like these, but we believe that helping to shape how our teaching is evaluated is worth the effort.

cc: Askeland, Moss, Ridley
Resolution I:

It is essential that the UMR faculty have a significant role in the development of policy concerning the evaluation of teaching. As the elected representatives of the UMR faculty, the Academic Council is the appropriate group to develop, discuss and adopt recommendations to be forwarded to the administration.

Resolution II:

In a general sense, the policy statement put forth by the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Policies (Attachment A) addresses the issues that need to be addressed by the faculty and thus is worthy of discussion, debate and/or amendment on the floor of the Academic Council.
Attachment A

Policy for Evaluation of Faculty Instruction

Effective teaching is central to the mission of the university. The recognition and promotion of effective teaching are essential and therefore evaluations of teaching effectiveness must be based on sound information and procedures.

The results of these evaluations will provide a portion of the information used by the administration in personnel decisions, including promotion and tenure, salaries, and awards. As such, it is crucial that the instruments used to collect the data, the procedures by which the instruments are administered, and the evaluation methods used to analyze and utilize the information be developed with the constant advice, review, and support of the faculty. These evaluations must be broad-based, including input from student evaluations, peer evaluations, and self evaluations, with all tenure track faculty participating in the evaluations on a periodic basis. The evaluative procedure must assure that similar information can be collected, interpreted, and acted upon regardless of the department or school to which the faculty member belongs.

Equally important is that the information gathered by the evaluations will be used by faculty members for instructional development and, therefore, any evaluation program must include resources for the improvement and further development of teaching. The instruments must be flexible enough to permit faculty members to request evaluation questions specific to their personal needs in addition to any standard evaluation questions.

The results of the evaluations will be confidential and available only to the faculty member being evaluated, the chair of that department, the dean of that school, and the vice-chancellor for academic affairs. In addition, the results will be available to committees reviewing promotion and tenure decisions. Faculty members may release their evaluations to other groups if they choose.
Attachment B

Specific Recommendations

1. Faculty will be recognized and rewarded for improving the quality of their teaching or for maintaining a high quality of teaching.

2. When judging teacher effectiveness, any special demands placed on that faculty member by the department will be described and taken into account when interpreting the evaluation. For example, if department chairs instruct faculty to use a particular grading curve, regardless of the quality of the class, this will be noted and taken into account.

3. Student evaluations will include the results of a recognized evaluative instrument that will provide, if possible, national norms by discipline, class size, and student level.

4. Peer evaluations will employ both curriculum review and classroom visitations.

5. Evaluations will assure that personalities do not unduly affect the evaluation process.

6. The faculty member will be made aware of the results of the peer evaluation and have the opportunity to respond to unwarranted criticism or to request additional evaluation.

7. The department chair will be responsible for combining all of the data (student evaluations, peer evaluations, and self evaluations) into a single report, along with a personal evaluation of how the faculty member's teaching effectiveness fits into the department's expectations.

8. All tenure track faculty, regardless of rank, must undergo periodic evaluations.

   Tenured faculty will be evaluated every third year. This evaluation would include student, peer and self evaluations. Student evaluations will be done in each course number taught by that faculty member during that one academic year. Peer evaluation of only one class during that year need be done. The self evaluation should be an overall evaluation of all teaching activities during that year.

   Untenured faculty will be evaluated each year. Student evaluations will be done in each course number each year.

   Non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair.

   Individual faculty members can request additional evaluations. Less extensive evaluations (i.e., just student or self evaluations) are encouraged for all faculty on a continuous basis.

9. The procedures, including copies of the various evaluative tools and procedures, will be made available to the faculty members prior to the beginning of the semester in which the evaluation is to take place.
10. Experience with the evaluative tools and procedures must be gained before they are used for personnel decisions. Use of evaluations for personnel decisions will be implemented only after a representative cross-section of at least one third of the tenured faculty have been evaluated. Teaching evaluations will not be implemented for personnel decisions if the only faculty being evaluated are those up for tenure, promotion or teaching awards.

11. Evaluation instruments and procedures will be reviewed by an appropriate faculty committee before any evaluation begins. Furthermore, an appropriate faculty committee will be apprised of the methods by which the evaluation results are to be analyzed and used by the administration. A mechanism for continued review by a faculty committee will be established.

12. Student scores on standardized or department-level achievement tests will not be used to evaluate individual faculty members.

13. Results of evaluations will not be aggregated for comparisons of departments or colleges.
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Purpose

Effective teaching is central to the mission of the university. The evaluation and recognition of teaching is essential. Because the evaluative information gathered is to be used by faculty members for instructional development and by the administration for personnel decisions, it is crucial that evaluations be based on sound information and procedures. Additionally, evaluation programs must include resources for the improvement and further development of teaching.

Policy

I. The focus of the evaluation program is faculty development.

a. Faculty will be recognized and rewarded for improving the quality of their teaching.

b. A formal means of assisting instructional improvement will be available to all faculty.

c. Faculty will be involved in establishing goals for their own teaching and procedures for conducting evaluations of their progress toward these goals.

II. The evaluations will be broad-based and flexible.

a. In a full evaluation, evaluations from each of the following three categories will be obtained.

1. Student Evaluations - These will include results of a well-recognized student evaluation form, and may include letters from alumni or unsolicited letters.

2. Peer Evaluations - Peer evaluations will employ a formal rating scheme, and raters will be trained in how to use the scheme. Peer evaluations will be based, at least in part, on observation of classroom instruction, review of teaching materials, handouts, and other teaching-related activities and publications.

3. Self Evaluation - Self evaluations may include statements of teaching philosophy, or teaching development activities.
III. Information obtained should be of high quality

a. The information obtained will be of sufficient detail to be of use to faculty members in course development or instructional improvement.

b. Steps will be taken to maximize objectivity during the evaluations. Written descriptions of these steps will be provided along with the results of the evaluation.

c. For evaluation tools adopted by the campus as a whole, studies of their reliability and validity begin immediately. Results of these studies as well as information on the overall variability of results, will be made available to faculty and included when data from the tools are included in personnel files. When data are not available, steps taken to assure objectivity of the data will be stated and made similarly available.

d. At least one of the evaluation tools will, when possible, contain national norms by discipline, class size and level.
IV. Utilization of Evaluative Information in Evaluation of Faculty

a. Evaluations are confidential and will be available only to the faculty member being evaluated, the chair of that department, the dean of that school, and the vice-chancellor for academic affairs. Results of all evaluations will be kept in a confidential personnel file maintained in the academic department.

b. For promotion and tenure decisions, results of all evaluations will be available to committees reviewing the dossier. Omissions of any evaluations will be explained in the chair’s narrative.

c. Individual faculty members may release their evaluations to groups.

d. Information will not be aggregated for comparison across departments or colleges since the intent of evaluation is faculty development, not departmental competition.

V. The evaluation program will be continuously reviewed formally by faculty and administration.

a. Faculty who are recognized as experts or particularly concerned about university education should conduct the reviews.

b. The reviews should occur at the college and department level when possible.
1988-89 MEETING DATES

Rules, Procedure and Agenda:

- Tuesday, August 23, 1988
- Thursday, September 29, 1988
- Tuesday, November 15, 1988
- Thursday, January 19, 1989
- Tuesday, March 7, 1989
- Thursday, April 6, 1989
- Thursday, June 1, 1989

Academic Council:

- Thursday, September 8, 1988
- Thursday, October 13, 1988
- Thursday, December 8, 1988
- Thursday, February 2, 1989
- Thursday, March 23, 1989
- Thursday, April 20, 1989
- Thursday, June 15, 1989

General Faculty:

- Tuesday, September 6, 1988
- Tuesday, November 29, 1988
- Tuesday, April 25, 1989

an equal opportunity institution
### BALLOT FOR ELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

**Grievance Hearing Panel**  
(elect five, but only one from each department)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Management</th>
<th>Physical Education</th>
<th>Mining Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babcock, Daniel L.</td>
<td>Keeton, L. Joe</td>
<td>Erten, Hayri M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>Petroleum Engineering</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicks, Troy L.</td>
<td>Numbere, Daopu T.</td>
<td>McDonald, H. O.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Civil Engineering**  
Geology & Geophysics          
Nuclear Engineering

| Best, John L.                | Laudon, Robert           | Kumar, Arvid        |
| Andrews, William A.          | Grant, Sheldon K.        | Mueller, Gary E.    |

**Basic Engineering**  
Computer Science

| Cunningham, Frank M.         | Baird, Thomas B.         |                     |
| Oglesby, David B.            | Prater, John B.          |                     |

**Campus Exigency Committee**  
(elect three, one from each school/college)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Mines &amp; Metallurgy</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metzner, Henry E.</td>
<td>Hagni, Richard D.</td>
<td>DeKock, Arlan R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westphal, Jerome A.</td>
<td>Tsoulfanidis, Nicholas</td>
<td>Finley, Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Peter G.</td>
<td>Rockaway, John D.</td>
<td>Hale, Edward B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronin, Donald L.</td>
<td>Anderson, Harlan</td>
<td>Joiner, James W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harvey, A. Herbert</td>
<td>Cain, Marvin R.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Long Range Planning Liaison**  
(elect one)

| Wolf, Robert V.              |                         |                     |

---
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The University will need $147 million a year more in operating support five years from now, President C. Peter Magrath told curators, because the University cannot sustain itself for the benefit of Missouri at its current funding level. Examination of the University's financial condition and associated educational quality makes it time for "candor and straight talk," Magrath said. Curators previewed a $51.8 million request for 1989-90 state operating funds, the first step in a five-year plan to repair the University's base support. The request is for 19.6 percent more than the appropriation for 1988-89 and includes funds for 12.5 percent increases in compensation.

Curators approved a $399.5 million operating budget for the fiscal year that begins July 1. The budget includes $5.3 million for salary and wage adjustments, which will provide pay adjustments averaging at least 2 percent. If state revenues permit the governor to release the $7.9 million withheld for 1988-89, the highest priority for those funds will be salaries. Pay hikes for academic, extension, administrative/professional, office/technical service and support staff categories will be based on performance and/or market circumstances. The budget also includes $9.2 million for continuing operating costs and $9.4 million for improvements. Retirees receiving benefits as of Sept. 1, 1986, will receive a 2.3 percent increase in retirement benefits.

An AIDS policy adopted by the board stresses the need for the University to ensure non-discrimination and confidentiality for students and employees with AIDS while protecting the health and safety of students, employees and visitors. The statement recommends University supervisors be sensitive to employee medical problems and ensure that AIDS victims are treated in the same manner as other employees.

The University's research parks have marked substantial progress in their development, the board heard. The 51-acre University Park adjacent to UMKC has been leased to Continental Development Corp., which will develop and secure financing for the project. The 246-acre Missouri Research Park near St. Louis is nearing completion of the first phase of its infrastructure development.

The Anheuser-Busch Charitable Trust has pledged $1.5 million for a teaching hospital at the UMC College of Veterinary Medicine if $500,000 of the amount is matched by other private gift sources. The building would be named "Clydesdale Hall."

The education library at UMSL will be named for Ward E. Barnes in recognition of his six decades of service to education in Missouri. Barnes, 83, was instrumental in helping found the University's St. Louis campus, the first four-year public university in St. Louis.

Awards and honors: Three faculty members received $4,000 Burlington Northern Faculty Achievement Awards for outstanding teaching in 1987: Donald R. Askeland, UMR professor of metallurgical engineering; Lori S. Franz, UMC associate professor of business; and Joel N. Glassman, UMSL associate professor of political science.
SUMMARY of the reports, actions, referrals and announcements made at the special meeting of the Academic Council held on September 22, 1988.

1. Call to order

2. President’s address - O. Crosser  
(Attachment II)

3. Chancellor’s address - M. Jischke  
(Attachment III)

4. Rules, Procedure and Agenda Committee resolution - C. Wade  
(Attachment IV)

5. Resolutions from the floor
   A. Commendation to President Peter Magrath - C. Adams  
      (Attachment V.A)
   B. Amended UMC resolution - D. Cronin

6. Four-Chairs Committee resolution - O. Crosser  
(Attachment VI)

Attachments: II  
III  
IV  
V.A  
VI
The September 22, 1988, special meeting of the Academic Council was called to order at 1:36 p.m. by Prof. Orrin Crosser, Academic Council President. The following substitutions were noted: Prof. Larry Gragg for Prof. Lance Williams and Prof. Pete Hansen for Prof. David Oglesby. The sequence of the meeting was set by President Crosser.

PRESIDENT’S ADDRESS. President Orrin Crosser began this meeting with statements of fact. The average increase for faculty and staff salary/wages was 3 percent UM system wide; while top administrators received 8.7 percent and better. The UMC Faculty Council met and resolved "that the following items be implemented:

1. At least 75 percent of the total new state and other monies added to the existing base in the fiscal year 1989-90 shall be applied to faculty and staff compensation at all campuses.
2. That new reallocation shall not be imposed on any campus or academic unit for the purposes of funding salary increases.
3. No new programs or any item from the Agenda for Action be funded until the mean salaries of faculty and staff equal the university stated goal of the mean of the Big8/Big10 combined.
4. The President shall report to the faculty within 30 days plans for the implementation of this resolution."

President Peter Magrath meets with the UMC faculty body on September 27, 1988.

The Four-Faculty Chairs met and concluded that a vote of "no confidence" would do more harm than good reaching consensus in a forthcoming resolution.

Finally, President Magrath, at the Board of Curator’s meeting on Friday, September 16, 1988, himself spoke in support of staff and faculty salaries/wages.

CHANCELLOR’S ADDRESS. Chancellor Martin Jischke, indicating agreement with those arguing for solutions to the lack of salary competitiveness and the underfunding
of higher education by the State of Missouri, basically addressed the topics of budget constraints regarding the FY89 salary/wage allocations and of actions currently being taken toward adequate solutions to the needs of higher education.

A. BUDGET CONSTRAINTS. Budget building guidelines for FY89 called for an aggregate salary/wage increase in each employee category of at least 2 percent. To achieve this, $177,617 in campus reallocation was required. Due to vacant positions and further departmental reallocation, a 2.2 percent increase for UMR was achieved (average increase for Faculty was 2.3 percent; overall was 2.2 percent) with fifteen individuals, excluding Chancellor Jischke, actually receiving increases of more than 9 percent. Of the new monies (2,700,905) received by UMR, 67.3 percent was used for employee compensation.

B. ACTIONS BEING TAKEN. Currently, the UM administration is working to recover last year's 3 percent withholding. The Board of Curators and President Magrath have been meeting with Civic and Corporate leaders as well as the Coalition, Missourians for Higher Education, to focus attention on the need for increased financial support. The Board of Curators have approved the FY90 request seeking a 12.5 percent salary increase and CBHE has agreed to reconsider recommending a 6 to 7 percent salary increase.

SPC MEET RULES, PROCEDURE AND AGENDA RESOLUTION. Prof. Clyde Wade introduced and moved for the adoption of the following:

"The recent salary increases for University Administrators gives misleading impressions to the legislature and the general public as to the resources available to the University.

This action, coupled with others, suggests to the faculty an insensitivity and lack of concern for staff and faculty efforts to achieve the real purpose of the University - namely, education.

Such action appears to jeopardize future efforts to achieve sufficient funding for the University."
In an attempt to moderate the deleterious effects on staff and faculty morale brought about by recent actions which have come to faculty attention through the media, the Academic Council of the University of Missouri-Rolla respectfully requests an accounting by the University administration of the rationale behind the announced salary increases for University administrators."

The motion was seconded after which Prof. D. Ray Edwards pointed out the need for a response deadline amending the motion by asking that President Magrath respond by October 13, 1988. The amendment was seconded by Prof. Vincent Roach and passed without opposition. The amended resolution was then adopted without opposition. (Attachment IV)

SPC MEET RESOLUTIONS FROM THE FLOOR.

A. COMMENDATION TO PRESIDENT C. PETER MAGRATH. Prof. Curtis Adams presented his resolution "to commend President C. Peter Magrath for his willingness to provide, by example, forthright, direct and pertinent leadership in the area of personal financial remuneration. During this decade, it has become increasingly clear that society has deemed altruism dead, and self-interest is paramount. The President has provided a striking example of success in this area and should have our steadfast appreciation."

For the purposes of discussion, Prof. Clyde Wade moved to adopt this resolution. Prof. D. Ray Edwards seconded the motion. After being thanked for his "wit and humor," the author withdrew his resolution. (Attachment V.A)

B. AMENDED UMC RESOLUTION. Prof. Donald Cronin moved to approve the UMC Faculty Council's resolution above replacing UMR for UMC and accordingly adjusting the recorded document date. The motion was seconded, but was defeated after discussion focusing on the reality of reallocation as a fact of managerial life, on the dependence by some campus(es) on new program funding, and on the unrealistic nature of the 75 percent figure. Prof. Frank Blum summarized that the "bigger issue here is underfunding" and whether or not "the President has been successful in getting the resources that the University needs to fulfill its mission."
SPC MEET FOUR-CHAIRS COMMITTEE RESOLUTION. President Orrin Crosser, after handing the 'gavel' to President-Elect Don Askeland, presented the document constructed by UM Faculty Chairs Burkhardt, Mirkin, Kimber and Crosser:

"In contemporary society a strong University is essential for the economic, political and social well being of the state. Academic programs and services provided by the University of Missouri affect present and future generations of Missourians and will have a long-term impact on the state's economy and culture.

Our University has been seriously underfunded for at least a decade. To restore the strength and competitive position of the University of Missouri requires an immediate and substantial increase in state financial support and a permanent state commitment to greater investment in the University.

We, the faculty of the Columbia, Kansas City, Rolla, and Saint Louis campuses of the University of Missouri urge the Coordinating Board of Higher Education to recommend, and the Legislature, and Governor to fund fully, the University of Missouri’s budget request for 1989-90.

We think it essential that the Board of Curators and the entire administration exert the greatest possible effort for the restoration of the University of Missouri's fiscal base, including appropriate compensation of its faculty and staff."

Prof. Orrin Crosser moved for passage of this document and the subsequent forwarding to the General Faculty for its consideration. Prof. Clyde Wade seconded the motion, which, after the question was called, carried.

Prof. Curtis Adams moved that this resolution be forwarded to the administration immediately. Prof. Richard Miller seconded the motion. Prof. Thomas Herrick substituted the motion directing the Chair to mail a ballot to the General Faculty. Prof. Vincent Roach seconded this motion which passed without opposition.
Prof. Richard Miller requested that the minutes of this meeting be transmitted with a cover letter to President C. Peter Magrath.

(Attachment VI)

The meeting adjourned at 2:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Clyde G. Wade
Secretary

Attachments: II
            III
            IV
            V.A
            VI

*Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.*
September 15, 1988

SPECIAL MEETING NOTICE

At the request of the Academic Council President, Orrin K. Crosser, a Special Meeting is called for Thursday, September 22, 1988, 1:30p.m. in G-5 Humanities/Social Sciences.

The purpose is to discuss the implications on UM-Rolla of recently announced UM Administrator salaries (1988-89); and to consider taking appropriate action.

*Missourian article included with copies sent Academic Council representatives and Department chairs.

(Academic Council meetings are open to General Faculty, and staff, attendance. Any such participants have voice but not vote.)

Rules, Procedures & Agenda Committee
Lance Williams, chr
Special Meeting of Academic Council
Thursday, September 22, 1988

Academic Council President Orrin Crosser called the meeting to order at
1:30 p.m. and announced the purpose of the meeting: to address the issue of
discrepancies between administrative and faculty salaries.

Calling upon faculty and staff "to harness our influence effectively" so
as to win greater financial support for university needs, Chancellor Jischke
raised three issues and addressed two of them: (1) "what happened in the
allocation of salaries" at UMR "for the FY 89 budget"; (2) "what specific
actions are being taken now to address the salary competitiveness problem." The
third issue, his own salary, he did not address because he "cannot be
responsible for a decision" that he "did not make." Chancellor Jischke then
offered to respond to questions. No questions were asked.

Three resolutions were presented. (1) A resolution from the Rules,
Procedures & Agenda Committee "respectfully requests an accounting by the
University administration of the rationale behind the announced salary
increases for University administrators." This resolution passed without
dissent. President Crosser announced that President McGrath will be invited
to address this issue at the October meeting of the Council.

President-elect Don Askeland then assumed the responsibilities of
cconducting the meeting so that President Crosser could present the second
resolution. This resolution was drafted and sponsored by the principal
elective officers of the four University senates or councils. It urges "the
Coordinating Board of Higher Education to recommend, and the Legislature and
[the] Governor to fund fully the University of Missouri's budget request for
1989-90." This resolution also passed without dissent.

(3) A witty "Counter Resolution" in the form of a commendation of
President McGrath was proposed and then withdrawn by the author after approval
was expressed for his having interjected a welcome instance of humor into the
proceedings.
Resolution I:

It is essential that the UMR faculty have a significant role in the development of policy concerning the evaluation of teaching. As the elected representatives of the UMR faculty, the Academic Council is the appropriate group to develop, discuss and adopt recommendations to be forwarded to the administration.

Resolution II:

In a general sense, the policy statement put forth by the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Policies (Attachment A) addresses the issues that need to be addressed by the faculty and thus is worthy of discussion, debate and/or amendment on the floor of the Academic Council.
3 Oct. 1988

Orrin K. Crosser
Chem. Engineering
G-29 Schrenk
UMR

Dear Orrin,

I like the resolution concerning the underfunding of faculty at the University.

I wonder about the use of the word "culture," however. (See line 5 of the resolution.)

Culture means many things to many people. Would not a more precise term be suitable, such as "intellectual life"?

One of our tasks at the University is to make very precise what it is we do. "Culture" suggests that we are in the business of taste-making, of producing discriminating arbiters of art, music, language, and so forth. That is not an activity likely to win much popular support. Moreover, it is not at all representative of what we do at the university, least of all in the liberal arts.

So, I recommend replacing "culture" with a more accurate term having to do with the discipline of thought and the spirit of inquiry.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

Douglas Wixon
Assoc. Prof.
October 6, 1988

Professor Douglas Wixson
Department of English
224 H-SS
UMR

Dear Doug:

You are quite right - "intellectual life" would be the correct replacement for "culture". I must regret that the resolution has already been acted upon as is. I have placed your letter with the resolution in the file of minutes of the Academic Council so that any referral to the item will have the benefit of your comment.

All the best,

Orrin K. Crosser
Professor

OKC/cdc
MEMORANDUM TO: Faculty
FROM: O. K. Crosser, President
Academic Council

Gentlemen and Ladies: The following resolution drafted by the FOUR CHAIRS presiding officers of the Faculty Councils of the UMR, UMC, UMSL and UMKC campuses is presented to you for approval or rejection by this mail ballot.

If you approve this resolution, it will be forwarded through the Office of the Chancellor to the Office of the President of the University of Missouri System, and to the Board of Curators, as an UMR Faculty action. Please consider and place your vote, and return it promptly to the Academic Council Office. Simply fold, tape and place this pre-addressed ballot in campus mail by October 5, 1988.

"In contemporary society, a strong university is essential for the economic, political and social well being of the state. Academic programs and services provided by the University of Missouri affect present and future generations of Missourians and will have a long-term impact on the state’s economy and culture.

Our University has been seriously underfunded for at least a decade. To restore the strength and competitive position of the University of Missouri requires an immediate and substantial increase in state financial support and a permanent state commitment to greater investment in the University.

We, the faculty of the Columbia, Kansas City, Rolla and Saint Louis campuses of the University of Missouri urge the Coordinating Board of Higher Education to recommend, and the Legislature, and Governor to fund fully, the University of Missouri’s budget request for 1989-90.

We think it essential that the Board of Curators and the entire administration exert the greatest possible effort for the restoration of the University of Missouri’s fiscal base, including appropriate compensation of its faculty and staff."

_______ I approve this resolution
_______ I reject this resolution

OKC/cmb
M.U. officials' raises soar past faculty's

By TERRY SCHMEEDING and MICHELE SAYRE
Missourian staff writers

The University of Missouri Board of Curators on Monday awarded President C. Peter Magrath a 10.26 percent salary increase this year. All four of the system's chancellors won increases of at least 8.7 percent.

Magrath's salary is set by the curators after they evaluate his performance for the year. Salaries for chancellors and vice presidents who report to Magrath are based upon his recommendations to the board.

Faculty salaries, which the president's spokesman said rose an average of 2.5 percent on the Columbia campus, will be the subject of a meeting at 3:40 p.m. today at Memorial Union.

Several faculty members said they were startled to learn of Magrath's salary increase.

Patricia Crown, professor of art history and archaeology, said, "I am surprised to learn that, and I think that question may be raised at the faculty meeting." Gordon Kimber, chairman of Faculty Council, learned of Magrath's increase from a press release. "I am appalled at the lack of sensitivity at this time," he said.

"It is very hard to accept that the general officers can be awarded salary increments three and four times that offered to the faculty and staff," Kimber said. "I must say that their credibility has been severely eroded.

The faculty will consider a proposal asking that at least 75 percent of next year's state funds be used for faculty and staff compensation.

"We hope most people will recognize that he's rated as one of the top five public-institution presidents," said Jeanne Epple, president of the University's Board of Curators. "It's hard to find an administrator with the kind of experience, reputation and integrity that he has, and is even more difficult to keep."

Curator Edwin Turner of the executive committee, said the board is concerned with low faculty salaries. "Of course, there is concern for the faculty, but there's more of a concern to keep that management team."

Administrators' raises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.U. system</th>
<th>1989 salary</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Peter Magrath</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McGill</td>
<td>$93,900</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Barton</td>
<td>$91,752</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Horton</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Musser</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ross</td>
<td>$58,700</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Snider</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Turner</td>
<td>$51,900</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskel Monroe</td>
<td>$104,200</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite Barnott</td>
<td>$98,000</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Jischo</td>
<td>$98,700</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Russell</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By TERRY SCHMEEDING and MICHELE SAYRE
Missourian staff writers
Mizzou's Faculty Bitter Over Low Salary Hikes

By Ann Scales Cobbs
Of the Post-Dispatch Staff

COLUMBIA, Mo. — The faculty and staff at the University of Missouri in Columbia overwhelmingly endorsed Tuesday a resolution that calls for 75 percent of all new money to the university next year to go to faculty and staff salaries.

The resolution now goes before University of Missouri President C. Peter McGrath. He is scheduled to have a general meeting with the faculty in two weeks.

More than 700 university faculty members and staff employees packed Jesse Hall Auditorium for their meeting, which had to be moved there from Memorial Union to accommodate a larger-than-expected crowd. Many of them were upset by the 2.5 to 3 percent wage increases for faculty and staff approved by the university system's board of curators in June. The raises took effect Sept. 1.

Compounding the problem was a disclosure by the administration this week that McGrath, the four chancellors of the University of Missouri campuses, and Jim McGill, the system's vice president, were given salary increases exceeding 8 percent.

They were among some 360 employees at the four campuses to get pay increases of more than 8 percent as part of the university's merit-pay system. The system rewards employees on the basis of their performances.

Mizzou Chancellor Haskell Monroe, who was chairman of the meeting, said he supported the resolution adopted by the faculty. He laid the blame for the low salary increases on "the low level of funding for higher education by the state of Missouri."

In a response that won him thunderous applause, John J. Pascucci, a professor of finance in the School of Business, accused Monroe of "speaking out both sides of your mouth at the same time."

Pascucci said: "Of greater concern to me is you have taken salary increases 7 and 6 times the size of faculty salaries and then you come here and tell us how times are hard."

Monroe got an 8.71 percent increase in pay this year, bringing his salary to $104,200. The average salary for a full professor at Mizzou last year was $44,606, while the average at universities in the Big Eight and Big Ten conferences was $51,219, according to information from university officials.
By JENNY THELEN
of the Tribune's staff

MU brass given big raises

Top MU administrators received raises of
more than 8 percent this year, compared to a
systemwide average raise of less than 3 per­
cent.

Psychology professor John Mueller said
yesterday's disclosure of administrators' sal­
aries shows the crescendoing furor over fac­
ty salaries amounts to more than the com­
plaints of "this greedy bunch on the faculty,"" in
administrators, he said, "are taking care of
themselves a lot better than they're taking
care of us."

UMC faculty were to meet at 3:40 this af­
fternoon to discuss salaries, and members of
the faculty council executive committee hope
they can channel faculty wrath away from a
vote of no-confidence in president Peter Ma­
grath.

The Board of Curators recommended Ma­
grath's raise and approved the president's
commendation of general officers' raises in
July. Board president Jeanne Epple said ad­
inistrators' raises were unrelated to the
university's failure to meet its goal — faculty
salaries should equal the average of the Big
Eight by this year and the average of the Big
Six and Big Ten combined by 1990. MU
salaries are about 15 percent below the Big
Eight-Big Ten combined average.

"We will not gain anything by not recog­
izing that we have a strong and an effective
team," Epple said of administrators.

Curator Jim Sterling also said administr­
ators' above-average raises were justified by
the university's desire to retain Magrath's
administration. "We looked at it as some­
thing we needed to do to keep the top man­
agement team together.

"We didn't just pick the top administrators
and leave everybody else trailing," he added.
Systemwide, 359 people received raises of
more than 8 percent. Sterling said the board
and administrators "are the people who are
working the hardest" to raise faculty sala­
ries.

Mueller questioned administrators' effec­
tiveness, particularly Magrath's. "If he's do­
ing a good job, he ought to be able to con­
vince the legislature that the university needs
that money more than the state needs a
domed football stadium in St. Louis."

The legislature this year approved a $4
million package in a futile attempt to keep
the St. Louis Cardinals football team in St.
Louis.

Faculty council executive committee mem­
ber Andrew Twaddle, a sociology professor,
said last night the council "would not like to
see a no-confidence proposal tomorrow." He
said a no-confidence vote "has got to divide
the president from the board. And I don't
think we've laid the groundwork for that."

He said the council wished to convey "a
need to change the system, not just the per­
sonnel." Council chairman Gordon Kimber
said the resolution, which states the univer­
sity should allocate a large portion of next
year's new funds to faculty salaries, demon­
strates faculty desire for a "change in
course."

Magrath, who received a raise of 10.26
percent this year, has asked for a meeting in
about two weeks with faculty to discuss sal­
ary raises.

He already met with the faculty council
MU administrators' wages

Following are new salary fig­
ures and percentage of increase
for top University of Missouri ad­
inistrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Magrath</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McGill</td>
<td>$99,800</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Barton</td>
<td>$91,782</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Horton</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Mussman</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ross</td>
<td>$88,700</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Snider</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Turner</td>
<td>$61,300</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskell Monroe</td>
<td>$104,200</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Barnett</td>
<td>$98,800</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Jischke</td>
<td>$98,700</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Russell</td>
<td>$100,900</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of Missouri
M.U. officials' raises soar past faculty's

By TERRY SCHMEDDING and MICHELE SAYRE
Missourian staff writers

The University of Missouri Board of Curators on Monday awarded President C. Peter Magrath a 10.26 percent salary increase this year. All four of the system's chancellors won increases of at least 8.7 percent.

Magrath's salary is set by the curators after they evaluate his performance for the year. Salaries for chancellors and vice presidents who report to Magrath are based upon his recommendations to the board.

Faculty salaries, which the president's spokesmen said rose an average of 2.5 percent on the Columbia campus, are the subject of a meeting at 3:40 p.m. today at Memorial Union.

Several faculty members said they were startled to learn of Magrath's salary increase.

Patricia Crown, professor of art history and archaeology, said, "I am surprised to learn that, and I think that question may be raised at the faculty meeting." Gordon Kimber, chairman of Faculty Council, learned of Magrath's increase from a press release. "I am appalled at the lack of sensitivity at this time," he said.

"It is very hard to accept that the general officers can be awarded salary increments three and four times that offered to the faculty and staff," Kimber said. "I must say that their credibility has been severely eroded."

The faculty will consider a proposal asking that at least a percent of next year's state funds be used for faculty and staff compensation. "We hope most people will recognize that he's rated as one of the top five public-institution presidents," said Jeannine Epple, president of the University's Board of Curators. "It's hard to find an administrator with the kind of experience, reputation and integrity that he has, and is even more difficult to keep."

Curator Edwin Turner of the executive committee said the board is concerned with low faculty salaries. "Of course, there's concern for the faculty, but there's more of a concern to keep that management team."

Turner of Chillicothe, Mo., said, "Magrath's team is second to none in the nation, and as a board we're going to make sure they are comfortable."

Guy Horton, one of the president's office, said the salary figures were set in relation to the University's merit policy. The increases also came because some administrators were invited by other institutions to be job candidates.

Bates said he didn't know whether Magrath had been offered a position elsewhere, but "he's one of the top four or five administrators in the United States, and when there's an opening, there are always rumors."

Magrath was in Kansas City on Monday and could not be reached for comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrators' raises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.U. system</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Peter Magrath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McGill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Horton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Mussman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Snider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskell Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Barnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Jischue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Russell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY of the special meeting of the Academic Council held on October 7, 1988. The meeting was called to order at 3:45 p.m.

Crosser—My name is Orrin Crosser. I am the President of the UMR Academic Council. I call this special meeting of October 7, 1988, to order. My plan for the meeting is as follows. I will speak very briefly and introduce President Magrath, who will make his presentation. Immediately following his presentation, I will entertain questions specifically toward his presentation. Following that interval, we will entertain other questions from the floor.

We at UMR see our goal as higher quality higher education for Missouri youth. We see an erosion of resources for maintenance and repair of facilities, development and replacement of library holdings, and, yes, even staff and faculty salaries.

As faculty, we contribute to those resources, personally, and also fiscally in the form of gifts, grants, and contract monies. We are here today because we may wish to disagree about the allocations of those financial resources within the University of Missouri system.

President Magrath, we thank you for travelling to Rolla to be with us today. As we stated in our resolution of September 22, we are particularly interested in the basis for the discrepancy between the raises for staff and faculty, and those for the top administrators of the University of Missouri System. President Magrath, the floor is yours.

Magrath—Mr. President, thank you. There is no place I'd rather be than at the University of Missouri-Rolla right now. I think I'll have the pleasure of being back tomorrow for a ground-breaking dedication for one of our important facilities. I'm going to try to follow the agenda that Prof. Crosser laid out so there's ample time for comments and questions and answers and dialogue. Unlike the Presidential and Vice-Presidential debates, there isn't a beeper or light or whatever to go off. But I'll try to watch the time. I want to start with what is the most important comment and that is ...

Personally (and not only because of the responsibilities that I hold as President of the University of Missouri System) to acknowledge and recognize the work and the contributions of the faculty at UMR and, of course, the staff as well. I am aware—in some cases personally and directly, and in many cases more indirectly from the record, from the representations and comments from your Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor, and those faculty with whom I do have the privilege of interacting, as to how dedicated and hard working the faculty and the staff are at this campus, as is true, of course, at the other three campuses; and I am also aware of the frustrations that you face in being as effective as you want to be
for the sake of the state and the work that you do because of the limitations that we have with regards to resources, including obviously the question of compensation which, I think we all would agree, is critical instrumentally—critical in terms of getting the job done, critical in terms of retaining [and] attracting the best possible men and women to continue to serve here. That’s why we’re concerned about compensation— not only in human terms—that’s very important. There are many people here and some who aren’t here who have dedicated their lives to this institution, and I understand that. I respect that [dedication]. And I salute them.

I want to now deal first with the resolution itself which spoke to salary increases for University administrators. I will deal first with my compensation. I don’t set my compensation. That is set by the Board of Curators, as I have had occasion to note recently. I cannot presume to give the basis for that judgment except the Curators have said that it was based on their evaluation of performance, merit, [and] market competitive considerations. To clear the air because the only increase that I, and I think, we are interested in is an increase in the base budget and in the compensation levels and in the support for computing and libraries. I am going to be donating my increase to the library endowment funds. There are many worthy causes, and my contribution obviously doesn’t address the underlying need of those programs; but I am donating my increase to the endowment funds for library purchases at the four campuses of the University.

With regard to administrators in general, a couple of quick remarks. Administrators in general, whether within the campus here or within the other campuses or within the system administration, are receiving average increases under the guidelines that we unfortunately had to have—unfortunate because the amount available for salary distribution was very limited and that will turn out to have been about 2 1/2 to 3 percent on the average for administrators by the time it’s all completed and all the forms are processed. The guidelines for administrators that were issued centrally and approved by the Board of Curators were no different than the guidelines for faculty.

Now, more specifically with regard to the general officers—if you will, the top administrators, the top leaders and people who have certain managerial responsibilities—I have accountable to me directly and personally but also accountable to the Board of Curators who participate in the selection and the appointment. There are seven general officers. I am one of them, and I’ve commented on my situation.

There are then six other individuals, four Chancellors and two Vice-Presidents. For five of those six individuals I recommended and the Board analyzed and thoughtfully, from their perspective, discussed recommendations for salary increases that were above the average for most people and most administrators. It is a very unique, not better, not special sample of individuals that we’re
talking about. We’re talking about Chancellors of the four campuses and one of the Vice-Presidents. Factors that went into those decisions have to do with market, merit, performance, and retention at the University of Missouri. Very specifically here with Chancellor Jischke. But the same comment would apply to the other Chancellors and one of the Vice-Presidents. Individuals recruited, not easily [and] brought to the University to provide strength and leadership to work with the faculty and the staff. Individuals who in my judgement, and that of the Board, have done exceptional work in trying to generate resources, support for resources, private support, which is on the upswing here and a desire not to lose [the individuals] and without my getting specific (and, you understand, professionally I can’t). There are other institutions, other universities, and it was my judgment and the Board’s judgment that it was critical to try to retain and recognize these individuals, recognizing that hardly meets the need in terms of total array of faculty and staff resources at the University.

I have, by the way, a number of individuals, not many, who report to me and who are, if you will, administrators; and their average increases will all turn out to have been in that 2 1/2 to 3 percent range. I would point out—although I don’t think it solves the frustration and the unhappiness that many understandably have—that approximately (and it’s not all clear yet) about 350-400 individuals, faculty and staff, throughout the university system [who] will have received increases above the extraordinarily low average that we had to do [with] this year. I say unfortunate because I wish instead of its having been 350-400, it could have been 3-4,000, or approximately 12-13,000, people that work at the University. I would point out that one of the things that I have looked for and the Board has looked for is efficiency in managing the administrative resources of the University.

The Chancellors and their top associates, working with faculty and staff, have done a very good job in shifting administrative costs as much as possible to primary educational missions. We’ve done a good deal of that. Resources which are dreadfully scarce are being husbands and used in ways that I think are as effective as possible under the circumstances. The trend lines in terms of administrative support costs, and that is just administration that involves programs for counseling of students, admissions, records, all of those types of activities, as well as the directly administrative functions [of] Deans, Vice-Chancellors, what have you. The trend lines in relative and in absolute terms on those operations both University wide and for the Campuses is clearly down. I won’t give a lot of dreary statistics; but, for instance, the CBHE data show that the University of Missouri four campuses and the central operation has the lowest administrative costs in the State of Missouri of the public institutions, and I’m personally dedicated, as I suspect everybody would want us to be dedicated, to continuing that trend line as much as possible.
I'd like to comment, if I may, on what lies ahead and where we stand. What lies ahead are grounds not for Pollyannish optimism but grounds for believing that we have some things in place that are good—that many good things are happening but they could be far better with adequate resources. We have reasons for optimism in that first the Board of Curators has committed itself unequivocally, and after a lot of dialogue and discussion, to a set of policies and understandings that are intended to repair the base budget of the University of Missouri. I am not personally interested (not because I think it's fruitful for a great deal of finger-pointing) to blame one group or another group or to blame legislators or to blame the state or anything of that type. I think that's totally unproductive. I think most Missourians, I'm sure virtually all Missourians, want the best for the University of Missouri and for higher education.

A few considerations: for whatever reasons the amount of investment that the State of Missouri has been able to make in higher education in the last ten years has been declining. We can get into this later if there's interest. But whereas about 10 percent of the state budget was going to higher education 10 years ago, it's around 14 percent. If we had the same amount of compensation—not compensation but resources—flowing into the University today that was the case 10 years ago—that is, the same relative percentage—we would have approximately $90 million more in the base budget of the University of Missouri.

One of the commitments that the Board of Curators made last spring and summer at my urging and after careful analysis of how far we could continue to go with internal reallocations and shifting of resources was to commit itself to a five-year plan to in effect repair and restore the base of the University so that we would be back at the more competitive level that we were at 5-10 years ago. That's a five-year budget plan. The first component of that five-year budget plan which projects about $150 million to restore the base, not counting now the normal growth that we would hope to have year by year. The first component of that is reflected in the request for the coming fiscal year, FY90. That is a request for an increase in the University's budget from the state of 20 percent and then when combined with the private income, which doesn't match in growth the state income, we would have a 15 percent increase.

Now the immediate question that would come, I should think, to your mind, as it has certainly come to mine, is—well, will that happen? There is no way obviously to predict and project what will happen. State resources are, I believe, limited in terms of what is available. But I think it is extraordinarily important that the Board of Curators has committed itself unequivocally to this process. [The Board] believes that the resources are inadequate, and more important still, is convinced that compensation for the sake of quality education—which is how Prof. Crosser phrased it, and it's the correct phraseology—that compensation is
a critical issue and is the highest priority for the University as we go into the coming legislative session, as we continue the dialogue that we in higher education are having with the CBHE. I think there are grounds for optimism because the case is strong. The need for the state, not for us so much, is very great. I'm encouraged, though, I don't presume to have any notion as to what will happen, that the CBHE is reconsidering earlier draft recommendations that would have projected about a 6 to 7 percent salary and compensation increase. They are seriously considering from their last meeting an increase. I hope it would be close to what we've asked, which is 12 percent. What the outcome will be, I don't know. But they tabled previous recommendations--at my urging and that of a few other people--and are studying that issue very carefully.

We've approached the Governor recently to ask whether or not, in view of what appears to be a fairly favorable state fiscal situation, the withholding of 3 percent which we have to budget for, and which in effect took 3 percent from the average compensation we could make available, might be released as soon as possible. As I'm sure you know, the Governor said he couldn't commit at this point. He was very sympathetic. He understood the situation that I had described to him and that, as soon as possible, by around mid-December, he would take a look; and that, unlike some previous years, he felt optimistic. But obviously he made no commitment. Well, I'm going to continue to be optimistic on that until and unless there's grounds not to be optimistic. Regardless, we're going to press the case for compensation and base support for the University as firmly as possible. I've been doing that for a number of years. Others have, and we must continue because it is one of the critical issues that we have to address. Relatedly, we have worked very hard to promote greater public understanding of what the value of the university is, what its needs are, not for itself narrowly, but for the state. I have come together in an alliance with our colleagues in the other sectors of higher education: private, public, large, small institutions--Missourians for Higher Education. And we are examining very carefully what kind of steps might be taken in the future to increase the resource base for higher education. I have been, in the years that I have been here, personally visiting, and I have been visiting even more intensely in the last couple of months, many of the top corporate and civic leaders in the state, and in my private discussions with them, I am profoundly encouraged that their understanding of the importance of a multi-campus research university and what it does, and I think there is the growing awareness that we are not going to be competitive and effective on the behalf of the state’s economy and social life without additional resources.

I think, Prof. Crosser so I don't over speak my welcome, there are many other things I would like to say. I would like to make one observation if I could. Your Council and, I believe, equivalent bodies at the other three campuses of the University passed a res-
olution that I won't read in the interests of time but [note] that it speaks to a strong university [and] its importance to the state. It goes on to say that our university has been seriously underfunded for at least a decade and it says "that to restore the strength and competitive position of University of Missouri requires an immediate and substantial increase in state financial support and a permanent state commitment to greater investment in the University." It goes on to say that "we the faculty on the four campuses of the University urge the CBHE to recommend the legislature and Governor to fund fully the University of Missouri's budget request for FY89-90." And it says "we think it essential for the Board of Curators and the entire administration exert the greatest possible effort for the restoration of the University of Missouri's fiscal base, including appropriate compensation of its faculty and staff." As is true with virtually all resolutions that emerge from faculty and other groups, I did not write that resolution. But I could have written that myself, and I would vote for it with enthusiasm. And indeed I intend to present that resolution for additional reinforcement to the Board of Curators.

One final observation, we have a lot in common within the university system. We do a lot of things well—we do a lot of things we could do better with adequate resources. I, Chancellor Jischke, all of us need to try to come together and work together in creative ways so that we can promote public understanding perhaps more than we've done in the past as to what we are and what we do and why investments in the University of Missouri are investments that truly benefit the state. And I very sincerely and very plainly ask for your help and advice as to how we can accomplish what I am convinced is a common set of objectives. As I said in another gathering (and it came from a comment I made to a colleague), I really believe—and hope rather than fear—in positive approaches rather than in dealing with some of the difficult negative issues of the past, and I think we have a real chance to get some things done. Mr. President, I will stop at this point and will be happy to try to respond to comments and questions.

Crosser—Thank you, President McGrath. [To the audience] May I ask that if you rise to speak, that you identify yourself for the oral record, and I will begin to entertain questions with respect to the President's presentation.

Roach, Chemistry—I wonder if—you recognize, of course, that the University of Missouri's four campuses have received a great deal of adverse publicity from the revelations about the salary increases of top administrators versus faculty when all the laymen read is—all they generally know—is what they read in the papers. And we go to the legislature each year and plead poverty asking for more appropriations. They read this [plea for appropriations] and
then they read next of the salary difference. What I wondered is: in all the deliberations in making this decision, did no one—any of your Vice-Presidents, Board of Curators members—realize what adverse effect this [publicity] was going to have as far as public relations?

Magrath—I can't speculate as to what's in people's minds. I can answer your question this way. That there is no doubt in my mind that we have a need for Chancellors who have to also function, as faculty do, in a highly competitive market; and I have had the pleasure, and it is literally a pleasure, of attracting or trying to persuade some individuals such as Dr. Jischke (since we're here in Rolla). I think it's appropriate to make that reference, and I know what's out there. I know how hard it is to attract people to those positions, and I understand equally well how difficult it is to attract faculty of great quality and substance or to retain them at a great university. I have to work directly and immediately with a small handful of individuals who I would like to retain. I know what the compensation levels are for those individuals at equivalent institutions who are very frequently, frankly, in the market for these people. I know the costs of running searches, the time that faculty and others spend on those searches, the loss of momentum that can be and has been generated here, frankly, at UMR, under Dr. Jischke. And I have taken that into account. That in no way is to imply—because I want to be as clear as my words, inadequate as they are at times, can make them—to say that those individuals are more important than other individuals. They're not. They are important but they're not more important. It is in no way to say that administrators are more important. Administrators count, too. They're human beings, and they are needed. Their salary adjustments on the average are very low this year. Just as low as the average adjustments of faculty. It is terribly important that we persuade our supporters, and we do have them, that our issues are not salaries narrowly defined, whether for faculty and that is a very hard sell, as I suspect you would appreciate. But that what we're interested in is retention and attraction of key people at all levels. And the—all I can tell you is that the Board insisted that the guidelines be followed and they were followed. A few individuals obviously extraordinarily visible—and I understand the issue—but I would say I think we have to look not only at that but look beyond that issue and look at what is really the challenge for us, which is to bring in not more compensation for you or another person or for any individual but more adequate support of which compensation is a very critical component, and I think we can do that.

Roach—A little follow-up. Then how seriously do you think your effectiveness has been undermined by the publicity you've gotten in all the urban papers. I have a feeling that it's been seriously undermined, maybe...
Magrath—Well, I’m not the best judge of that. I know what I believe in. I know what this university is about. It’s quality education, research, and, where appropriate, service. I know what the work is that’s being done and has been done. I believe that people are interested in the end results, and I think the end results have been good. I think that they could be for the University a lot better if we had the adequate resources, and I feel good about what’s possible. I think it’s important to know that there is a Board of Curators that I’ve worked very closely with and (there’ve been some changes as men and women come and go) that is extraordinarily supportive as a lay board of this University and what it tries to accomplish; and I believe they are credible, just as I know you are credible, and I think we have a credible tale to tell about the University of Missouri.

Wixson, English—First of all, I’d like to say as a Board member of the Friends of the Library at UMC, I appreciate your gift. I’d like to say—simply register my feeling—that the pay differential between faculty and salary delivers a message that research and teaching don’t count as much as administrative work. I’m sure you’ve already, but I think it’s important to make and since our principal function is research and teaching, it’s important that that be recognized as such. It’s a question of perception, I think, as much as fact. The other thing I wanted to say was on this question of marketability. Our marketability is quite different, it seems to me, for administrators in comparison to faculty, because the tendency at the University of Missouri, at least, is to—when people, faculty, leave—to replace them with other people at a much lower salary. It represents a great cost saving to the University, but this is not necessarily true for administrators. If you replace administrators, usually you bring them on board at the same salary or at a higher salary.

Magrath—I have to add a comment to what you’ve said. Of course, what I feel very profoundly sorry about is that within the world and within universities we are compelled to have differentials that are not, in human terms, easily explainable and justifiable. That is to say, it’s an open secret that—to use that harsh word marketability—there are differentials of marketability, unfortunately, within a university for faculty that have chosen to be in a certain discipline and a certain set of pursuits. I mean, it’s no secret that a humanities department and program—and the point is well made—a professor of art or art history or music, or obviously of history, or social sciences aside from everything else is unfortunately less marketable than a professor who is in perhaps the computer sciences. I don’t have to, in this setting, go into any detail. That is a very unhappy fact of life because in my world, that’s if I could create it, we would recognize and
reward on the basis of accomplishment and the function being performed regardless of whether one is a ceramic engineer, or a chemical engineer, or a physicist, or a professor of English or of music, and so on and so forth. Administrators are not more important. The few people that I am directly responsible for, referring now to Chancellors, are individuals who are—yes, I suspect in that harsh word—marketable. They’re individuals who are needed and who I think we need at this University, and who I am convinced (and I can’t prove it, as we can’t prove many things) who really do care about the research function and the teaching function and want to work, frankly, literally their fannies off to try to attract the resources so you and the other men and women here and colleagues at the other campuses cannot only be recognized and compensated fairly and adequately but so that you can get your work done that you want to do for the state. That’s what these individuals are dedicated to and that, in my judgement at least, are doing remarkably well, and I’d like to keep them here.

Miller, Philosophy—Depending on my mood and how bitter I happen to be at any given moment, I might characterize one of the earlier comments you made as misleading, deceptive, or fraudulent. When you were talking about how well we do administratively and how cheap it is to run the administration and how efficient we are, I’ve been here now 21 years; and it seems to me, that in large measure, that apparent increase in administrative efficiency have primarily been at the expense of the faculty. What’s happened is that functions migrate; and so the University of Missouri central administration system migrates functions to the campuses ... [and] the campus migrates them to the colleges and schools. The colleges and schools migrate them to departments. Ultimately, they come down to faculty, so that there are far heavier administrative or quasi-administrative loads that now start to fall upon the faculty; and, of course, since we are not listed as part of the administration, and we don’t make part of our compensation there. It starts to look like we’re doing the administration cheaply. But what we’re really doing is passing it on down the line. I wonder if in your heart of hearts (if you really look at it) if you don’t see that is what’s been happening and so that part of this apparent savings in administration is just that—it’s appearance.

Magrath—Well, if I might make—I’ll try to answer the question, if I might make one rejoinder. I spoke about the administrative side because I was asked to address that, and I didn’t want to avoid that so I spoke to that and that’s why I went on a bit at length on that topic because that’s what I was asked to in part address. I think
you make a fair point in part. I think, I personally think, it's rather complex. In the first place, a lot of things that are labeled administration--such as support services work that's done by professional staff that operate computers and the like--I don't regard as what I do. I'm an administrator, obviously; but there are lots of professionals that work on the campus here, and elsewhere, who, I don't feel, are administrators. They are professionals performing certain functions. Faculty and staff to some considerable extent in these kinds of universities do participate in administrative functions, and I think that's important. I'm referring to time spent on various types of committees, all the kinds of service things that over the years you've probably had your stomach full of as others have. That's, by the way, sometimes hard to explain to--there's many worlds we live in. The outside world ..., who don't understand that faculty in addition to their research and teaching have to spend time on quasi-administrative functions. Having said that, there are measures and ways to track how expenditures are going. I can't give you a clinical answer, but the fact is that in the last 10 years there has been a significant reduction university wide in terms of administrative support services, in part by eliminating certain things, in part by going to user fees for certain operations, in part by efficiencies that can be absolutely demonstrated that are not now on the backs of the faculty, which is one of the issues you say, "Well, that could be part of it." The trend line is so clear. It's also true, and you make a valid point, that thanks to the recommendations of the Knight Committee suggesting that it would be better to devolve certain functions closer to the campus and away from, if you will, the central administration--we've done that. Now that reduced central administrative costs to some extent but even taking that down--taking that factor out--we can show there have been reductions and holding of the cost lines. I think that you then have to get into an analysis on a campus-by-campus basis. I think that there's some truth, frankly, in what you say. I think maybe we have shared the burden more, but I am absolutely convinced professionally that we have, in absolute terms, have cut administrative costs, and I'm in favor of that. I have to say, ultimately, I don't think that's the solution. I don't think that reallocation endlessly is a solution, although the policy of the Board of Curators, which I know they feel very strongly about, is that there has to be some level of continuing reallocation focused; and this would be more popular, if it doesn't turn out the way you dislike it in your darker moments--on administrative costs. That is a policy of the Board that would continue, but as I have said repeatedly, internal--we can argue among ourselves, and there's some good arguments and some fair arguments to have, and we need to strengthen our communications. But internal reallocation will not give us the resources we need for our computers, for our libraries, [and] for compensation. It just isn't there. We have to [seek funds] from the private
Wade, Council Secretary--I'll read my question. A good number of my students this semester (at least 20 of them) are members of the UMR staff. Evidently none has received a raise sufficient to cover the increased costs of living. I would add that they are good students, albeit part-time ones, and are among our most highly regarded staff. These staff members earnestly discuss between classes their concern about the decline of their real income. They are disheartened, for example, that their medical insurance costs are about to rise sharply and wipe out what little raise they have received. A question they ask in each discussion is this: should we unionize and through a union seek better wages? Some of them have asked that question of me. It is a question, sir, I cannot answer, but then it really should be addressed to you. What choice do you and your administration offer staff except some kind of collective bargaining?

Magrath--Well, you know those decisions are made by professionals and individuals acting in terms of what they think is in their or the institution's best interest, and I'm obviously not in a position to advise anyway on that. I would say that with regard to the increased medical costs which are extremely unfortunate, particularly for the staff levels that you've described, that it also compelled us centrally to invest or spend more money on medical benefits because of the rising inflation in that sector. That isn't the only reason we're in this very difficult situation in the current fiscal year, but it is one of the contributing factors along with increased social security costs and some other factors. But, honestly, I really think that it still brings us back to the fundamental issue of resources. Now, yes, there is an argument we can have, and in a university we're going to have arguments and that's healthy, that's good. It's not a university if we don't. As to how the available resources are being used, inadequate as they are, because we will all agree on one thing--we'll all agree that we want to use the available resources wisely and well. We may disagree as to whether they are being used wisely and well or [whether] the right decisions are being made. But I think we're also going to agree that we're arguing within a very limited circle, and we tend, I'm afraid, to argue over crumbs rather than...
an entire loaf of bread. And regardless of what choices employees (and I don’t like to use that term; I think that’s as harsh as that marketability word) but staff of performing the functions that you describe, regardless of what’s happened or what they might choose to do—I think the ultimate question is still going to be: what resources can be attracted through the private sector and from the public sector to the University of Missouri? And one reason—if I can, and I’m not trying to filibuster, because I feel so strong—we’re not a poor state. We don’t make the investment that, in my opinion, we should make in public higher education. But we are the 15th largest state in population; in terms of per capita wealth, we are around the median. We’ve two great cities and lots of other important cities such as Rolla and Columbia and Springfield and Joplin to be neutral. We have a diversified economic base. We have some extraordinarily sophisticated individuals, and I think we have good people in our public and political life too. I’m not passing, finger pointing, or anything. The potential—the raw material—is there, and unless that’s addressed, I think—and I don’t want to have this argument or this discussion again—but I think we’ll continue to have that argument among ourselves when the real issue, I think, goes beyond us.

Watson, Metallurgical Engineering—It is evident that one of the major problems facing the University of Missouri system is underfunding. Indeed, by your admission, it’s been that way for 10 years. Indeed, through the last 10 years, things are probably looking worse. We are now well removed from the average of the Big 8/Big 10 salaries as far as faculty are concerned. My question is, what are we doing differently this year than we’ve done in the past 10 years to improve the situation?

Magrath—A comment about the Big 8 comparison group, and we all get hung up on this. So many people tell me: will we stop talking about football conferences as a basis for comparison? I agree not only in terms of football which—not talking about Rolla and the Miners—but, that aside, you know for us the real issue is competitiveness with equivalent types of institutions and it’s not just the Big 8; it’s the Big 10. But it isn’t only that, it’s places like the University of North Carolina and places that we’re all, I think, quite familiar with. Within the Big 8, a little context, I think, is appropriate. It doesn’t solve anything but just for context. A year ago we were close to the top or at the average of the Big 8, okay. And now we’ve slipped, and we’re—depending on the rank—we’re third from the bottom, second from the bottom and so on and so forth; and what I have observed over the years because I’ve been in and out of the Big 8 institutions is that it’s two steps
forward for 2 or 3 of them in a given year or for 2 years, and then they stand still, and then the other two or three lunge forward and make some progress, and then they get stuck, and the other ones move forward. For example, it wasn’t very long ago that the University of Oklahoma was working on about zero salary increases, that the Kansas institutions were doing that, and Nebraska was in despair. This year, I think, those three sets of institutions have done very well. We did very poorly. I’ve been here three and a half years now. In the first three years that I had the pleasure and the privilege of working with budgets, we were able--this doesn’t answer anything, but maybe it speaks a bit to commitment, that a lot of us have. We were able, inadequately as it was, to increase salaries, unfortunately not for staff in general, but for ranked continuing faculty above the average of the budget growth. Now we did that through lots of painful choices: intradepartment, intercollege, interuniversity, et cetera, et cetera. And one year the numbers were pretty good. In fact, one of those years would even have been better, but there was a veto that was done for fiscal reasons by the Governor. And we’ve had the problems of withholdings.

One thing that’s different this year is that the withholding situation has caught up with us. We were able in past years to use some accumulated one-time resources to cover the impact of the withholding. We now have to budget for the withholding. We have budgeted right now $8.2 million. In effect, it’s in escrow—that’s terribly technical—we’ve got about $8 million in escrow which we can’t spend—Well, we could spend it. I could call Martin Jischke and say “Martin, go ahead; we’ve got some serious problems. Start spending it.” And obviously we do it elsewhere.

The problem is if it wasn’t released as we got into March or April or June, we would have stepped into something that would be extremely difficult to get out of because we would have no choices to back away. This year has been particularly tough on us. There’s no question about it. The previous three years weren’t great, but they at least kept us within that range of...

But I’m not satisfied with that. I doubt that you are, and I doubt that anybody in this room is. I would like—I’m not fixated on the Big 10, but I would like—to get to that median, at least between the Big 8 and the Big 10. More importantly, I’d like us to be able to be competitive with the institutions that we’re really competing with. There are a number that pertain to Rolla. Purdue is one. It happens to be a Big 10 institution. But there are other institutions. I think change is possible; not easily, but I think it’s possible.

Leighly, Metallurgical Engineering—I’ve got a back-of-the-envelope calculation on these pay increases, and I come up with about $2 million. You figure you’ve got about 50,000 students in the system. That runs about $40 a student.
Now there's an army maximum that says when the commanders take care of the troops the troops take care of the commanders. There are graves around the world filled with the bodies of officers who forgot the maxim. Now for my question. In 1969-70, John Weaver, then President of the University of Missouri, declined a salary increase. Did you consider making a similar sacrifice?

Magrath--I’ve commented on that subject. My salary ...

Leighly--But you’ll take a tax deduction as well.

Magrath--No sir, I will not. You might want to take a look at the new tax laws.

Roach--You made a comment about the decrease in state support for higher education over, what, the last seven years. There was a decrease. I don’t believe you specified whether it’s by percentage or total dollars--it doesn’t matter. But what I’m concerned about, and I asked this question of a previous Chancellor of ours, Ray Bisplinghoff, before he left. I’ve always been a Missourian. I’m very proud of that and very loyal to the University, and I’ve always wondered why the state of Missouri did not have--did not support--the University at the level that would create a first-rank university like the University of Illinois, the University of Wisconsin--fairly close states. And I see--I won’t give you Raymond’s answer to this, but he did pinpoint it at the Governor’s level, the Coordinating Board’s level, the Curators’ level. Where do you--you probably can’t comment on this politically--but which level is it that we ...?

Magrath--Fair question and I will comment. I honestly do not believe that there are people or individuals to blame. Now, I know that that can be done, and it is done in various settings, and we all understand that. I think the problem is a generic one. I think we are in a very awkward situation in the sense that--thanks to you, if I may personalize it, since you just spoke and you are loyal--that many of us are here [are also loyal]. We do a good job with very limited resources. I have seen opinion surveys as to how we are regarded by our fellow citizens of the state of Missouri, and I think it’s good news. We are well regarded for what we do. Better that than [that] we are regarded ill, and we seek additional resources, and we have to carry the burden of being regarded as mediocre, incompetent, [or] the faculty don’t care, don’t work, et cetera, et cetera. That isn’t the general perception by the public. I’m not talking about what we say to ourselves because we probably tend to reinforce each other. The fact is that we are
well regarded according to opinion surveys that have been done. That being true, it's very easy for many people to say, "Well, that's wonderful, Prof. Roach, keep up the good work, even though you are undoubtedly underpaid and under-supported in the efforts that you do, et cetera, et cetera. But keep up the good work. Let me be the first one to congratulate you." And I am not saying that, and since we're in an open session and I know the professor understands the context in which I'm saying that. We are well regarded. We have given a full measure to the state. Faculty effort on the average [by] countless individuals generated last year—what? $56 million of outside federal support. Grants, primarily, have come in thanks to the research faculty and some others at the University of Missouri. We do a good job. Higher education in general, the private sector, the community colleges, are also well regarded. The state may not be fully aware that while we have done a good job with very limited and in some cases declining resources (and there are some factors in the state budget, by the way, that account for this). The state is fiscally conservative—I mean that isn't a matter of blaming any individual, members of the General Assembly, the Governor—I mean the state is fiscally conservative. Has been for a long time, and I suspect probably will continue to be fairly flinty-eyed in the future.

The fact is that certain accounts had to be met. The State had to pay for certain costs related to the public schools, school desegregation costs in Kansas City and in Saint Louis, increased costs of corrections, increased costs of retiring certain debts that essentially account for what's happened. It's all affecting the budget of higher education. When I made the comment about the declining amount of money, first there is no percentage. There is no formula that says we are entitled to 20 percent of the state's budget for higher education or 18 or any percentage. All of higher education has participated in that side. The state does have a fiscal policy that's quite conservative. There is an amendment named after a gentleman by the name of Mr. Handcock that provides a limitation on what can be generated through the normal growth in state revenues. And I'm not the historian here. I think that's been a situation for a long time. I think it's more acute now for reasons that have to do with national and international competitiveness—that have to do with the fact that for very long, we have relied on, frankly again to personalize it, your goodwill and that of others who are loyal to make the University work and be effective, and we have a lot we can boast about. But we also have to walk that line of pointing out: "Yes we're good; we do well. But we could do so much more, not for ourselves, but for the state." I believe that's possible.

Williams, History—I think I have a question that relates to your opening statement and your expectations, your hope, your optimism regarding FY90. What strikes me is that we sit here
in Rolla assuming that University administrators have a handle on what the legislature will do and we have lobbyists and we have people very well met who will make sure that our share is tended to. On the other hand we have the Board of Curators appointed by a Governor. The Board of Curators then hires the President of the University, who in turn may hire or assign people to be lobbyists. Are we schizophrenic in terms of which side of the legislative process that we seek support for our funding needs? Are we caught in a bind there?

Magrath--Lance, I want to ask you a question. I don’t think we are, but I’m not sure. I want to really address your question and not skirt around it. If the question is--and I may not be answering what you’re really trying to get at. I hope we’re not schizophrenic, and I don’t think we are, and I don’t feel schizophrenic nor paranoid nor anything else. I think that if your question is: Are the Curators committed to increased resources? Are the Curators willing to visit and work with legislators? And there will be changes in the legislature. There’s an election going on and for instance Representative Marvin Proffer—who has been a good friend of higher education and the University of Missouri in general, very specifically and certainly of this campus—Mr. Proffer is leaving. I don’t have the slightest idea who will replace Mr. Proffer as chair of the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives. I mean we will be working with some, not new legislators, but new people in those important chairs. The Curators certainly—certainly I, Jim Snider, who is our full-time lobbyist, the Chancellors, who participate in this—I think we’re of one mind in telling our story and giving the same message to the legislature and the General Assembly, who are not, by the way, the enemy. They try to do the best they can with available resources. I have had more than once, both kind of on the record and privately, [have heard] key legislators say, "you’ve got a good story, a real case, and I’d like to do more, but we can’t because it isn’t there." They are not our enemies. In fact, I don’t think we have any enemies unless we make ourselves our own enemies, and I don’t think we’re going to do that. I think we’re going to work to try to attract the resources, and the Curators are committed [to that goal]. Believe me, they are committed on the FY90 proposals which are, regardless of what happens, and if I can’t be optimistic and you can’t, then there’s no chance. But it’s that budget statement and that five-year budget plan is a very strong statement by a Board of Curators that had to be persuaded, as they have been persuaded, that we [have] got to get the funding base of the University restored. Now, Lance was that your question or not, because I’m not sure I answered it? Close enough. Okay, I’ll take it.
Herrick, Electrical Engineering—I have to say, President Magrath, that I honestly feel that the covenant of fairness between staff and faculty members and the administration—even the Board of Curators—was broken. I find it incredible that the upper administration is worthy of a 10 percent raise because they are so singularly important. I don’t have great trouble with large raises for meritorious effort, but I don’t think they (the Administration and the Board) realize the vast damage that’s been done to the morale of the faculty and staff by denying those people, who also perform meritoriously, similar raises. I have not heard a satisfactory explanation for the inequity. If we do not offer competitive salaries to faculty and staff, we lose fine people and cannot replace them. These damages go on for years and years.

Magrath—Thank you. I appreciate your point of view.

Crosser—Are there other questions. Thank you President Magrath.

Magrath—May I make a closing one-and-a-half minute statement? I want to thank you for coming together, Mr. President, on short notice. I wanted to respond to your resolution and your concerns. I wanted to hear the questions and the comments that have been made. I think that’s productive and helpful. I think that there are many issues that we can focus on that are in the past. There’s lots of data that we can throw around with each other. But I think there’s one piece of data that isn’t data. It has to do with what this University’s about, and what we’re about is research and teaching. And the raw material is there for us to garner the support, certainly to state our case and to attract, then, the resources, so we can get the job done that every person in this room, and I think every person at the University of Missouri, wants. And I think that, despite the frustrations that irritate us and the understandable disagreements of perspectives that we may have, that I’m proud of this faculty and this staff and this University. Not because of what they’ve done, which is very good under very difficult circumstances, but because, I think that you—with your help and your understanding of the public and what you’re doing—can help us state the case to our supporters in the private sector as well as in the public sector, and I think we ought to get on—I think we can move ahead. Thank you very much for listening to me. I really appreciate it.
Crosier--A motion to adjourn is in order. So moved. All in favor say I.
All opposed. Thank you for coming.

The meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Clyde G. Wade
Secretary
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SPECIAL MEETING NOTICE

At the request of Orrin K. Crosser, 1988-89 Academic Council President, a Special Meeting is called for Friday, October 7, 1988, at 3:45 p.m., in Miles Auditorium, 104 Mechanical Engineering.

The purpose of the meeting is to hear the response of the University of Missouri President, C. Peter Magrath, to the resolution on 1988-89 University Administrators’s salaries adopted by Academic Council at its Special Meeting, September 22, 1988, and any related discussion.

(Academic Council meetings are open to the University community and public. All faculty have voice, Council representatives only have vote.)

Rules, Procedures & Agenda Committee
Lance Williams, chr
The October 13, 1988, meeting of the Academic Council was called to order at 1:34 p.m. by Prof. Orrin Crosser, Academic Council President. The following substitutions were noted: Prof. Charles Haas for Prof. Norm Smith; Prof. Don Siehr for Prof. Frank Blum; and Prof. Don Cronin for Prof. Al Crosbie. Motions to approve the minutes of the September 8, 1988, regular and the September 22, 1988, special meetings of the Council were made, seconded, and passed.

reports and responses.

A. PRESIDENT’S REPORT. President Orrin Crosser’s report consisted of three items: the Four-Chairs’ Resolution regarding University of Missouri underfunding was approved by the UMR General Faculty by mail ballot (175 for, 3 against, and 1 abstention); the Board Review was circulated and President Crosser offered to field any questions regarding the meeting later; and the UMC Faculty Council, after executive session, forwarded, on October 7th, a letter of censure of President Magrath to Board of Curators President Jeanne Epple.

President Crosser, responding to an inquiry from Prof. Clyde Wade, stated that the UMKC and UMSL Faculty and Chairs are "disturbed, in general, because it's possible that it [UMC Faculty reaction] may have an unfavorable influence on additional efforts to gain support for the four campuses" and that they "have no plans to support the action of the UMC Faculty."

Prof. Vincent Roach also concerned over public opinion and the public reaction of individual Board members, specifically Curator Ed Turner's statement regarding faculty teaching time (only 3-6 hours per week), requested that President Crosser ask Curator Turner for clarification of his recent statement with the knowledge that any response "will be made public."

Prof. Thomas Herrick then requested of President Crosser that the Curators be asked about the reasoning behind the upper administration salary increases specifically the "premise that a few key employees ... hold the future of the University in their hands ...." (Attachment II.A)
B. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT. Chancellor Martin Jischke first congratulated Alumni Affairs and Development and the students for the homecoming festivities and then recounted Mr. Don Castleman’s pledge toward the completion of the Music Alumni Auditorium. During homecoming weekend, gifts were also received from Southwestern Bell and Westinghouse.

Congratulated also were those faculty members who received advisor awards: Profs. David Cunningham, Madison Daily, David Oglesby, and Rich Johnson.

The University of Missouri-Rolla has recently been informed that it has successfully proposed a program for advanced technology, a manufacturing research and training center, with the Missouri Corporation for Science and Technology. Other winning proposals identified were Washington University in the area of Plant Biotechnology and University of Missouri-Kansas City in the area of telecommunications and computer science. UMR will receive a 5-year, challenge grant of $400,000 per year. (Attachment II.B)

C. VICE-CHANCELLOR’S REPORT.

1. CHANCELLOR’S SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM. This program, as related by Vice-Chancellor John Park, was developed due to concerns that, regardless of effort in the National Merit Program, UMR was consistently being out-bid. Development of the program was based on successful programs at other campuses (University of North Carolina, Emory University, Transylvania University, DePaul University, and the University of Kentucky were identified) and will be used to attract students as well as to increase the reputation of our University and our programs.

The focus of the program will be the total number competing, not the ten final recipients. All competing students must have applied and been accepted at UMR, be eligible for the Missouri Bright Flight and Curators’ Scholarships, and have completed a scholarship application (to be used as a basis for the on-campus interview).

Several committees are involved with the Scholarship Program process. The Faculty Chancellor Scholarship Selection Committee, being the key assemblage, have met and are in the
process of establishing the interview procedure. The size of this Committee will probably be increased to interview a larger number of applicants within a corresponding time period. Another committee, chaired by Prof. Wayne Cogell and working with honor students, will organize the visitation process.

2. TEACHING EVALUATION. Teaching evaluation has two purposes, as stated by Vice-Chancellor Park: one is providing information for self-improvement; the other is providing information for administrative evaluation. Any evaluation process involves four parts: self, student (consumer), peer, and administrative. At present, a faculty Ad Hoc Committee is studying evaluation in the area of self-improvement, and a subcommittee of department chairs is studying administrative evaluation.

Dr. Ellen Leininger has studied evaluation literature and the available evaluation instruments. The result is a draft of possible evaluation instruments sent to Department Chairs for comment only. Vice-Chancellor Park assured the Council that no imposed evaluation would come from his office; however, he will promote and support the Faculty and the Department Chairs with regards to their studies and decisions in this matter.

Vice-Chancellor Park also reported on the offer to pay for student volunteers in a pilot study of the Ideas Exam from Kansas State University. Even though meaningless statistically, it would allow comparison with other evaluation instruments in order to gauge effectiveness.

A. PUBLIC OCCASIONS.

1. CALENDAR, 1990-91. Prof. Clyde Wade moved for a rule suspension in order to allow the Public Occasions Committee report immediate presentation. Prof. Lance Williams seconded the motion, which passed.

Prof. Jerry Bayless presented his Committee's 1990-91 academic calendar proposal. Prof. Glen Haddock moved for approval, and Prof. C. Dale
Elifrits provided the second. Prof. Don Cronin moved to amend the Fall Semester 1990 start date to August 21st from August 14th. The amendment was seconded by Prof. Al Crosbie. A comment by Registrar Myron Parry, concerning the period of time between an amended Fall commencement date of December 22nd and an unamended start date for the following Spring semester with regards to the posting of Fall grades, resulted in Prof. Cronin's amending his motion to include moving the Spring Semester 1991 start date a week later. This amendment was passed by Council. Lance Williams moved to return the calendar to Committee for reconsideration. Prof. Glen Haddock seconded this motion, which failed. The motion to approve the calendar carried. (Attachment III.A.1)

2. PUBLIC OCCASION DATES, 1989-90. The proposed public occasion dates were introduced by Prof. Bayless. Prof. C. Dale Elifrits moved for adoption. Prof. Don Askeland seconded the motion, which carried. (Attachment III.A.2)

3. SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FAIR, 1989. Prof. Bayless, indicating the previously approved dates of March 10-11th for this event, reported that several sponsors of high-school science projects became concerned over the possibility of inadequate completion time to meet this deadline. To allow students an adequate preparatory time period and to avoid Spring Semester breaktime, the Committee proposed that the Fair be rescheduled to April 7-8, 1989. A motion for adoption was received from Prof. C. Dale Elifrits, seconded by Prof. Lance Williams, and passed.

B. ADMISSIONS AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS.

1. ADMISSIONS PERFORMANCE STANDARDS. Prof. Thomas Herrick resubmitted his Committee's recommendation moving for Council approval of the previously presented document with two modifications:

a. "100-200 students in this range [100-200] are frequently at high risk in successfully completing University level work. Students in this category may be admitted, but will
receive advising, recommendations for remediation, and reduced academic schedules."
(The ambiguity in this statement of admissibility, in Committee opinion, should remain.)

b. "less than 100 students in this range (less than 100) normally admissible only after additional academic development which is not available at UMR. Students in this category may later apply to UMR through the Transfer Student Program." (This provision gives students a direction to pursue if their score falls below 100.)

Prof. D. Ray Edwards seconded this motion.

In the matter of implementation, this recommendation, once approved, would be included in UMR's admission packet/application booklet (see attachments). After Prof. Glen Haddock expressed concern that the admission/performance requirements form would not be retained by the student, Prof. Herrick indicated that he would relay the message to Admissions. Replying to Prof. Don Askeland's question on approval, Prof. Herrick noted that, "Final admission to the University of Missouri is controlled by the Board of Curators"; and Dean Don Warner's question regarding the Board of Curators' willingness to consider separate admission standards for each campus was met with no firm response. Prof. Glen Haddock called for the question. The recommendation was approved.

It was pointed out that there has been a four-campus committee established, to which Profs. Thomas Herrick and Lance Williams have been appointed; it is charged with reviewing UM admission standards. The Academic Affairs Council and the General Officers will also be considering admission standards on their agenda.
(Attachment III.B)

C. CURRICULA.

1. REPORT NO. 2, 1988-89. Prof. David Oglesby moved for approval of the Curricula Committee’s report with two modifications: CC1 2912, Mining Engineering 320, should be Mining Engineering 306; and CC1 2998, Mechanical Engineering 306, should
be co-listed with Mining Engineering 306, not Mining Engineering 320. Prof. Don Askeland seconded the motion, which carried.
(Attachment III.C.1)

2. FEE STRUCTURE INEQUITIES RESOLUTION. The Chair then recognized Prof. Askeland, who, speaking in regards to EC1 156, 157, and 158 (all the identical course, Intro to Neural Nets and Applications, offered by Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, and Engineering Management Departments), indicated that Computer Science and upper-level students would be paying less for this course than others, moved that the Council request an explanation from the administration concerning the fee inequities for these groups of students. Prof. Askeland’s resolution was seconded. Prof. Clyde Wade proposed amending the resolution to include the fees charged to Arts and Science students, who enroll in engineering courses. The amendment failed to receive a second, and the Council approved the resolution.
(Attachment III.C.2)

D. RULES, PROCEDURE AND AGENDA.
1. STUDENT AFFAIRS REPRESENTATIVE REPLACEMENT. Prof. Lance Williams moved that Prof. Max Anderson fill the position, vacated by Prof. Jack Bourquin, on the Student Affairs Committee. Prof. D. Ray Edwards seconded the motion, and Prof. Anderson was duly elected.

E. STUDENT AFFAIRS.
1. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES. Prof. Madison Daily moved for acceptance of the May 1988 requested clarification of the proposed changes in policy. Prof. Clyde Wade seconded the motion. Prof. Lance Williams editorially proposed the substitution of the word "shall" with "may" in paragraph 8a: "In the case of two or more students of a section charging the instructor with capricious grading, one student shall be elected from those students by a simple majority ..." The motion to accept the updated grade appeal procedure document then carried.
(Attachment III.E.1)
2. CONSTITUTION — BACCHUS CHAPTER OF UMR. Prof. Daily moved for Council approval of the BACCHUS, UMR Chapter, constitution. The motion was seconded by Prof. Herrick and passed. (Attachment III.E.2)

G. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY TEACHING EVALUATION POLICIES.

1. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING ACQUISITION/USE/INFORMATION ON FACULTY TEACHING EVALUATIONS. Prof. Catherine Riordan first outlined her procedure for considering the Committee's report and then moved for approval of the first of two proposed resolutions:

"It is essential that the UMR faculty have a significant role in the development of policy concerning the evaluation of teaching. As the elected representatives of the UMR faculty, the Academic Council is the appropriate group to develop, discuss, and adopt recommendations to be forwarded to the administration."

The motion was seconded by Prof. Lance Williams, and the motion carried.

Prof. Riordan moved for approval of the second resolution:

"In a general sense, the policy statement put forth by the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Policies (Attachment A) addresses the issues that need to be addressed by the faculty and thus is worthy of discussion, debate, and/or amendment on the floor of the Academic Council."

The second was received from Prof. Vincent Roach, who spoke for the resolution. He reported from the Chemistry department's meeting with Chancellor Jischke that he received the clear impression "the Chancellor intends to impose some sort of teacher evaluation on this campus, whether we like it, or not."

Prof. Jerome Westphal speaking against a campus-wide policy indicated that the decision and duty of teaching evaluation policy development rests with the departments, given the differences in the subjects being taught.
Prof. Lance Williams offered a substitute resolution that "this Council recommends that this issue be considered a department responsibility." A second was received from the floor.

Prof. D. Ray Edwards then moved to table until the next Academic Council meeting. Prof. Cronin seconded the motion which carried. (Attachment III.G)

XVIII, 2 OLD BUSINESS.

A. UMC HISTORY FACULTY RESPONSE TO THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET CRISIS. Prof. Clyde Wade requested that the response of the UMC History faculty be, for informational purposes, circulated with these minutes. Prof. Wade's motion was seconded by Prof. D. Ray Edwards and passed by Council. (Attachment IV.A)

The meeting adjourned at 3:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Clyde G. Wade
Secretary

Attachments: II.A
III.A.1
III.A.2
III.B
III.C.1
III.C.2
III.E.1
III.E.2
III.G
IV.A

*Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.*
PUBLIC OCCASIONS DATES FOR 1989-90

Industry Day............................Thursday, October 5, 1989

Homecoming.............................Friday and Saturday
                                          October 6 and 7, 1989

University Day..........................Saturday, October 21, 1989

Parents Day.............................Saturday, November 11, 1989

Commencement...........................Saturday, December 16, 1989

Science and Engineering Fair..........Friday and Saturday,
                                          March 30 and 31, 1990

Spring Open House.......................Saturday, April 14, 1990

Commencement...........................Saturday, May 12, 1990

Summer Open House......................Friday, July 13, 1990
1989-90 DATES

HOME FOOTBALL GAMES

SEPT 9
OCT 7
OCT 21
OCT 28
NOV 11

OTHER DATES

Student Council Free Day Oct. 13
ACT Test Oct. 29
Easter April 15, 1990
Spring Break March 31-April 9, 1990
EIT Exam Saturday, April 21, 1990
MEMO TO: Orrin Crosser, President
       Academic Council

FROM: Madison Daily, Chairman
      Student Affairs Committee

DATE: September 23, 1988

RE: Changes in the Grade Appeal Procedures

The changes to the grade appeal procedures (pages 36 and 37 of the 1988-1989 Manual of Information) is returned to the Academic Council. It was referred back to the Student Affairs Committee in the May 1988 meeting for clarification of the changes being made. The changes are respectively:

1. that the Chancellor be made the ultimate appellate level,
2. that there be placed a time limit on the hearing process,
3. that there be a manner by which multiple allegations could be addressed.

The attached document clearly shows what changes are being proposed.
8. GRADING APPEAL PROCEDURE

a. The grade appeal procedure is available only for review of alleged capricious grading, and not for review of the judgment of instructors in assessing the quality of students' work, or for questioning the stated grading criteria selected by the instructor. Only a student who alleges he or she was subjected to capricious grading may use the grade appeal procedure.

b. Capricious grading, as that term is used here, consists only of any of the following:
   1. The assignment of a semester grade to a particular student on some basis other than those related to academic performance in the section;
   2. The assignment of a semester grade to a particular student by more exacting or demanding criteria than were applied to other students in the same section. (NOTE: Additional and/or different grading criteria may be applied to graduate students enrolled for credit in a course numbered below the 400 level);
   3. The assignment of a semester grade by criteria that represents a substantial departure from the instructor's previously announced criteria.

c. The grade appeal procedure shall consist of the following steps:
   1. The initial step in the grade appeal procedure shall be for the student to review with the section instructor the semester grade, the stated grading criteria, and how the stated grading criteria were applied to determine the student's semester grade. This step must be initiated within 30 days after the first class day of the succeeding regular academic semester. If the student and the instructor fail to reach a mutually satisfactory decision during this discussion, then the student may proceed to step 2.
   2. The student shall contact the chairperson of the instructor's department and request their service as a mediator during a discussion between the student and the instructor. If the student and instructor fail to reach a mutually satisfactory decision during this discussion, then the student may proceed to step 3.
   3. The student shall inform the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at this point that a grade appeal is in progress. The student shall request, in writing, that the department chairperson inform the instructor and convene an ad hoc review group composed of the following: the chairperson (or designated representative) of the instructor's school or college, and a third member to be appointed by this dean from his or her faculty. The student and instructor shall be allowed to appear before the ad hoc review group. The decision reached by the ad hoc review group on the
question of alleged capricious grading shall be binding and final on both the student and the instructor.

d. If capricious grading is substantiated by the ad hoc review group, the student shall be assigned a grade consistent with the stated grading criteria. A report of the ad hoc review group, with the student's semester grade, shall be forwarded by the department chairperson to the Registrar's Office.

reach a mutually satisfactory decision during this discussion, then the student may proceed to step 3.

3. The student shall inform the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at this point that a grade appeal is in progress. The student shall request, in writing, that the department chairperson inform the instructor and convene an ad hoc review group composed of the following: the chairperson (or designated representative) of the instructor's school or college, and a third member to be appointed by this dean from his or her faculty. The student and instructor shall be allowed to appear before the ad hoc review group. If the student and the ad hoc review group fail to reach a mutually satisfactory decision during this discussion, then the student may proceed to step 4.

4. The student may then appeal directly to the Chancellor. The student and the instructor shall be allowed to appear before the Chancellor. The decision reached by the Chancellor shall be binding and final on both the student and the instructor.

5. All actions undertaken under steps 2 through 4 must be initiated and once initiated be completed within ten working days unless waived by the Chancellor.

d. If capricious grading is substantiated by the Chancellor, the student shall be assigned a grade consistent with the stated grading criteria. A report of the Chancellor, with the student's semester grade, shall be forwarded by the department chairperson to the Registrar's Office.
MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Lance Williams, Chairman  
Rules, Procedures and Agenda Committee  

FROM: Jerry Bayless, Chairman  
Public Occasions Committee  

SUBJECT: Academic Council Agenda Items  

The public events dates for 1989-90 and the calendar for 1990-91 as approved by the Public Occasions Committee are herewith submitted for consideration by the Academic Council at the October 13 meeting. With regard to the 1989-90 Public Events Dates, it is noted that the two dates for Commencement were approved last year as a part of the 1989-90 calendar.

It is also recommended that the dates for the 1989 Science and Engineering Fair be changed from March 10 and 11 to April 7 and 8. Several teachers who sponsored students in the Science and Engineering Fair last spring indicated that the March dates were too early for students to adequately prepare their entries.

JRB:mhs
### FALL SEMESTER 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall semester opens</td>
<td>Aug. 14, Tues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen Orientation</td>
<td>Aug. 14, Tues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td>Aug. 15, Wed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student registration 8:15am-3:30pm</td>
<td>Aug. 16, Thurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration ends 12:00 noon</td>
<td>Aug. 17, Fri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classwork begins 7:30am</td>
<td>Aug. 20, Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Day Holiday</td>
<td>Sept. 3, Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Semester</td>
<td>Oct. 13, Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving vacation begins 7:30am</td>
<td>Nov. 21, Wed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving vacation ends 7:30am</td>
<td>Nov. 26, Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Class Day</td>
<td>Dec. 7, Fri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Day</td>
<td>Dec. 8, Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Examinations begin 8:00am</td>
<td>Dec. 10, Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Examinations end 5:30pm</td>
<td>Dec. 14, Fri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall semester closes 5:30pm</td>
<td>Dec. 15, Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Commencement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPRING SEMESTER 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester opens</td>
<td>Jan. 7, Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Registration 8:15am-4:30pm</td>
<td>Jan. 7, Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classwork begins 7:30am</td>
<td>Mar. 2, Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Semester</td>
<td>Mar. 14, Thurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring recess begins 7:30am</td>
<td>Mar. 18, Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring recess ends 7:30am</td>
<td>Mar. 30, Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring break begins 7:30am</td>
<td>Apr. 8, Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring break ends 7:30am</td>
<td>May 3, Fri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Class Day</td>
<td>May 4, Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Day</td>
<td>May 6, Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Examinations begin 8:00am</td>
<td>May 10, Fri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Examinations end 5:30pm</td>
<td>May 11, Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring semester closes 5:30pm</td>
<td>May 11, Sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Commencement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### *SUMMER SESSION 1991*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session opens</td>
<td>June 3, Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Registration 8:15am-3:30pm</td>
<td>June 3, Mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classwork begins 7:30am</td>
<td>June 4, Tues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Day Holiday</td>
<td>July 4, Thurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session closes 12:00 noon</td>
<td>July 27, Sat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Schedule shows the regular eight-week Summer Session. Other special course sessions may be scheduled.*

### CLASS SESSIONS (Excluding final examinations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Semester</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** For the St. Louis Graduate Center, all class sessions/holidays/examinations will coincide with the calendar of the University of Missouri-St. Louis evening program. Registration times and dates to be announced later.

The faculty is reminded of the religious and other holidays that a substantial number of students may wish to observe.
October 7, 1988

President C. Peter Magrath
321 University Hall
UMC

Dear Sir:
The UMC Faculty Council in closed session voted, without dissent, to send to the Board of Curators the attached public letter of censure.

According to the wish of the Faculty Council I have transmitted that letter to the Board and, at the same time, made it available to all other interested parties.

Sincerely,

Gordon Kimber, Chairman
Faculty Council

Enclosure

Dear President Epple:

This letter of public censure of President C. Peter Magrath is written to express our extreme dissatisfaction with his past and continuing leadership and his response to the faculty resolution. The ineffective leadership demonstrated by President Magrath has compromised the ability of faculty to accomplish the essential mission of the university. This is a matter of pressing priority to the students, staff, faculty, alumni and friends of the university.

The University of Missouri Faculty Council, in executive session on the 6th of October, 1988, mandated this letter, without dissent, in order to express its increasingly grave concern about the quality of leadership at the system level of the University. Our concerns include the following.

There has been ineffective leadership in working with the legislature in obtaining sufficient funds for the University.

Salaries, benefits and annuities at the University of Missouri-Columbia lag substantially behind those of other research universities. Many of our best and most productive faculty and staff have left or are leaving for other institutions. In addition, most departments are finding it increasingly difficult, and often impossible, to recruit new faculty and staff of the quality of those now here. Especially regrettable in this context is the higher priority of expansion at the expense of existing programs and the people who give meaning to them.

Libraries and laboratories have deteriorated. These are the most essential common elements in providing the environment for teaching, research and scholarship.

A recent group of computer consultants to this campus has verbally described administrative computing as in the top five in the nation while academic computing is not in the top 100. Computer facilities are not adequate to support research and teaching needs on the campus. Decision making with reference to the purchase of computer equipment has been driven by administrative needs. The purchase of another administrative mainframe computer was wasteful of university resources.
A large proportion of our essential staff are actually taking home less money this year as a result of low salary increases combined with large increases in benefit contributions.

The Faculty Council, representing the whole faculty, views with alarm our increasing inability to maintain a competitive position in recruiting and retaining high quality faculty and staff, the deterioration of the academic resources of the University, and the apparent lack of an adequate program at the system level for addressing these problems.

President Magrath is not effectively representing our views, needs and concerns to the Board of Curators, the legislature and the public. The system administration, except when a crisis is generated, does not seem to be in touch with the activities, programs, concerns and personnel on the campus. The faculty, staff and students feel, in spite of repeated claims to the contrary, that the system administration is unaware of the conditions on campus, does not understand the problems we face in day to day activities that constitute the core mission of the University, and is remote and unconcerned with the quality of teaching and research.

The ineffective leadership of President Magrath is jeopardizing the quality of education being provided to the people of the State of Missouri. This deterioration of the university threatens the economic future of the State.

Some recent actions lead us to hope for fundamental changes in the approach to leadership and governance in the University. We support President Magrath's proposal to repair the base through working with educators and corporate leaders throughout the state, his agreement to work with faculty as well as administration in constructing budgets, and his intention to take greater leadership in directing Chancellors to establish mechanisms for more active faculty involvement in governance and development of budgets.

However, much more needs to be done. The faculty, staff and students of this campus have made clear their desire to work actively with the system administration and Curators. We expect the President to actively lead us in such efforts.

In the absence of substantial evidence of improved leadership before the start of the next semester, the faculty will have to consider the possibility of additional action.

Transmitted on behalf of the UMC Faculty Council

Gordon Kimber, Chairman

Statement by Jeanne V. Eppe, President,
University of Missouri Board of Curators

In view of the October 7, 1988, letter sent to the Board of Curators by the Faculty Council of the University of Missouri-Columbia, I make this response on behalf of the Curators:

1. The Board of Curators of the University of Missouri System has the responsibility of insuring a quality education at all four campuses of the University. The Curators are committed personally and as a Board to continue to provide excellence in education within the University of Missouri System;

2. The Board of Curators wants every Missouri citizen to clearly understand that President Magrath and Chancellor Monroe have the unequivocal and complete confidence and support of the Curators;

3. The Board of Curators stands behind the implementation of its policies by the University administration;

4. The Board of Curators assures the citizens of Missouri that positive steps to support the work of President Magrath and Chancellor Monroe will be continued.

This statement has the approval of the Board of Curators.

President Magrath:

I am continuing to concentrate my time and energy on efforts to further the interests of the University of Missouri. I have made a number of comments during the last several days that have been widely publicized, and I have no further comment to make.
September 30, 1988

MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Lance Williams, Chairman
Rules, Procedures and Agenda Committee

FROM: Jerry Bayless, Chairman
Public Occasions Committee

SUBJECT: Academic Council Agenda Items

The public events dates for 1989-90 and the calendar for 1990-91 as approved by the Public Occasions Committee are herewith submitted for consideration by the Academic Council at the October 13 meeting. With regard to the 1989-90 Public Events Dates, it is noted that the two dates for Commencement were approved last year as a part of the 1989-90 calendar.

It is also recommended that the dates for the 1989 Science and Engineering Fair be changed from March 10 and 11 to April 7 and 8. Several teachers who sponsored students in the Science and Engineering Fair last spring indicated that the March dates were too early for students to adequately prepare their entries.

JRB:mhs
PROPOSED UMR CALENDAR

FALL SEMESTER 1990

Fall semester opens 7:30am
Freshmen Orientation
New Student Orientation
Student registration 8:15am-3:30pm
Registration ends 12:00 noon
Classwork begins 7:30am
Labor Day Holiday
Mid-Semester
Thanksgiving vacation begins 7:30am
Thanksgiving vacation ends 7:30am
Last Class Day
Reading Day
Final Examinations begin 8:00am
Final Examinations end 5:30pm
Fall semester closes 5:30pm
Fall Commencement

SPRING SEMESTER 1991

Spring Semester opens 7:30am
Student Registration 8:15am-4:30pm
Classwork begins 7:30am
Mid-Semester
Spring recess begins 7:30am
Spring recess ends 7:30am
Spring break begins 7:30am
Spring break ends 7:30am
Last Class Day
Reading Day
Final Examinations begin 8:00am
Final Examinations end 5:30pm
Spring semester closes 5:30pm
Annual Commencement

SUMMER SESSION 1991

Summer Session opens 7:30am
Student Registration 8:15am-3:30pm
Classwork begins 7:30am
Independence Day Holiday
Summer Session closes 12:00 noon

*Schedule shows the regular eight-week Summer Session. Other special course sessions may be scheduled.

CLASS SESSIONS (Excluding final examinations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Semester</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For the St. Louis Graduate Center, all class sessions/holidays/examinations will coincide with the calendar of the University of Missouri-St. Louis evening program. Registration times and dates to be announced later.

The faculty is reminded of the religious and other holidays that a substantial number of students may wish to observe.
PUBLIC OCCASIONS DATES FOR 1989-90

Industry Day............................Thursday, October 5, 1989

Homecoming.............................Friday and Saturday
                                           October 6 and 7, 1989

University Day..........................Saturday, October 21, 1989

Parents Day..............................Saturday, November 11, 1989

Commencement...........................Saturday, December 16, 1989

Science and Engineering Fair.............Friday and Saturday,
                                           March 30 and 31, 1990

Spring Open House.......................Saturday, April 14, 1990

Commencement.........................Saturday, May 12, 1990

Summer Open House.......................Friday, July 13, 1990
1989-90 DATES

HOME FOOTBALL GAMES

SEPT 9
OCT 7
OCT 21
OCT 28
MAY 11

OTHER DATES

Student Council Free Day Oct. 13
ACT Test Oct. 28
Easter April 15, 1990
Spring Break March 31-April 9, 1990
EIT Exam Saturday, April 21, 1990
RECOMMENDATION

If the sum of the high school class rank percentile and aptitude examination percentile is:

120 or greater  the student is directly admissible. However, the University placement process may require remediation and reduced schedules for some students.

100 - 120  students in this range are frequently at high risk in successfully completing University level work. Students in this category may be admitted, but will receive advising, recommendations for remediation and reduced academic schedules.

less than 100  students in this range are normally admissible only after additional academic development which is not available at UMR. Students in this category may later apply to UMR through the Transfer Student Program.

Our recommendation is involved but the committee was guided by the following considerations:

a) The UMR admission policy should embody "truth in advising".

b) It should also have sufficient flexibility to accommodate students who are marginally qualified as well as direct those who are not qualified to appropriate programs so that they can develop the academic skills necessary to succeed in programs on this campus.
Admission of Transfer Students

The following minimum requirements are established for general admission of transfer students. They do not include more stringent requirements that may be established by the faculties of the individual schools, colleges, or campuses, or the requirements of special programs within some schools. It is the responsibility of the transfer student to check with the school, college, department, or program concerning more specific requirements.

1. A student who has completed fewer than 24 semester hours of college-level work must apply under the procedures for admission to the freshman class and must have at least a 2.0 overall grade point average (4.0 system) in all college-level courses attempted at previous institutions.

2. An applicant who has completed 24 or more semester hours of college-level work is eligible for admission if he or she is in good standing and has attained an overall grade point average of at least 2.0 (4.0 system) in all college-level courses attempted at previous institutions.

3. An applicant who does not meet these standards may apply by submitting to the Campus Faculty Admissions Committee such data as the committee considers appropriate. The committee, or the director of admissions acting under its direction, may determine who shall be admitted.

Importance of Math

Because of the mathematical aptitude and training required by the curricula in engineering and science at UMR, all new freshmen will take placement tests in algebra and trigonometry. These tests will be given during the summer orientation and registration sessions or during the fall registration (for those who do not register during the summer).

A high level of performance is required on both of these tests in order for you to be placed in Calculus with Analytic Geometry I the first semester. It is strongly recommended that you have a minimum of three years of high school mathematics courses (four years preferred) and that you thoroughly review algebra and trigonometry before you take these tests. The Mathematical Association of America pamphlet The Math in High School...You'll Need for College is a good guide for you and should be available from your high school counselor, teacher, or the UMR admissions office (upon written request).

Importance of Written and Oral Communication

Reports from leaders in major businesses support the need for today's graduates to have strong backgrounds in written and oral communication. No matter what your major, you will enhance your professional opportunities with a thorough knowledge of written and oral communication.

Freshman students take English I: Composition, unless they successfully "quiz out" of the course by completing an essay judged by the English faculty to be of excellent quality. Students qualify to write the essay on the basis of exceptional SAT or ACT test scores.

All departments expect their majors to take writing or speech and media studies courses beyond English I. A variety of English and speech and media studies courses are offered to students. For more depth, students may pursue minors in writing offered in English and communication in speech and media studies.

Measles Policy

In order to attend classes at any UM campus, all persons who were born after 1956 must show either documented proof of measles and rubella immunization or prove immunity or request a waiver from immunization. Students must present documentation of immunization on or before the first day of matriculation; failure to do so within 60 days can result in cancellation of the student's registration. A waiver from immunization is permitted for medical, religious, or philosophic reasons; however, in the event of a measles outbreak these individuals will be denied access to the campus and can be quarantined by the public health department.

Educational Fee Prepayment

All new applicants pay an admissions prepayment on the educational fee: $20 Missouri resident/$40 non-Missouri resident. This prepayment is nonrefundable and will be applied toward payment of your incidental fee upon enrollment.

Credit by Examination

If you are a registered UMR student and have learned enough about a subject, you may be able to get college credit for your knowledge. There are six different programs included in UMR's Credit by Examination Program.

These programs include the Advanced Placement Program, College-Level Examination Program, UMR Placement Testing Program, International Baccalaureate Program, military experiences, and departmental examinations.

The Advanced Placement Program provides for certain college-level courses to be offered in selected high schools which prepare students for examinations administered throughout the country.

In the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP), you may obtain credit for specific courses through subject examinations.

The Placement Testing Program allows high school students to receive credit for certain subject areas and to be placed in advanced classes.

Advanced placement and/or course credit will be given for course work completed by each student in the International Baccalaureate Program after each course performance of each student has been reviewed by the relevant department.

UMR will grant credit for experience gained through the armed services according to the recommendations of the Commission of Accreditation of Services Experiences of the American Council on Education.

Many of the academic departments offer departmental examinations if you feel you can quiz out of selected courses. CLEP and placement examinations are given by the Counseling and Testing Center. Departmental exams are given by the departments. The admissions office can provide you with further information on these programs.
Admission of First Time College Students

The following minimum requirements have been established for general admission of first-time college (entering freshmen) students. Certain specialized and professional undergraduate programs accept a limited number of students or have unique requirements for admission. Admission to one of the campuses of the University does not guarantee acceptance to these programs.

(A) Any high school graduate is admissible without further data upon submission of a transcript or other evidence indicating he or she meets both of the following requirements:

1. At least 14 units of credit (1 unit = 1 year in class) as follows:
   - 4 units of English, one of which may be in speech or debate. Two units emphasizing composition or writing skills are required.
   - 3 units of mathematics (algebra I and higher)
   - 2 units of science (not including general science), one of which must be a laboratory course
   - 2 units of social studies
   - 3 additional units selected from foreign language, English, mathematics (algebra I and higher), science, or social studies. Among these options, two units of foreign language are strongly recommended.

2. The sum of the student's high school class rank percentile and aptitude examination percentile must be 75 or greater. The requirement for non-Missouri students is the same as for Missouri students.

(B) Applicants who do not meet the above requirements will be considered for admission and are encouraged to apply to the director of admissions, who may later request additional data.

This form must be returned with your application.
Attachment III.B

Admission of First Time College Students

The following minimum requirements have been established for general admission of first-time college (entering freshmen) students. Certain specialized and professional undergraduate programs accept a limited number of students or have unique requirements for admission. Admission to one of the campuses of the University does not guarantee acceptance to these programs.

(A) Any high school graduate is admissible without further data upon submission of a transcript or other evidence indicating he or she meets both of the following requirements:

1. At least 14 units of credit (1 unit = 1 year in class) as follows:

   4 units of English, one of which may be in speech or debate. Two units emphasizing composition or writing skills are required.

   3 units of mathematics (algebra I and higher)

   2 units of science (not including general science), one of which must be a laboratory course

   2 units of social studies

   3 additional units selected from foreign language, English, mathematics (algebra I and higher), science, or social studies. Among these options, two units of foreign language are strongly recommended.

2. If the SUM of the high school class rank percentile and aptitude examination percentile is:

   120 or greater
   the student is directly admissible. However, the University placement process may require remediation and reduced schedules for some students.

   100 - 120
   students in this range are frequently at high risk in successfully completing University level work. Students in this category may be admitted, but will receive advising, recommendations for remediation and reduced academic schedules.

   less than 100
   students in this range are normally admissible only after additional academic development which is not available at UMR. Students in this category may later apply to UMR through the Transfer Student Program.

(B) Applicants who do not meet the above requirements will be considered for admission and are encouraged to apply to the director of admissions, who may later request additional data.

This form must be returned with your application.
The Academic Council requests that the administration explain inequities in the fee structure for:

1. courses in the College of Arts and Sciences that are co-listed with those in either the School of Engineering or the School of Mines and Metallurgy (the engineering supplemental fee)

2. courses which are normally considered to be freshmen or sophomore courses taken by students who are juniors or seniors (difference in hourly rate above and below the 60 hour level)
FROM: Madison Daily, Chairman
Student Affairs Committee

DATE: September 23, 1988

RE: Changes in the Grade Appeal Procedures

The changes to the grade appeal procedures (pages 36 and 37 of the 1988-1989 Manual of Information) is returned to the Academic Council. It was referred back to the Student Affairs Committee in the May 1988 meeting for clarification of the changes being made. The changes are respectively:

1. That the Chancellor be made the ultimate appellate level,
2. That there be placed a time limit on the hearing process,
3. That there be a manner by which multiple allegations could be addressed.

The attached document clearly shows what changes are being proposed.
8. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURE

a. The grade appeal procedure is available only for review of alleged capricious grading, and not for review of the judgement of instructors in assessing the quality of students’ work, or for questioning the stated grading criteria selected by the instructor. Only a student who alleges he or she was subjected to capricious grading may use the grade appeal procedure.

b. Capricious grading, as that term is used here, consists only of any of the following:
   1. The assignment of a semester grade to a particular student on some basis other than those related to academic performance in the section;
   2. The assignment of a semester grade to a particular student by more exacting or demanding criteria than were applied to other students in the same section. (NOTE: Additional and/or different grading criteria may be applied to graduate students enrolled for credit in a course numbered below the 400 level);
   3. The assignment of a semester grade by criteria that represents a substantial departure from the instructor's previously announced criteria.

c. The grade appeal procedure shall consist of the following steps:
   1. The initial step in the grade appeal procedure shall be for the student to review with the section instructor the semester grade, the stated grading criteria, and how the stated grading criteria were applied to determine the student’s semester grade. This step must be initiated within 30 days after the first class day of the succeeding regular academic semester. If the student and the instructor fail to reach a mutually satisfactory decision during this discussion, then the student may proceed to step 2.
   2. The student shall contact the chairperson of the instructor’s department and request their service as a mediator during a discussion between the student and the instructor. If the student and instructor fail to reach a mutually satisfactory decision during this discussion, then the student may proceed to step 3.
   3. The student shall inform the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at this point that a grade appeal is in progress. The student shall request, in writing, that the department chairperson inform the instructor and convene an ad hoc review group composed of the following: the chairperson (or designated representative) of the instructor’s school or college, and a third member to be appointed by this dean from his or her faculty. The student and instructor shall be allowed to appear before the ad hoc review group. The decision reached by the ad hoc review group on the
question of alleged capricious grading shall be binding and final on both the student and the instructor.

d. If capricious grading is substantiated by the ad hoc review group, the student shall be assigned a grade consistent with the stated grading criteria. A report of the ad hoc review group, with the student's semester grade, shall be forwarded by the department chairperson to the Registrar's Office.

3. The student shall inform the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at this point that a grade appeal is in progress. The student shall request, in writing, that the department chairperson inform the instructor and convene an ad hoc review group composed of the following: the chairperson (or designated representative) of the instructor's school or college, and a third member to be appointed by this dean from his or her faculty. The student and instructor shall be allowed to appear before the ad hoc review group. If the student and the ad hoc review group fail to reach a mutually satisfactory decision during this discussion, then the student may proceed to step 4.

4. The student may then appeal directly to the Chancellor. The student and the instructor shall be allowed to appear before the Chancellor. The decision reached by the Chancellor shall be binding and final on both the student and the instructor.

5. All actions undertaken under steps 2 through 4 must be initiated and once initiated be completed within ten working days unless waived by the Chancellor.

d. If capricious grading is substantiated by the Chancellor, the student shall be assigned a grade consistent with the stated grading criteria. A report of the Chancellor, with the student's semester grade, shall be forwarded by the department chairperson to the Registrar's Office.
Date: September 28, 1988

Memo To: Orrin Crosser, President, Academic Council

From: Catherine Riordan, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Policies

Re: Proposed Policy Statement

At the September 8th meeting of the Academic Council it was apparent that consideration of a detailed recommendation on teaching evaluation policies was premature. It would seem that two points need to be considered first: (1) Do members of the Academic Council believe that we, as the representatives of the faculty, should attempt to make recommendations to the administration concerning the evaluation of our teaching; and, (2) In general, are the issues addressed in policy proposed by the ad hoc committee close enough to the those that the faculty want to address that the Council should proceed with debate on the specifics of the proposal? If the Council would take a position on these two points, the advisability of proceeding with consideration of the committee's policy will be clear. For this reason, we would like offer the two resolutions that are attached and ask that they be voted upon by the council. If the first one fails, there would be no reason to offer the second or to go any further with the remaining documents. Should the first pass and the second fail, another committee and a new charge could be established.

Should both resolutions pass, we would like to offer the attached revision of the policy statement. The first page of that revision (Attachment A) is a general statement of policy. The second and third pages (Attachment B) include very specific recommendations. We ask that A be considered before before moving on to the specifics contained in B. Approval of A would not necessarily imply approval of B or any part of B.

Since we were an ad hoc committee and officially completed our charge on June 1, it may be inappropriate for us to offer these resolutions and revisions. However, by sending the policy back to the committee, the council seemed to be calling for additional input. We hope that this format will provide a more manageable task for the Council, so that, should a majority of the faculty want to make recommendations concerning policy, their voice can be heard. There is no way to avoid heated debates and significant compromise when grappling with issues like these, but we believe that helping to shape how our teaching is evaluated is worth the effort.

cc: Askeland
    Moss
    Ridley

an equal opportunity institution
Resolution I:

It is essential that the UMR faculty have a significant role in the development of policy concerning the evaluation of teaching. As the elected representatives of the UMR faculty, the Academic Council is the appropriate group to develop, discuss and adopt recommendations to be forwarded to the administration.

Resolution II:

In a general sense, the policy statement put forth by the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Policies (Attachment A) addresses the issues that need to be addressed by the faculty and thus is worthy of discussion, debate and/or amendment on the floor of the Academic Council.
Effective teaching is central to the mission of the university. The recognition and promotion of effective teaching are essential and therefore evaluations of teaching effectiveness must be based on sound information and procedures.

The results of these evaluations will provide a portion of the information used by the administration in personnel decisions, including promotion and tenure, salaries, and awards. As such, it is crucial that the instruments used to collect the data, the procedures by which the instruments are administered, and the evaluation methods used to analyze and utilize the information be developed with the constant advice, review, and support of the faculty. These evaluations must be broad-based, including input from student evaluations, peer evaluations, and self evaluations, with all tenure track faculty participating in the evaluations on a periodic basis. The evaluative procedure must assure that similar information can be collected, interpreted, and acted upon regardless of the department or school to which the faculty member belongs.

Equally important is that the information gathered by the evaluations will be used by faculty members for instructional development and, therefore, any evaluation program must include resources for the improvement and further development of teaching. The instruments must be flexible enough to permit faculty members to request evaluation questions specific to their personal needs in addition to any standard evaluation questions.

The results of the evaluations will be confidential and available only to the faculty member being evaluated, the chair of that department, the dean of that school, and the vice-chancellor for academic affairs. In addition, the results will be available to committees reviewing promotion and tenure decisions. Faculty members may release their evaluations to other groups if they choose.
Specific Recommendations

1. Faculty will be recognized and rewarded for improving the quality of their teaching or for maintaining a high quality of teaching.

2. When judging teacher effectiveness, any special demands placed on that faculty member by the department will be described and taken into account when interpreting the evaluation. For example, if department chairs instruct faculty to use a particular grading curve, regardless of the quality of the class, this will be noted and taken into account.

3. Student evaluations will include the results of a recognized evaluative instrument that will provide, if possible, national norms by discipline, class size, and student level.

4. Peer evaluations will employ both curriculum review and classroom visitations.

5. Evaluations will assure that personalities do not unduly affect the evaluation process.

6. The faculty member will be made aware of the results of the peer evaluation and have the opportunity to respond to unwarranted criticism or to request additional evaluation.

7. The department chair will be responsible for combining all of the data (student evaluations, peer evaluations, and self evaluations) into a single report, along with a personal evaluation of how the faculty member's teaching effectiveness fits into the department's expectations.

8. All tenure track faculty, regardless of rank, must undergo periodic evaluations.

   Tenured faculty will be evaluated every third year. This evaluation would include student, peer and self evaluations. Student evaluations will be done in each course number taught by that faculty member during that one academic year. Peer evaluation of only one class during that year need be done. The self evaluation should be an overall evaluation of all teaching activities during that year.

   Untenured faculty will be evaluated each year. Student evaluations will be done in each course number each year.

   Non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair.

   Individual faculty members can request additional evaluations. Less extensive evaluations (i.e., just student or self evaluations) are encouraged for all faculty on a continuous basis.

9. The procedures, including copies of the various evaluative tools and procedures, will be made available to the faculty members prior to the beginning of the semester in which the evaluation is to take place.
10. Experience with the evaluative tools and procedures must be gained before they are used for personnel decisions. Use of evaluations for personnel decisions will be implemented only after a representative cross-section of at least one third of the tenured faculty have been evaluated. Teaching evaluations will not be implemented for personnel decisions if the only faculty being evaluated are those up for tenure, promotion or teaching awards.

11. Evaluation instruments and procedures will be reviewed by an appropriate faculty committee before any evaluation begins. Furthermore, an appropriate faculty committee will be apprised of the methods by which the evaluation results are to be analyzed and used by the administration. A mechanism for continued review by a faculty committee will be established.

12. Student scores on standardized or department-level achievement tests will not be used to evaluate individual faculty members.

13. Results of evaluations will not be aggregated for comparisons of departments or colleges.
September 26, 1988

Dear Chairperson:

The Department of History at UMC, gravely concerned by the deteriorating salary situation throughout the University system, has passed the enclosed series of resolutions. We hope that you will share them with the members of your department, discuss them in meetings, and enact the same or similar resolutions. We believe the time has come to act. We hope you will join us.

Sincerely yours,

Gerard H. Clarfield
Chairman, History

GHC/nt

Enclosure
HISTORY DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO
THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET CRISIS

Improving UMC faculty and staff salaries is clearly not a major priority for Missouri public officials and university administrators. Even release of the withheld portion of the university budget would only bring raises up to the 1987-88 inflation rate. That would still leave salaries far behind the Big Eight/Big Ten averages, which supposedly constitute the salary goals of this university.

Moreover, during the past week we have learned that the curators intend to raise our medical insurance costs by 28%, thereby obliterating a large portion of our recent "raise". And, to add insult to injury, we have learned that certain top administrators and a fictitiously-elite minority of UMC faculty have been rewarded with the 8-10% salary increases which we were assured were prohibited by budgetary constraints affecting all faculty, staff, and administrators alike.

It is time for faculty action to address our common grievances. Once again our administrators urge that we maintain or increase faculty and staff productivity in order to demonstrate our worth to Missouri's citizens and public officials. But this latest call to achieve still more for yet less is nothing but a summons to continue our unwitting exploitation. For experience shows that the leadership of this state and this university is either unwilling or unable to deliver fair and adequate compensation to a faculty and staff that for decades have provided students and the entire state with service far higher in quality than the pay-levels for faculty and staff warrant.

In fact, the university's success in maintaining a relatively high-quality set of academic programs has been paid for largely out of the pockets of faculty and staff by a systematic and long-continuing underpayment which worsens each year. Over the last two decades, for example, the salary of an average member of the History Department has fallen at a rate of 1.1% per year when inflation is taken into account. We estimate that, if present economic trends continue, any of our department's present members who is unfortunate enough to end his or her career at UMC will be deprived of at least one-fourth to one-half a million dollars in gross salary and retirement benefits. Those projected figures do not take account of real income lost through inflation, so they represent only part of the considerable price we will pay for the privilege of working at UMC. Ironically, then, we find that our sense of professional integrity and our dedication to quality teaching and research have been systematically manipulated to our economic disadvantage by those who have little respect for the former and no real intention or need to give us fair compensation for the latter.

None of our political or administrative leaders will explain why a state that ranks 49th in financial support of higher education has the right to demand anything better than a 49th-rank state university. Nor will they explain why we must continue our blind complicity in the salary-allocation, hiring, and promotion policies which maintain university quality far above 49th rank. No wonder! The harsh reality is that these very policies are the primary mechanisms which enable our leaders to tout UMC as a "great university" while providing minimal state investment in this institution. Thus, the ultimate irony is that the UMC faculty itself is complicit in policies which actually remove all incentives and obviate all necessity for Missouri public officials and university administrators to increase funding and salaries to levels commensurate with our efforts and achievements.

Therefore, the Department of History at the University of Missouri-Columbia rejects those specific policies which are economically and politically injurious to faculty and staff interests, and urges that other departments, schools, colleges, and academic units at UMC and our sister campuses join us in the following actions:
1. Because the so-called merit pay system, operating always in a context of woefully inadequate overall salaries, rewards no one fairly and serves only to stimulate levels of productivity which greatly and unjustifiably exceed the levels of faculty and staff compensation, and because "merit" pay raises, if they can ever be defended, only make sense if they are added to cost-of-living increases, which workers in any socially responsible institution have a right to expect;

Therefore, we refuse to allocate faculty/staff salary funds according to "merit" criteria except in those years when the general percentage raise exceeds the inflation-rate for the previous 12 months, and in such years we propose to distribute on a "merit" basis only the percentage difference between the overall salary increase and the inflation-rate.

2. Because the university systematically depresses its funding needs for faculty salaries through policies that encourage the flight of senior professors and their replacement by even more poorly-paid junior faculty;

Therefore, we refuse to automatically hire faculty replacements at salary and rank-levels lower than those attained by our departed colleagues.

3. Because the current high quality of the university, in the face of wholly inadequate funding, results in part from the uncompensated extra efforts of a dedicated faculty and staff;

Therefore we propose to:

a. Encourage department members to avoid all "extra" uncompensated work until salary grievances are redressed; such work includes service on university committees and task-forces; teaching additional courses and accepting classroom overloads; student advising outside of posted office-hours or during summers (when not teaching); and speeches before alumni or civic groups, except on the topic of the crisis at UMC.

b. Refuse cooperation with new "assessment" schemes which attempt to increase faculty productivity without commensurate compensation and which serve as fraudulent substitutes for maintaining or improving actual quality through adequate funding.

c. Take steps to insure that the university's salary crisis receives maximum publicity, nationally as well as statewide, and assist underpaid faculty and staff to locate better positions elsewhere in institutions where salaries are commensurate with achievement.

d. Support actions by staff protesting salaries and by students concerned about the threatened erosion of the university's quality and reputation.

4. Finally, because the successful pursuit of faculty goals may require major institutional as well as policy changes;

Therefore, we urge a radical reassessment of those structural relationships between faculty and administration which have developed over time into a system riddled with unequal power-relations and a degree of administrative unaccountability which has proven highly damaging to faculty interests and integrity.
Omin:
Don Siehr will replace me at the Oct 13 Fac Council Meeting.

[Signature]

Blum
MEMO TO: Orrin K. Crosser
FROM: Al Crosbie
RE: My Proxy

Don Cronin is my proxy for the Academic Council Meeting on Thursday October 13, 1988.

Alfred L. Crosbie
Professor of Mechanical Engineering
President C. Peter Magrath, in a report to the board, said he hopes the University can channel frustrations about inadequate compensation into a constructive outcome for faculty and staff, the University and the state. "There is anguish and pain and frustration for faculty who are concerned with the well-being of the University and its vital role in our state," Magrath said. "I am in complete agreement with those who advocate that the time has come not for words but for action." Magrath told curators about current efforts to build a sharper awareness that existing state resources are too low. "Salaries have been and will, even more in the months ahead, be our central priority. All of us must work harder and communicate more clearly this need."

Two changes in the medical benefit program are effective Jan. 1. The first is a 28 percent increase in premiums, necessary because of rising medical costs, greater use of the plan and decreasing reserve funds. The University System's contribution, which funds two-thirds of the medical plan, will increase the same percentage. Also, utilization review of all in-patient hospitalizations is now mandatory. No penalties will be assessed during the first three months of 1989. After that, failure to comply with utilization review will result in lower co-payments by the plan -- 70 percent instead of 80 percent of covered expenses or, if an employee has met out-of-pocket expenses for the year, 90 percent of covered expenses instead of 100 percent.

The UM System's balance sheet, which reflects the University System's overall financial status, continues to be strong, reported James T. McGill, vice president for administrative affairs. The report shows continued efforts to reallocate from administration to primary missions by reducing administrative expenses, System administration supporting services and institutional support costs throughout the UM System. "To say that the University is effectively managing its resources is not the same as saying it has adequate resources," McGill said. "While the accomplishment of the goals and objectives of the long-range plan depends upon effective financial management, it depends even more on the availability of sufficient resources."

Fourteen UM System faculty members will visit the University of the Western Cape in South Africa this academic year as part of the University System's South Africa Educational Program launched in January 1986. The faculty members will lecture, provide curriculum and technical assistance and conduct research there. Ron Turner, special assistant to Magrath, told curators that of the 36 exchanges already completed between the UM System and the University of the Western Cape, 21 have been hosted by UM System campuses.

The amount of UM System funds invested in companies that do business in South Africa declined almost 20 percent during the first six months of the five-year divestment program, Treasurer Don Holm reported.

Next meeting: Nov. 3-4, UM-Columbia
MEMO TO:  Academic Council Report  
FROM:  UMR Curricula Committee  
DATE:  November 22, 1988  
SUBJECT:  UMR Curricula Committee Meeting of November 17, 1988

Reviewed ECl's:

EC1 135, Nuclear Engineering 301, Radiation Protection Engineering. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisites: NE 205.

EC1 151, Engineering Management 301, Intelligent Manufacturing. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989 semester. Prerequisites: Consent of Instructor.

EC1 150, Engineering Management 401, Advanced Computer Integrated Manufacturing. Course approved Sept. 22, 1988, meeting. A change of credit hours were approved this meeting. From 2 hr. lec. and 2 hr. lab. to 2 hr. lec. and 1 hr. lab.

EC1 181, Chemistry 201, Inorganic Chemistry Lab. Approved 1 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: Preceded or accompanied by Chem 237.

CC1 3013, Geology & Geophysics 000. Approved change in curriculum. The courses for "Geology and Geophysics" have been merged into one curriculum to reflect the single program in "Geology and Geophysics" and to define the emphasis areas, one in Geophysics and one in Geochemistry.


CC1 2999, Mining Engineering 218, Mine Atmosphere Control. Approved change in credit hours from (2 hr. lec; 2 hr. lab.) to (3 hr. lec; 1 hr. lab).

CC1 3002, Mathematics & Statistics 000. Approved change in curriculum. Delete footnote 6 in the Mathematics (applied) curricula description. Renumber the following footnotes.
Attachment III.C.1

CC1 3003, Mathematics & Statistics 000. Approved change in curriculum. Changes are proposed in the way courses are listed in the graduate catalog. Specifically, mathematics courses would be listed under Mathematics and statistics courses under Statistics. Under the headings of Statistics in the Area of Study and the Faculty sections of the graduate catalog, readers would be referred to the already existing heading of Mathematics and Statistics.

CC1 3004, Mathematics & Statistics 000. Approved change in curriculum. (Attachment with CC1 form, page 70., delete STATISTICS entry.) Changes are proposed in the way courses are listed in the undergraduate catalog. Specifically, mathematics courses would be listed under Mathematics and statistics courses under Statistics.

CC1 3005, English 233, Literature and Folklore in the Industrial Age (1850-1950). Approved new course. 3 credit hours. Prerequisites: English 1 and a semester of college literature. Description reads: Literary and cultural studies of self-discovery and commitment in the industrial era (1850-1950). Interdisciplinary.

CC1 3006, Chemistry 013, General Chemistry for Chemistry Majors. Approved deletion.

CC1 3007, English 225, Science Fiction Literature. Approved change in course title from Science Fiction and Fantasy Literature. Change in description reads: A study of the fiction which represents the development and techniques of science fiction genre. (English 1 and one semester of college literature).

CC1 3008, English 226, Utopian Literature. Approved new course. 3 credit hours. Prerequisites: English 1 and a semester of college literature. Description reads: A study of the development, themes, and techniques of the Utopian genre primarily narratives from Plato and More to the present.

CC1 3009, English 227, Fantasy Literature. Approved new course. 3 credit hours. Prerequisites: English 1 and a semester of college literature. Description reads: A study of the development of fantasy literature in the 19th and 20th centuries. The primary focus will be novels, especially the work of J. R. R. Tolkien.

CC1 3010, English 133, The Literature and Folklore of Technology. Approved deletion.


CC1 3015, Civil Engineering 345, Construction Methods. Approved change in prerequisites from CE 215, 216, 218, 245 each with grade of "C" or better to CE 245 with grade of "C" or better.

David Oglesby, Chairman Curricula Committee
MEMO TO: Academic Council Report
FROM: UMR Curricula Committee
DATE: November 22, 1988
SUBJECT: UMR Curricula Committee Meeting of November 17, 1988

Reviewed EC1's:

EC1 135, Nuclear Engineering 301, Radiation Protection Engineering. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisites: NE 205.

EC1 151, Engineering Management 301, Intelligent Manufacturing. Approved 3 hour course for Winter 1989 semester. Prerequisites: Consent of Instructor.

EC1 150, Engineering Management 401, Advanced Computer Integrated Manufacturing. Course approved Sept. 22, 1988, meeting. A change of credit hours were approved this meeting. From 2 hr. lec. and 2 hr. lab. to 2 hr. lec. and 1 hr. lab.

EC1 181, Chemistry 201, Inorganic Chemistry Lab. Approved 1 hour course for Winter 1989. Prerequisite: Preceded or accompanied by Chem 237.

CC1 3013, Geology & Geophysics 000. Approved change in curriculum. The courses for "Geology and Geophysics" have been merged into one curriculum to reflect the single program in "Geology and Geophysics" and to define the emphasis areas, one in Geophysics and one in Geochemistry.


CC1 2999, Mining Engineering 218, Mine Atmosphere Control. Approved change in credit hours from (2 hr. lec; 2 hr. lab.) to (3 hr. lec; 1 hr. lab).

CC1 3002, Mathematics & Statistics 000. Approved change in curriculum. Delete footnote 6 in the Mathematics (applied) curricula description. Renumber the following footnotes.
CCI 3003, Mathematics & Statistics 000. Approved change in curriculum. Changes are proposed in the way courses are listed in the graduate catalog. Specifically, mathematics courses would be listed under Mathematics and statistics courses under Statistics. Under the headings of Statistics in the Area of Study and the Faculty sections of the graduate catalog, readers would be referred to the already existing heading of Mathematics and Statistics.

CCI 3004, Mathematics & Statistics 000. Approved change in curriculum. (Attachment with CCI form, page 70., delete STATISTICS entry.) Changes are proposed in the way courses are listed in the undergraduate catalog. Specifically, mathematics courses would be listed under Mathematics and statistics courses under Statistics.

CCI 3005, English 233, Literature and Folklore in the Industrial Age (1850-1950). Approved new course. 3 credit hours. Prerequisites: English 1 and a semester of college literature. Description reads: Literary and cultural studies of self-discovery and commitment in the industrial era (1850-1950). Interdisciplinary.

CCI 3006, Chemistry 013, General Chemistry for Chemistry Majors. Approved deletion.

CCI 3007, English 225, Science Fiction Literature. Approved change in course title from Science Fiction and Fantasy Literature. Change in description reads: A study of the fiction which represents the development and techniques of science fiction genre. (English 1 and one semester of college literature)

CCI 3008, English 226, Utopian Literature. Approved new course. 3 credit hours. Prerequisites: English 1 and a semester of college literature. Description reads: A study of the development, themes, and techniques of the Utopian genre primarily narratives from Plato and More to the present.

CCI 3009, English 227, Fantasy Literature. Approved new course. 3 credit hours. Prerequisites: English 1 and a semester of college literature. Description reads: A study of the development of fantasy literature in the 19th and 20th centuries. The primary focus will be novels, especially the work of J. R. R. Tolkien.

CCI 3010, English 133, The Literature and Folklore of Technology. Approved deletion.


CCI 3015, Civil Engineering 345, Construction Methods. Approved change in prerequisites from CE 215, 216, 218, 245 each with grade of "C" or better to CE 245 with grade of "C" or better.

David Oglesby, Chairman Curricula Committee
The December 8, 1988, meeting of the Academic Council was called to order at 1:33 p.m. by Prof. Donald Askeland, Academic Council President-Elect. The following substitutions were noted: Prof. Bruce Selberg for Prof. Don Cronin and Prof. Samarayake for Prof. Jagdish Patel. Prof. Clyde Wade moved to approve the October 7th special meeting minutes. The motion was seconded and approved. Prof. Lance Williams moved to approve the October 13th regular meeting minutes as amended:

A. SUBSTITUTIONS. Prof. Don Cronin was not substituting for Prof. Al Crosbie. Both are Council members.

B. ADMISSIONS AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE - ADMISSIONS PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (III.B.1.a). "100-200" should instead be "100-120."

C. VICE-CHANCELLOR PARK'S REPORT - TEACHING EVALUATION POLICY (II.C.2 Paragraph 3). Vice-Chancellor Park also reported on the offer to pay for the ideas examination material used by graduate student and faculty volunteers in a pilot study ...

D. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURE (Attachment III.E.1).

1. B.C.3. ... and convene an ad hoc review group composed of the following: the chairperson (or designated representative) of the instructor's department, the dean (or the dean's designated representative) of the instructor's school or college, and a third member to be appointed by this dean from his or her faculty ...

2. B.D. ... A report from the Chancellor, with the student's semester grade, shall be forwarded by the department chairperson to the Registrar's Office.

E. PUBLIC OCCASIONS COMMITTEE - 1990-91 CALENDAR REPORT (III.A.1). ... Prof. Glen Haddock seconded this motion, which failed. The motion to amend the start date for each semester failed. The motion to approve the calendar as originally proposed by the Public Occasions Committee carried. Prof. C. Dale Elifrits seconded the motion which carried.
A. PRESIDENT'S REPORT. President-Elect Donald Askeland, substituting for President Orrin Crosser, indicated that President Crosser, the chairs from the UM campuses, and the chair of ICFC met with the Board of Curators in special session on December 1. Each campus representative presented topics of concern before the Board. Prof. Burkholder from UMSL stressed inadequate funding, Prof. Kimber from UMC discussed faculty government, Prof. Mirkin from UMKC and President Crosser from UMR remarked on the University's mission and the differing missions of the four campuses toward higher quality higher education. Prof. Doyle of ICFC discussed the advantages of the four campus system—the reach it provides to fill the university's mission throughout the state—describing it as the "four-in-one system." President Crosser reported that Curator Raven pointed out the importance of dialogue between the Board and the Faculty and cautioned the media from reporting comments made in "the heat of battle in open meetings."

President-Elect Askeland on behalf of President Crosser also reminded the Council Committees that in lieu of fewer Council meetings speedy action is necessary to have a productive year.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES.
1. FEE STRUCTURE INEQUITIES — M. Jischke
   (Attachment II.B.1)
2. ADMISSION PERFORMANCE STANDARDS — M. Jischke
   (Attachment II.B.2)

C. REFERRALS.
1. FEE STRUCTURE INEQUITIES (COURSE CO-LISTINGS) to the Curricula Committee
2. FEE STRUCTURE INEQUITIES (STUDENT RANK) to the Budgetary Affairs Committee
3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE to the Personnel Committee
4. PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHING RANK AND/OR TENURE to the Personnel Committee
ident-Elect Askeland recapped the status of the Ad Hoc Committee report, and Prof. Lance Williams moved for adoption of yet another substitute policy (see attachment) that leaves evaluation policy to individual departments with the possibility of Faculty intervention through the Academic Council. Prof. Catherine Riordan seconded the motion which failed.

The October 13th substitute motion offered by Prof. Williams was again considered by Council: "This Council recommends that this issue be considered a department responsibility." The question was called and this substitute motion, too, failed.

Resolution II of the October 13th Ad Hoc Committee report was then reconsidered and approved: "In a general sense, the policy statement put forth by the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation Policies (Attachment A) addresses the issues that need to be addressed by the faculty and thus is worthy of discussion, debate and/or amendment on the floor of the Academic Council."

Attachment A, mentioned in the above, was duly considered for approval. Editorially, Prof. Glen Haddock requested that the phrase "personal needs" in the third paragraph, last sentence, be replaced by "course objectives." On the basis of departmental differences, Prof. Frank Blum moved that the last sentence in the second paragraph be removed. Prof. Thomas Herrick provided the second, and the amendment passed. Prof. Curt Adams moved to add the following sentence to the end of the third paragraph of Attachment A: "Faculty have the right to provide additional information or explanation of evaluation results." Prof. Williams seconded the amending motion, which passed. After the question was called, the policy, as amended, was approved.

Prof. Haddock also moved to forward Attachment B to the appropriate parties without Council approval. Prof. Williams provided the second and the motion carried.

The Ad Hoc Committee members were thanked for their dedication and hard work.

(Attachment III.A.1)
B. ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT.

1. ASSESSMENT UPDATE. Prof. Robert Laudon reported that the Committee has met four times since its last report before Council. The Committee has reviewed and discussed the Assessment Day highlights for 1987-88. A copy has been sent to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. A resolution for Council consideration has been drafted; but with the arrival of two documents (UMC’s Faculty Assessment Task Force final report and the Statement of Assessment Principles adopted by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges) which need review by Committee members, presentation will be postponed until February 2. (Attachment III.B.1)

2. ASSESSMENT DATES, 1989. The dates of April 5, 6, and 8 have been set for Sophomore and Junior assessment.

C. CURRICULA.

1. REPORT NO. 3, 1988-89. Prof. David Oglesby moved for approval of the Curricula Committee’s report. Prof. C. Dale Elifrits seconded the motion, which carried. (Attachment III.C.1)

D. RULES, PROCEDURE AND AGENDA.

1. ELECTION OF UM BENEFITS SPECIAL COMMITTEE NOMINEE. Prof. Lance Williams moved for the election of Prof. Don Myers and Prof. Clyde Wade seconded the motion. Prof. Bruce Selberg was nominated from the floor. Prof. Myers, who was elected by Council, received 15 votes while Prof. Selberg received 12.

Prof. Williams moved for a vote of affirmation in nominating Profs. Ralph Alexander and Dan Babcock for one seat on the Committee to be filled by Vice-President James McGill. The motion was seconded by Prof. Glen Haddock and passed.

2. SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY. Prof. Williams moved for approval of the following policy: "The University of Missouri-Rolla administration, as a matter of university policy, grant one-semester sabbatical leaves, at full pay, to eligible faculty members." Prof. Vincent Roach provided the second. Prof. Jerome Westphal suggested an editorial change--
inserting the word "may" before "grant." This suggestion was accepted and the Council voted to approve this policy. (Attachment III.D.2)

E. STUDENT AFFAIRS.
1. CONSTITUTION - PAKISTAN STUDENT ASSOCIATION. Prof. Daily moved for Council approval of the Pakistan Student Association constitution. The motion was seconded by Prof. Clyde Wade and passed. (Attachment III.E.1)

The meeting adjourned at 3:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Clyde G. Wade
Secretary

Attachments: II.B.1
II.B.2
III.A.1
III.B.1
III.C.1
III.D.2
III.E.1

*Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.*
November 18, 1988

MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Clyde Wade  
FROM: John T. Park  
      Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
SUBJECT: Minutes of Academic Council Meeting 10/13/88  
         Section XVIII, C.2.

Please note that my offer to pay for use of the IDEAS exam from Kansas State was to graduate student and faculty volunteers. I assume that the students, themselves, would not be volunteers in that they would be asked to complete the form if their teacher asked to use it.

The purpose of this offer to volunteers is to give the campus some experience as to the utility and value of the IDEAS exam before it is used on a more widespread basis. I've heard good reports about this particular teaching evaluation instrument but, until we have some experience, we really don't know whether it is something we would want to use or not.

Ellen Leininger indicates that there are some volunteers, although not too many. I think that there will be enough for us to get a feel as to how this particular evaluation instrument works, how much trouble it is for the students, how long it takes to get it scored, if the information that comes back is useful.

Thanks again for your assistance.

JTP/vr
process of establishing the interview procedure. The size of this Committee will probably be increased to interview a larger number of applicants within a corresponding time period. Another committee, chaired by Prof. Wayne Cogell and working with honor students, will organize the visitation process.

2. TEACHING EVALUATION. Teaching evaluation has two purposes, as stated by Vice-Chancellor Park: one is providing information for self-improvement; the other is providing information for administrative evaluation. Any evaluation process involves four parts: self, student (consumer), peer, and administrative. At present, a faculty Ad Hoc Committee is studying evaluation in the area of self-improvement, and a subcommittee of department chairs is studying administrative evaluation.

Dr. Ellen Leininger has studied evaluation literature and the available evaluation instruments. The result is a draft of possible evaluation instruments sent to Department Chairs for comment only. Vice-Chancellor Park assured the Council that no imposed evaluation would come from his office; however, he will promote and support the Faculty and the Department Chairs with regards to their studies and decisions in this matter.

Vice-Chancellor Park also reported on the offer to pay for student volunteers in a pilot study of the Ideas Exam from Kansas State University. Even though meaningless statistically, it would allow comparison with other evaluation instruments in order to gauge effectiveness.

XVIII, 2 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

A. PUBLIC OCCASIONS.
1. CALENDAR, 1990-91. Prof. Clyde Wade moved for a rule suspension in order to allow the Public Occasions Committee report immediate presentation. Prof. Lance Williams seconded the motion, which passed.

Prof. Jerry Bayless presented his Committee's 1990-91 academic calendar proposal. Prof. Glen Haddock moved for approval, and Prof. C. Dale
ATTENTION
ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
DECEMBER 8 MEETING

Please be sure to attend or to obtain a substitute for the Thursday, December 8 meeting of the Academic Council. The attached agenda includes several crucial resolutions that will be discussed in this final meeting of 1988. The proposed policy for evaluation of effective teaching will be discussed and acted upon; your input is essential. A policy governing the appropriate use of assessment results will be presented.

For your convenience, fewer Council meetings have been scheduled for 1988–89. Therefore your attendance at these meetings is particularly important. In addition, your active participation in the discussion is desired. Perhaps the enclosed "Parliamentary Procedure...at a glance" will be of assistance.

Donald R. Askeland
President-elect
RESOLUTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE UMR ACADEMIC COUNCIL

It is the opinion of the Academic Council at UMR that assessment should be used primarily as a tool for internal evaluation. It is appropriate to use assessment to identify strengths, weaknesses, truths, and myths within an institution or within a department. It is not appropriate to use assessment as a "score card" for comparison of institutions or departments, and it is not appropriate to allocate state funds based upon comparisons of assessment results. As such, assessment results should be made available to the faculty, but there is little value in the distribution of results to the general public.

RATIONALE

Although
(1) Sentence 2 of the ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF CURATORS reads "Institutional evaluation will identify strengths and weaknesses of our general education programs relative to those of peer institutions, and although ...
(2) UMR recognizes the value and importance of assessment and accountability to the public, and although
(3) Based upon the 1988 results it appears that it may be to the advantage of UMR to compare institutions, it is the opinion of the UMR Academic Council that assessment should not be used to compare institutions or departments. If assessment is used to "keep score" and financial appropriations are tied to the "scores," then universities and departments will have no choice but to teach toward the standardized tests.

We, as members of the UMR faculty, recognize that there is a strong feeling among the general public, among government officials and among the Board of Curators that higher education needs to be accountable for the funds that it receives. However, this same group of people needs to be aware that assessment results may be misinterpreted and abused.

Recent conferences on assessment have underscored two particular areas where comparison of assessment results from standardized tests may be very misleading. The following two areas are particularly susceptible to abuse:

1. It is very dangerous to use standardized tests to compare departments or universities, simply because different departments and different universities have different missions. Many leading and innovative or "frontier" departments are proud of the fact that their emphasis area is unique in the nation. Such top departments are likely to fare poorly on standardized tests because the core of their curriculum is not standard—it is not taught anywhere else and the subject matter will not appear on standardized tests. Standardized tests simply cannot treat different emphasis areas fairly.

2. Value added, defined as a comparison of what students know when they enter a university relative to what they know when they graduate, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain statistically and interpret from standardized tests.
Memorandum to: Lance Williams, Chair RP&A Committee
Re: One Semester Sabbaticals
From: Lawrence O. Christensen, Chair History and Political Science

Lance:

I request that the Academic Council consider the following resolution: That the University of Missouri-Rolla administration, as a matter of university policy, grant one-semester sabbatical leaves, at full pay, to eligible faculty members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Do This:</th>
<th>You Say This:</th>
<th>May You Interrupt the Speaker</th>
<th>Do You Need a Second?</th>
<th>Is It Debatable?</th>
<th>Can It Be Amended?</th>
<th>What Vote Is Needed?</th>
<th>Can It Be Reconsidered?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJOURN MEETING</td>
<td>&quot;I move that we adjourn&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALL AN INTERMISSION</td>
<td>&quot;I move that we recess for...&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLAIN ABOUT HEAT, NOISE, ETC.</td>
<td>&quot;I rise to a question of privilege&quot;</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO VOTE</td>
<td>NO (usually)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPEND FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF AN ISSUE</td>
<td>&quot;I move to table the motion&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END DEBATE AND AMENDMENTS</td>
<td>&quot;I move the previous question&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTPONE DISCUSSION FOR A CERTAIN TIME</td>
<td>&quot;I move to postpone the discussion until...&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIVE CLOSER STUDY OF SOMETHING</td>
<td>&quot;I move to refer the matter to committee&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMEND A MOTION</td>
<td>&quot;I move to amend the motion by...&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCE BUSINESS</td>
<td>&quot;I move that...&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Motions Listed Above Are in Order of Precedence... Below There Is No Order...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Do This:</th>
<th>You Say This:</th>
<th>May You Interrupt the Speaker</th>
<th>Do You Need a Second?</th>
<th>Is It Debatable?</th>
<th>Can It Be Amended?</th>
<th>What Vote Is Needed?</th>
<th>Can It Be Reconsidered?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROTEST BREACH OF RULES OR CONDUCT</td>
<td>&quot;I rise to a point of order&quot;</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO VOTE</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTE ON A RULING OF THE CHAIR</td>
<td>&quot;I appeal the chair's decision&quot;</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPEND RULES TEMPORARILY</td>
<td>&quot;I move to suspend the rules so that...&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVOID CONSIDERING AN IMPROPER MATTER</td>
<td>&quot;I object to consideration of this motion&quot;</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>- 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERIFY A VOICE VOTE BY HAVING MEMBERS STAND</td>
<td>&quot;I call for a division&quot; or &quot;Division!&quot;</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO VOTE</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUEST INFORMATION</td>
<td>&quot;Point of information&quot;</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO VOTE</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKE UP A MATTER PREVIOUSLY TABLED</td>
<td>&quot;I move to take from the table...&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO VOTE</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECONSIDER A Hasty ACTION</td>
<td>&quot;I move to reconsider the vote on...&quot;</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Unless vote on question is not yet taken.
- Unless the committee has already taken up the subject.
- Only if the motion to be amended is debatable.
- Except in doubtful cases.
- A majority vote in negative needed to reverse ruling of chair.
- A 2/3 vote in negative needed to prevent consideration of main motion.
- Only if the main question or motion was not, in fact, considered.
- Only if motion to be reconsidered is debatable.
November 22, 1988

MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Don Askeland

FROM: Martin C. Jischke
        Chancellor

SUBJECT: Fee Structure Inequities Resolution

The request for information from the Academic Council addresses two issues. The first issue concerns the engineering supplemental fee. It is a fact that the engineering supplemental fee is attached to all engineering courses. As a result, if a student enrolls in a course which is dual listed between a department in the College of Arts and Sciences and a department in the School of Engineering or a department in the School of Mines and Metallurgy, the fees will be different than if the student enrolls in a course listed as a College of Arts and Sciences course rather than as a School of Engineering or School of Mines and Metallurgy course.

The engineering supplemental fee structure was established by the Board of Curators, and any change in the fee structure would require approval by the Board of Curators. Quite frankly, the campus cannot afford the lost income which would result in a reduction in the engineering supplemental fee. This does not appear to be an appropriate time to discuss changes in the engineering supplemental fee structure.

It would seem advisable to pursue campus solutions to this equity question. This question would appear to be an appropriate topic for the Curricula Committee. It may be possible to accomplish the positive goals involved in co-listing courses without raising questions of equity. The number of adjustments which would need to be made would not be excessive.

The second topic addressed in the request for information from the Academic Council is in regard to the Board of Curators' current fee structure which bases fees on the student's class standing. It is quite possible that a senior taking a freshman course would pay upper level fees for a course, whereas a freshman taking a senior level course would pay lower level fees.
Any changes to this fee structure must also be approved by the Board of Curators. Any changes would need to be carefully studied to assure that it was revenue neutral. One possible solution would be the adoption of a fee structure which is based on course level rather than on class standing of the student enrolled. It might be necessary to examine departmental curricula to be sure that the fee structure based on the class level would not result in students attempting to avoid upper division course work. With appropriate cautions, however, the fee structure based on class level would seem to be possible.

Any recommendations for changes to the current fee structure should be submitted through the Budgetary Affairs Committee of the Academic Council. Those recommendations will be given careful consideration by the campus administration in preparing its recommendations for the General Officers, who are responsible for developing a fee structure recommendation for approval by the Board of Curators.

I share your concerns about the equity and appearance of equity in the fee structure. Any changes in the fee structure must, however, be made carefully to avoid undesirable side effects. I assure you that the concerns of the Academic Council will be given thorough consideration as recommendations for future fee structures are prepared.

MCJ/bjc
MEMORANDUM TO: Vice Chancellor John T. Park
FROM: Myron Parry
DATE: November 21, 1988
SUBJECT: Academic Council Request – Fees for Co-listed Courses

John, there are a number of co-listed courses within a specific department, such as Mechanical Engineering and Aerospace Engineering. However, the courses do not cross School or College boundaries and, as a consequence, the student fees remain the same. In checking for those co-listed courses that do cross School or College boundaries, I have only found the following:

Chem E 377  Met 377  Cer Engr 377  and Phys 377
Chem E 353  Chem 325
Aero E 337  Mech E 337 and Phys 337

There are several experimental courses listed in the 1989 Winter semester schedule that are co-listed but, again, they are not affected by a fee differential since they are all under the School of Engineering. In any case, the fee structure, as approved by the Board of Curators, requires an Engineering Supplemental fee to be charged for all courses taught by the School of Engineering and the School of Mines and Metallurgy except Geology and Geophysics courses. Unfortunately, students frequently drop the engineering course registration to add the non-engineering co-listed course to the consternation of the faculty. The fees are considerably less and the instruction is the same. The only penalty is what is shown on the transcript.

Unfortunately, there are several very large groups of students in which the inequity cannot be avoided, e.g. lower division, upper division and graduate student fees. In a particular course, there could be 3 different in-state fees to students receiving the same instruction and the same entry on their transcript. It is very difficult to deal with fees based on student level. For example, we have just mailed out bills for the 1989 Winter term. To correctly bill the student we must project his level at the end of this semester. A dropped or failed course can change this projection. On the other hand, the numerous Summer add-on courses can raise the level of the student requiring the Cashier's Office to rebill the student after the fees have been paid and the semester has been underway for 3-4 weeks. It has been the practice to not rebill the students if the transfer credit reaches UMR after the fourth week of class.

There are a number of situations that have surfaced with the lower and upper
division fee differential. In one case, an excellent student (GPA = 3.8) deliberately reduced her schedule to 13 hours to avoid going into Junior standing. However, she had overlooked the fact that we had given her credit for Math 4 and 6 by virtue of her entrance exams and, as a consequence, she was at the Junior level and didn't realize it. Obviously, it caused the student to have bad feelings about the situation. I attempted to bring the situation on Math 4 and 6 to the attention of Professor Garver and the Counseling Center seeking to allow the students the choice of taking this credit or not receiving credit. The procedure remains the same today.

In another situation, the "Fundamentals of Engineering" course taught by extension gives the student one hour of credit upon enrolling at UMR. However, we do not accept the credit towards a degree and the student is still required to enroll in Freshman Engineering 10. In several cases, this course has caused the difference between lower division and upper division fees. I would recommend discontinuing the practice of giving one hour of credit for this course since it can in no way be used towards a degree.

Ironically, when the upper and lower fee differential was instituted the lower division fees were lowered by an amount that the upper division fees were raised. It would tend to lead to the conclusion that all of this activity and associated problems is an exercise that does not lead to any increased fee income. If there is slightly more, I'm not sure that one could justify the difference in terms of student/parent dissatisfaction with the system. Especially each Fall, we spend considerable time explaining to students and parents why additional fees are being charged to them several weeks after school had begun and they had paid the bill. If an opportunity arises to change this part of the fee structure, I would strongly encourage your participation in eliminating the differential in fees for lower and upper division courses.

Unfortunately, the differential between upper and lower division fees was recommended to the Board of Curators by a Fee Task Force the last year Dr. Marchello was Chancellor. It is not clear what motivation was used by the committee in making this recommendation. However, it is clearly approved by the Board of Curators and, at this point, is an inequity that all campus students suffer.
November 10, 1988

MEMORANDUM TO: Martin C. Jischke, Chancellor

FROM: Donald Askeland, Vice-President

Academic Council

SUBJECT: Fee Structure Inequities Resolution

On October 13, 1988, the Academic Council decided to request, on my recommendation, an explanation concerning the inequities in the fee structure for the following two course groupings:

1. courses in the College of Arts and Sciences co-listed with those in either the School of Engineering or the School of Mines and Metallurgy (the engineering supplemental fee).

2. courses normally considered to be freshmen or sophomore courses taken by students who are juniors or seniors (difference in hourly rate above and below the 60 hour level).

cc: John Park, Vice-Chancellor

Academic Affairs

Marvin Barker, Dean

College of Arts and Sciences

Robert Davis, Dean

School of Engineering

Don Warner, Dean

School of Mines and Metallurgy
MEMO TO: Donald Askeland
Vice President, Academic Council

FROM: Martin C. Jischke
Chancellor

DATE: November 17, 1988

SUBJECT: Admission Performance Standards

I have your memorandum of November 11 describing the Academic Council's recommendation for admission performance standards. It is my intention to transmit this recommendation, with my own endorsement, to the President for consideration by the General Officers and the Board of Curators. I shall keep the Academic Council informed of any actions on this recommendation.

MCJ/cal

cc: Orrin Crosser,
President-Academic Council
Policy for
Evaluation of Faculty Instruction

Effective teaching is central to the mission of the university. The recognition and promotion of effective teaching are essential and, therefore, evaluations of teaching effectiveness must be based on sound information and procedures.

The results of these evaluations will provide a portion of the information used by the administration in personnel decisions, including promotion and tenure, salaries, and awards. As such, it is crucial that the instruments used to collect the data, the procedures by which the instruments are administered, and the evaluation methods used to analyze and utilize the information be developed with the constant advice, review, and support of the faculty. These evaluations must be broad-based, including input from student evaluations, peer evaluations, and self evaluations, with all tenure track faculty participating in the evaluations on a periodic basis.

Equally important is that the information gathered by the evaluations will be used by faculty members for instructional development and, therefore, any evaluation program must include resources for the improvement and further development of teaching. The instruments must be flexible enough to permit faculty members to request evaluation questions specific to their course objectives in addition to any standard evaluation questions. Faculty have the right to provide additional information or explanation of evaluation results.

The results of the evaluations will be confidential and available only to the faculty member being evaluated, the chair of that department, the dean of that school, and the vice-chancellor for academic affairs. In addition, the results will be available to committees reviewing promotion and tenure decisions. Faculty members may release their evaluations to other groups if they choose.
RESOLUTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE UMR ACADEMIC COUNCIL

It is the opinion of the Academic Council at UMR that assessment should be used primarily as a tool for internal evaluation. It is appropriate to use assessment to identify strengths, weaknesses, truths, and myths within an institution or within a department. It is not appropriate to use assessment as a "score card" for comparison of institutions or departments, and it is not appropriate to allocate state funds based upon comparisons of assessment results. As such, assessment results should be made available to the faculty, but there is little value in the distribution of results to the general public.

RATIONALE

Although
(1) Sentence 2 of the ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF CURATORS reads "Institutional evaluation will identify strengths and weaknesses of our general education programs relative to those of peer institutions, and although • • • !"
(2) UMR recognizes the value and importance of assessment and accountability to the public, and although
(3) Based upon the 1988 results it appears that it may be to the advantage of UMR to compare institutions, it is the opinion of the UMR Academic Council that assessment should not be used to compare institutions or departments. If assessment is used to "keep score" and financial appropriations are tied to the "scores," then universities and departments will have no choice but to teach toward the standardized tests.

We, as members of the UMR faculty, recognize that there is a strong feeling among the general public, among government officials and among the Board of Curators that higher education needs to be accountable for the funds that it receives. However, this same group of people needs to be aware that assessment results may be misinterpreted and abused.

Recent conferences on assessment have underscored two particular areas where comparison of assessment results from standardized tests may be very misleading. The following two areas are particularly susceptible to abuse:

1. It is very dangerous to use standardized tests to compare departments or universities, simply because different departments and different universities have different missions. Many leading and innovative or "frontier" departments are proud of the fact that their emphasis area is unique in the nation. Such top departments are likely to fare poorly on standardized tests because the core of their curriculum is not standard--it is not taught anywhere else and the subject matter will not appear on standardized tests. Standardized tests simply cannot treat different emphasis areas fairly.

2. Value added, defined as a comparison of what students know when they enter a university relative to what they know when they graduate, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain statistically and interpret from standardized tests.
Memorandum to: Lance Williams, Chair RP&A Committee
Re: One Semester Sabbaticals
From: Lawrence O. Christensen, Chair History and Political Science

Lance:

I request that the Academic Council consider the following resolution: That the University of Missouri-Rolla administration, as a matter of university policy, grant one-semester sabbatical leaves, at full pay, to eligible faculty members.
President-Elect's Report  President Elect Don Askeland reported that the chairs of the four UM representative bodies (including President O. K. Crosser of the UMR Academic Council) and the Chair of IFC addressed the entire Board of Curators after Board member Peter Raven stressed the importance of dialogs between the Board and representatives of the faculty. In his remarks Professor Crosser emphasized the mission of the University System and the individual campuses for higher quality, higher education and noted that the specific missions of the several campuses differ. Professor Doyle of IFC stressed the importance of the four campus system—specifically the advantages of the breadth and depth of education the system provides. The new catch word for the system may well be Professor Doyle's phrase "four-in-one system."

Responses have been made to actions of the October 13 meeting of the Council. (1) Chancellor Jischke will transmit the Council's recommendation of New Admission Performance Standards to the Board of Curators along with his recommendation that the Standards be approved. (2) The Administration has responded to the Fee Inequities Resolution passed by the Council October 13. Prof. Askeland emphasized two points made by the Administration on the issue of fee structures. (1) Any change in fee structure will require approval by the Board. (2) The campus cannot afford any loss of income should the Engineering Supplemental fee be reduced.

On the topic of seniors paying upper-level fees for freshman courses and freshman paying upper-level fees: a possible solution might be the adoption of a fee structure based on course level rather than class standing. Any recommendation for changes in current fee structures should be submitted through the Budgetary Affairs Committee of the Academic Council.

The President-Elect made two referrals: (1) Co-listing of courses which result in fee inequities is referred to the Curricula Committee; (2) student rank in regard to fee structure inequities is referred to Budgetary Affairs Committee.

President Crosser made two referrals to the Personnel Committee: (1) Drug-free workplace; (2) Procedures for establishing rank and tenure for persons seeking positions at UMR.
Committee Reports

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY TEACHING proposed a "Policy for Evaluation of Faculty Instruction" which the Academic Council passed with amendments. The policy states that evaluations "of teaching effectiveness must be based on sound information and procedures." Such evaluations will "provide a portion of the information used...in personnel decisions, including promotion and tenure, salaries, and awards." The evaluations will also be used "by faculty members for instructional development...and must include resources for the improvement and further development of teaching....Faculty have the right to provide additional information or explanation of evaluation results." "The results of the evaluations will be confidential and available only to the faculty member being evaluated, the chair of that department, the dean of that school, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs,...and committees reviewing promotion and tenure decisions."

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT Professor Laudon reports that April 5, 6, and 8 will be the assessment dates.

R P & A. Professor Don Myers was elected to be UMR's nominee for the STAFF AND FACULTY BENEFITS PLANNING REVIEW COMMITTEE. The one-semester sabbatical policy proposal brought to the Council from the PERSONNEL COMMITTEE was voted on, passed, and forwarded to the Administration for its consideration. It reads: "The University of Missouri-Rolla administration, as a matter of university policy, may grant one-semester sabbatical leaves, at full pay, to eligible faculty members."

STUDENT AFFAIRS The proposed constitution for the Pakistan Students Association presented by Professor Daily was voted on and approved.

The Academic Council expressed its thanks to the AD HOC COMMITTEE ON TEACHING EVALUATION POLICIES for its sincere dedication and hard work.
November 1, 1988

Memo to: Celia Brotherton

From: Vicki Gibbons

Re: Correction in Grade Appeal Procedure

Dr. Crosser called Dr. Daily regarding a missing phrase in the new grade appeal section. Dr. Daily forwarded the following information to me and it should read as follows:

8. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURE

C.

3. The student shall inform the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at this point that a grade appeal is in progress. The student shall request, in writing, that the department chairperson inform the instructor and convene an ad hoc review group composed of the following: the chairperson (or designated representative) of the instructor's department, the dean (or the dean's designated representative) of the instructor's school or college, and a third member to be appointed by this dean from his or her faculty. The student and instructor shall be allowed to appear before the ad hoc review group. The decision reached by the ad hoc review group on the question of alleged capricious grading shall be binding and final on both the student and the instructor.
To: Orrin Crosser  
President, Academic Council

From: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor

Date: November 18, 1988

Subject: Academic Council Meeting  
December 8 Meeting

I have just been informed that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education Advisory Committee of which I am a member will be meeting in Kansas City at 8:00 a.m. on December 8 followed by the Council on Public Higher Education and the Governor's Conference. The CBHE Advisory Committee agenda contains matters vital to our campus, and I feel it is important that I be present for these discussions.

I sincerely regret having to miss the Academic Council meeting but am sure you and the Council will understand the necessity of my attending these meetings in Kansas City.
PROXY

I authorize Professor B. P. Selberg to vote for me at the December 6, 1988, meeting of the Academic Council.

Donald L. Cronin
Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

12/6/88
Here are some motions you might make, how to make them, and what to expect of the rules.

## TO DO THIS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO DO THIS</th>
<th>YOU SAY THIS:</th>
<th>MAY YOU INTERRUPT THE SPEAKER?</th>
<th>DO YOU NEED A SECOND?</th>
<th>IS IT DEBATABLE?</th>
<th>CAN IT BE AMENDED?</th>
<th>CAN IT BE RECONSIDERED?</th>
<th>WHAT VOTE IS NEEDED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJOURN MEETING</td>
<td>&quot;I move that we adjourn!&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALL AN INTERMISSION</td>
<td>&quot;I move that we recess for...&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLAIN ABOUT HEAT, NOISE, ETC.</td>
<td>&quot;I rise to a question of privilege.&quot;</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO VOTE (usually)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPEND FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF AN ISSUE</td>
<td>&quot;I move to table the motion&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END DEBATE AND AMENDMENTS</td>
<td>&quot;I move the previous question&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTPONE DISCUSSION FOR A CERTAIN TIME</td>
<td>&quot;I move to postpone the discussion until...&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIVE CLOSER STUDY OF SOMETHING</td>
<td>&quot;I move to refer the matter to committee&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMEND A MOTION</td>
<td>&quot;I move to amend the motion by...&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCE BUSINESS</td>
<td>&quot;I move that...&quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MAJORITY</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THE MOTIONS LISTED ABOVE ARE IN ORDER OF PRECEDENCE... BELOW THERE IS NO ORDER...

| PROTEST BREACH OF RULES OR CONDUCT              | "I rise to a point of order."           | YES                             | NO                    | NO               | NO                 | NO VOTE (usually)     | NO                   |
| VOTE ON A RULING OF THE CHAIR                  | "I appeal the chair's decision."        | YES                             | YES                   | YES              | NO                 | MAJORITY (3)          | YES                  |
| SUSPEND RULES TEMPORARILY                       | "I move to suspend the rules so that..." | NO                              | YES                   | NO               | NO                 | 2/3                    | NO                   |
| AVOID CONSIDERING AN IMPROPER MATTER           | "I object to consideration of this motion." | YES                             | NO                    | NO               | NO                 | 2/3 (3)               | - (7)                |
| VERIFY A VOICE VOTE BY HAVING MEMBERS STAND    | "I call for a division!" or "Division!" | NO                              | NO                    | NO               | NO                 | NO VOTE (2)           | NO                   |
| REQUEST INFORMATION                             | "Point of information."                | YES                             | NO                    | NO               | NO                 | NO VOTE (2)           | NO                   |
| TAKE UP A MATTER PREVIOUSLY TABLED             | "I move to take from the table..."      | NO                              | YES                   | NO               | NO                 | MAJORITY (3)          | NO                   |
| RECONSIDER A HASTY ACTION                       | "I move to reconsider the vote on..."   | YES                             | YES                   | - (3)            | NO                 | MAJORITY (3)          | NO                   |

### NOTES:

1. Unless vote on question is not yet taken.
2. Unless the committee has already taken up the subject.
3. Only if the motion to be amended is debatable.
4. Except in doubtful cases.
5. A majority vote in negative needed to reverse ruling of chair.
6. A 2/3 vote in negative needed to prevent consideration of main motion.
7. Only if main question or motion was not, in fact, considered.
8. Only if motion to be reconsidered is debatable.
Support is growing for the University System's efforts to increase funding from the state, President C. Peter Magrath told the board. The president noted that support is growing for the University's 1989-90 state appropriations request, the first year of a five-year plan to repair the budget base of the institution. To strengthen support of faculty and staff for efforts to increase public investment in the University, chancellors and other University leaders are being asked to ensure faculty and staff participation in campus planning and budgeting. Magrath will visit each campus to discuss the future and listen to views of faculty and staff. The University's efforts are part of a larger effort in which Missouri's colleges and universities are working together to improve state support for higher education, Magrath said. "This cooperation and the powerful message that Missouri cannot continue to lag behind other states in support for higher education will be enormously valuable to our overall strategy."

Last month's Coordinating Board for Higher Education committee recommendation of 10 percent faculty pay increases is appreciated, said Curator Peter Raven, chairman of the board's Academic Affairs Committee, but there should be no distinction between staff and faculty in compensation increases. The CBHE fiscal affairs committee recommended 5 percent pay hikes for staff. "We need outstanding staff as well as outstanding faculty," Raven said. The board is requesting funding from the state for 12.5 percent increases for faculty and staff. Raven also endorsed Magrath's efforts to work with corporate leaders and others in soliciting support for increased financing of the University and urged everyone associated with the University to back the board's five-year funding plan.

The University should continue to reallocate 1 percent of operating expenditures -- about $4 million annually -- from lower to higher priority activities, reported an Agenda for Action committee of Missouri citizens and University representatives. The committee that reviewed the board's reallocation plan said the $24.2 million reallocated since 1985 goes well beyond what most American universities have done, but reallocation alone will not provide enough money to meet long-range goals.

To meet the long-range plan's goal set for research grants and contracts, additional money is needed to increase our competitiveness for sponsored research funds. Money is needed to provide better research facilities and to recruit and retain talented research professors. The UM System had nearly $41 million in research grants and contracts in 1987-88; the long-range goal is to double grants and contracts (to $60 million) by 1990.

Awards and honors: Harlan U. Anderson, professor of ceramic engineering at UM-Rolla, was named Curators' Professor of ceramic engineering. University System President Emeritus Elmer Ellis received a curators' award for outstanding service to the University System. Ellis began his University career in 1930 as a history faculty member at UM-Columbia. He was named acting president of the University in 1954, became the 13th president in 1955 and was president when the University System was created in 1963. He retired in 1966. Ellis Library on the Columbia campus was named for the president emeritus in 1972.

Next meeting: Dec. 1-2, UM-Columbia

University of Missouri System
Columbia • Kansas City • Rolla • St. Louis
Adopted formally by the Board of Curators was the five-year plan to repair the University's funding base. The plan seeks, over the next five years, an additional $147 million annually in revenue -- $117 million more from the state and $30 million generated by the University. The biggest portion of the increased revenue would go toward repairing the funding base, including $51.4 million for competitive faculty and staff compensation and $31 million for libraries, academic computing and equipment replacement.

In a report on improving state support for the University, President C. Peter Magrath discussed trends in state funding during the past decade and the need to dramatically improve upon the progress made since declines in net state funding ended in 1985. "We must act with renewed dedication to improve state funding for this University." The president cited the situation in Texas, where industry and government investment of $610 million in University research has had a total economic impact of $1.4 billion in new jobs, new products and new businesses. Magrath also discussed the funding recommendations of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education, including salary recommendations. "We must now work even harder to secure the 12.5 percent faculty and staff salary increase we have requested." In a status report on the Agenda for Action, Magrath said reports from the 10 Agenda for Action committees have been forwarded to the University Planning Council, which will develop a report for discussion throughout the UM System during the next few months.

The board spent more than an hour in a dialogue with the Intercampus Faculty Council and leaders of the campus faculty governing groups. Presentations were made by James F. Doyle, UM-St. Louis, chairman of the Intercampus Faculty Council; and campus governance chairmen, Mark A. Burkholder, UM-St. Louis; Orrin K. Crosser, UM-Rolla; Gordon Kimber, UM-Columbia; and Harris G. Mirkin, UM-Kansas City. Topics covered included the adequacy of funding for the University, faculty participation in the University's governance, the missions of the University System and its individual campuses and how the University operates as a system.

A change in the University's identification policy allows UM-Columbia to use "MU" as a name for that campus only.

Elected president of the Board of Curators for 1989 was Ed Turner of Chillicothe. Eva Louise Frazer of St. Louis was elected vice president.

Richard Wallace, associate vice president for academic affairs for the University System, will be interim vice president for academic affairs following the retirement Dec. 31 of Jay Barton, vice president since 1985.

Awards and honors: Lloyd P. Jorgenson, UM-Columbia professor emeritus of education, received the prestigious Curators' Publication Award for his book "The State and the Non-Public School, 1825-1925," published by the UM Press. Three faculty members, Robert J. Calsyn of UM-St. Louis, Stanley R. Ingman of UM-Columbia and Jeng-Hsiung Frank Peng of UM-Kansas City, are among 10 Missouri researchers who received the first awards distributed under a program initiated by the General Assembly to study Alzheimer's and related diseases. The Board of Curators administers the program, which is funded by the state. Nineteen researchers received awards from the Missouri Research Assistance Act.

Next meeting: Jan. 26-27, UM-St. Louis
MEMO TO:  Academic Council Report
FROM: UMR Curricula Committee
DATE: January 19, 1989
SUBJECT: UMR Curricula Committee Meeting of January 19, 1989

EC1's reviewed:

EC1 182, Life Sciences 201, Flora of the Ozarks. Approved extension course for Winter 1989. No prerequisites; 3 hours credit.

EC1 183, Chemistry 201, Organic Chemistry for the Health Sciences. Approved extension course for Winter 1989. No prerequisites; 3 hours credit.

EC1 184, Geological Engineering 201, Basic Weather. Approved for Summer 1989. No prerequisites. 3 hours credit.

EC1 185, Electrical Engineering 301, Introduction to Optical Communications Systems. Approved for Fall 1989. Prerequisites: EE221, EE273, and EE265. 3 hours credit.

CC1's reviewed:

CC1 2981, Chemistry 005, General Chemistry for Engineers. Approved change in catalog description and prerequisites. Description reads: An accelerated version of Chem 1, Chem 2, and Chem 3. Four lectures and three laboratory hours per week. Students not meeting the prerequisite should take Chem 1, Chem 2, and Chem 3. Prerequisites: (A minimum score of 60 for the sum of the MMPT and the ACT N. Sci. test scores with neither score below 27).

CC1 3011, Physics 005, Concepts in Physics Laboratory. Approved new course. Prerequisites: Preceded or accompanied by Physics 004. 1 hour lab. Description reads: A series of elementary experiments, 5 required, 6th optional, will be used to illustrate such basic concepts of physics as conservation of energy and momentum, interference of light, atomic spectra, etc.

CC1 3017, Engineering Management 000. Approved curriculum change. Freshman engineering 10 to 5 and 15. EMech 50 to BE 50.
CC1 3022, English 230, Black American Literature. Approved course number change from 130 to 230. Prerequisites changed from English 1 to English 1 and a semester of college literature.

CC1 3023, English 224, Ozark Folklore. Approved course number change from 124 to 224. Prerequisite change from English 1 to English 1 and a semester of college literature. New description reads: A study of the research and collection methods of folklore with emphasis on Ozark culture and the literature of the region.

CC1 3024, Statistics 213, Statistical Methodology in Engineering. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Math 21. Description reads: An introduction to statistical methods in engineering dealing with basic probability, estimation, tests of hypotheses, regression, design of experiments and control charts. Statistical computer packages will be used in connection with some of the material studied.

CC1 3025, Engineering Mechanics 436, Advanced Fracture Mechanics. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: EMe 336 or EMe 322. Description reads: Mathematical theories of equilibrium cracks and brittle fracture; mathematical analysis of elastic-plastic fracture mechanics, COD, R-curve and J-integral analysis.

CC1 3026, Aerospace Engineering 235, Aircraft & Space Vehicle Propulsion. Approved change in prerequisites from AE 231, or ME 231 to ME 231, or accompanied or preceded by AE 271.

CC1 3027, Aerospace Engineering 283, Experimental Methods in Aerospace Engineering II. Approved new course. 2 hours credit. Prerequisites: AE 282, AE 235, AE 253, AE 271. Description reads: Laboratory investigations into phenomena associated with aerospace engineering. Investigations will include vibrations, propeller acoustics, turbulence measurements, flame measurements, propulsion experiments, flight simulation experiments, and controls experiments.

CC1 3028, Aerospace Engineering 282, Experimental Methods in Aerospace Engineering I. Approved change in course title. Prerequisites changed from AE 235, AE 251, AE 273 & ME 240. to AE 231, AE 251. New description reads: Laboratory investigations into aerodynamics, gas dynamics and structures. Investigations will include drag determination on bodies, forces and moments on airplane models, investigation of shock waves in a shock tube and supersonic wind tunnel, and strain and air load determination of a typical aircraft structure.

CC1 3029, M&AE&EM, AE 253, Aerospace Structures II. Approved change of description to: Introduction to the finite element method for static analysis of aerospace structures and to the mechanics of advanced composite materials.

CC1 3030, Engineering Management 420, Technological Innovation Management. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: EMgt 314. Description reads: Technological innovation is new technology creating new products and services. This course studies the issues of managing technological innovation under four topics: 1) Innovation; 2) New Ventures; 3) Corporate Research & 4) R&D Infrastructure.

Approved change of credit hours from 3 hours lecture to 1 hour lecture and 2 hours lab.

CC1 3032, Aerospace Engineering 000. Approved changed in curriculum. ME 240 is being dropped and replaced by an aerospace related experimental course. The hours are the same so there is no change in total hours required to graduate. Also, changes in the Freshman Engr. course numbers and changes in EMe to BE have been incorporated.

CC1 3033, Engineering Management 410, Seminar. Approved change in credit hours from 0 hours to variable hours credit.

CC1 3034, Mechanical Engineering 306, Material Processing by High-Pressure Water Jet. Approved change of course title. New description reads: Methods of generating high pressure water jets; standard equipment, existing techniques, and basic calculations. Application of water jets to materials cutting and mineral processing. Safety rules. The course will be supported by laboratory demonstration. (Co-listed with Mining Engr. 306).

CC1 3035, Mechanical Engineering 351, Intermediate Aerospace Structures. Approved new course. 3 credit hours. Prerequisites: AE 253, or ME 212. Description reads: Discussion of the finite element method for static and dynamic analysis of complex aerospace structures. Solution of basic problems using established finite element computer programs. (AE 253 or ME 212) (Co-listed with AE 351).

CC1 3036, Aerospace Engineering 233, Introduction to Aerothermochemistry. Approve change in prerequisites from ME 225, AE 271 to AE 271.

CC1 3037, Aerospace Engineering 351, Intermediate Aerospace Structures. Approved change of prerequisites from AE 253 to AE 253 or ME 212. New description reads: Discussion of the finite element method for static and dynamic analysis of complex aerospace structures. Solution of basic problems using established finite element computer programs. (AE 253 or ME 212) (Co-listed with ME 351).

David Oglesby, Chairman Curricula Committee
MEMO TO: Academic Council Report

FROM: UMR Curricula Committee

DATE: January 19, 1989

SUBJECT: UMR Curricula Committee Meeting of January 19, 1989

EC1's reviewed:

EC1 182, Life Sciences 201, Flora of the Ozarks. Approved extension course for Winter 1989. No prerequisites; 3 hours credit.

EC1 183, Chemistry 201, Organic Chemistry for the Health Sciences. Approved extension course for Winter 1989. No prerequisites; 3 hours credit.

EC1 184, Geological Engineering 201, Basic Weather. Approved for Summer 1989. No prerequisites. 3 hours credit.

EC1 185, Electrical Engineering 301, Introduction to Optical Communications Systems. Approved for Fall 1989. Prerequisites: EE221, EE273, and EE265. 3 hours credit.

CC1's reviewed:

CC1 2981, Chemistry 005, General Chemistry for Engineers. Approved change in catalog description and prerequisites. Description reads: An accelerated version of Chem 1, Chem 2, and Chem 3. Four lectures and three laboratory hours per week. Students not meeting the prerequisite should take Chem 1, Chem 2, and Chem 3. Prerequisites: (A minimum score of 60 for the sum of the MMPT and the ACT N. Sci. test scores with neither score below 27).

CC1 3011, Physics 005, Concepts in Physics Laboratory. Approved new course. Prerequisites: Preceded or accompanied by Physics 004. 1 hour lab. Description reads: A series of elementary experiments, 5 required, 6th optional, will be used to illustrate such basic concepts of physics as conservation of energy and momentum, interference of light, atomic spectra, etc.

CC1 3017, Engineering Management 000. Approved curriculum change. Freshman engineering 10 to 5 and 15. EMech 50 to BE 50.
CCI 3022, English 230, Black American Literature. Approved course number change from 130 to 230. Prerequisites changed from English 1 to English 1 and a semester of college literature.

CCI 3023, English 224, Ozark Folklore. Approved course number change from 124 to 224. Prerequisite change from English 1 to English 1 and a semester of college literature. New description reads: A study of the research and collection methods of folklore with emphasis on Ozark culture and the literature of the region.

CCI 3024, Statistics 213, Statistical Methodology in Engineering. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Math 21. Description reads: An introduction to statistical methods in engineering dealing with basic probability, estimation, tests of hypotheses, regression, design of experiments and control charts. Statistical computer packages will be used in connection with some of the material studied.

CCI 3025, Engineering Mechanics 436, Advanced Fracture Mechanics. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: EMe 336 or EMe 322. Description reads: Mathematical theories of equilibrium cracks and brittle fracture; mathematical analysis of elastic-plastic fracture mechanics, COD, R-curve and J-integral analysis.

CCI 3026, Aerospace Engineering 235, Aircraft & Space Vehicle Propulsion. Approved change in prerequisites from AE 231, or ME 231 to ME 231, or accompanied or preceded by AE 271.

CCI 3027, Aerospace Engineering 283, Experimental Methods in Aerospace Engineering II. Approved new course. 2 hours credit. Prerequisites: AE 282, AE 235, AE 253, AE 271. Description reads: Laboratory investigations into phenomena associated with aerospace engineering. Investigations will include vibrations, propeller acoustics, turbulence measurements, flame measurements, propulsion experiments, flight simulation experiments, and controls experiments.

CCI 3028, Aerospace Engineering 282, Experimental Methods in Aerospace Engineering I. Approved change in course title. Prerequisites changed from AE 235, AE 251, AE 273 & ME 240. to AE 231, AE 251. New description reads: Laboratory investigations into aerodynamics, gas dynamics and structures. Investigations will include drag determination on bodies, forces and moments on airplane models, investigation of shock waves in a shock tube and supersonic wind tunnel, and strain and air load determination of a typical aircraft structure.

CCI 3029, M&AE&EM, AE 253, Aerospace Structures II. Approved change of description to: Introduction to the finite element method for static analysis of aerospace structures and to the mechanics of advanced composite materials.

CCI 3030, Engineering Management 420, Technological Innovation Management. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: EMgt 314. Description reads: Technological innovation is new technology creating new products and services. This course studies the issues of managing technological innovation under four topics: 1) Innovation; 2) New Ventures; 3) Corporate Research & 4) R&D Infrastructure.

Attachment III.C

Approved change of credit hours from 3 hours lecture to 1 hour lecture and 2 hours lab.

CCE 3032, Aerospace Engineering 000. Approved changed in curriculum. ME 240 is being dropped and replaced by an aerospace related experimental course. The hours are the same so there is no change in total hours required to graduate. Also, changes in the Freshman Engr. course numbers and changes in EMe to BE have been incorporated.

CCE 3033, Engineering Management 410, Seminar. Approved change in credit hours from 0 hours to variable hours credit.

CCE 3034, Mechanical Engineering 306, Material Processing by High-Pressure Water Jet. Approved change of course title. New description reads: Methods of generating high pressure water jets; standard equipment, existing techniques, and basic calculations. Application of water jets to materials cutting and mineral processing. Safety rules. The course will be supported by laboratory demonstration. (Co-listed with Mining Engr. 306).

CCE 3035, Mechanical Engineering 351, Intermediate Aerospace Structures. Approved new course. 3 credit hours. Prerequisites: AE 253, or ME 212. Description reads: Discussion of the finite element method for static and dynamic analysis of complex aerospace structures. Solution of basic problems using established finite element computer programs. (AE 253 or ME 212) (Co-listed with AE 351).

CCE 3036, Aerospace Engineering 233, Introduction to Aerothermochemistry. Approved change in prerequisites from ME 225, AE 271 to AE 271.

CCE 3037, Aerospace Engineering 351, Intermediate Aerospace Structures. Approved change of prerequisites from AE 253 to AE 253 or ME 212. New description reads: Discussion of the finite element method for static and dynamic analysis of complex aerospace structures. Solution of basic problems using established finite element computer programs. (AE 253 or ME 212) (Co-listed with ME 351).

David B. Oglesby, Chairman Curricula Committee
March 16, 1989 Agenda Material

MEMO TO: Academic Council Report

FROM: UMR Curricula Committee

SUBJECT: UMR Curricula Committee Meeting of January 19, 1989

Listed below are the reviewed EC1's:

EC1 186, Civil Engineering 401, Construction Systems. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: CE 345.

EC1 187, Mechanical Engineering 301, Optimal Design of Mechanical Systems. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: ME 208, CSc 73, CSc 77.

EC1 188, Life Sciences 301, General Virology. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Life Science 110, 221 and Chem 221.

EC1 189, Philosophy 301, Internship. Approved for Winter 1989. 0-6 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior status; must have completed 24 hours in major.

EC1 190, Economics 301, Internship. Approved for Winter 1989. 0-6 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior status; must have completed 24 hours in major.

EC1 191, History/Pol Sci 301, Internship. Approved for Winter 1989. 0-6 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior status; must have completed 24 hours in major.

EC1 192, Psychology 301, Internship. Approved for Winter 1989. 0-6 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior status; must have completed 24 hours in major.

EC1 193, English 301, Internship. Approved for Winter 1989. 0-6 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior status; must have completed 24 hours in major. The committee added this statement to the description: This course will not count as a required elective.

EC1 194, Civil Engineering 301, Professional Aspects of Engineering Practice. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior Standing.

EC1 195, Electrical Engineering 301, Introduction to Neural Nets and Applications. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Math 203 or Math 229. (Co-list with CSci and Engr.Mgt.)

EC1 196, Engineering Management 301, Introduction to Neural Nets and Applications. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Math 203 or Math 229. (Co-list with CSci and EE.)
EC1 197, Aerospace Engineering 301, \textit{Composite Materials in Aircraft Structures}. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: AE 251, co-requisite AE 253.

EC1 198, Electrical Engineering 301, \textit{Digital Speech Processing}. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: EE 266 or EE 267.

EC1 199, Electrical Engineering 301, \textit{Introduction to CMOS VLSI Design}. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: EE 213 and EE 254.

EC1 200, Physics 301, \textit{Physics for Elementary School Teachers}. Approved for Summer 1989. 3 hours credit. No prerequisite.

EC1 201, Physics 101, \textit{Environmental Physics}. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. No prerequisite.

EC1 202, Physics 201, \textit{Classical Mechanics}. Approved for Fall 1989. 4 hours credit. Prerequisites: Math/Stat 204, Phy 24 or 25.

EC1 203, Computer Science 301, \textit{Introduction to Neural Nets and Applications}. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Math 203 or Math 229. (Co-list with EE and Engr.Mgt.)


EC1 206, Philosophy 101, \textit{Introduction to Arts & Sciences}. Approved for Fall 1989. 1 hour credit. Prerequisite: Limited to Arts & Sciences Undecided students.

EC1 207, English 301ML, \textit{English Comedy: Shakespeare to Shaw}. Approved for Summer 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: A semester of literature.

CC1's Reviewed:

CC1 2976, Chemical Engineering 241, \textit{Biochemical Engineering Laboratory II}. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: ChE 240. Description: Introduction to the unit operations involved with the production of biochemicals. The experiments emphasize enzymatic and whole-cell reactions and the ancillary processing steps used to produce useful products.

CC1 2978, Chemical Engineering 240, \textit{Biochemical Engineering Laboratory I}. Approve new course. 2 hours credit. Prerequisites: ChE 238. Description: Introduction to the unit operations employed in the separation of chemical and biochemicals. The experiments illustrate the unit operations studied in ChE 238; stage and continuous separation systems are involved.
CCI 3000, Chemical Engineering 000. Approved Biochemical Engineering Emphasis in Chemical Engineering.

CCI 3001, Chemical Engineering 238, Fundamentals of Mass Transfer and Separation for Bioprocesses. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: ChE 143, 231, 233, Chem 221, 241. Description: The fundamentals of mass transfer are introduced and applied to various unit operations employed in the separation of chemical compounds as well as in biomolecule separations. Both stage and continuous separation processes are studied.

CCI 3018, Psychology 268, Clinical Psychology. Approved change in course number from 368 to 268. Justification: Reevaluation of course sequencing in their B.A. and B.S. curricula. Aim is to place broad areas of psychology at the 100 and 200 level and more specialized areas at the 300 level.

CCI 3019, Psychology 330, Physiological Psychology. Approved change in course number from 230 to 330. Justification: (See CCI 3018)

CCI 3020, Psychology 360, Personality Theory. Approved change in course number from 260 to 360. Justification: (See CCI 3018)

CCI 3021, Psychology 262, Abnormal Psychology. Approved change in course number from 362 to 262. Justification: (See CCI 3018)

CCI 3039, Mining Engineering 220, Bulk Materials Handling. Approved deletion.

CCI 3040, Mining Engineering 226, Surface Mining of Metallic & Industrial Minerals. Approved change in course title. Prerequisites change to CE 215 or Min 231, accompanied by or preceded by Min 221. Description changes to: Principles utilized in the development of metallic and industrial mineral deposits into productive entities by surface mining methods, including bank stability, benching, equipment selection and coordination, economics, safety and overall operational considerations.

CCI 3041, Mining Engineering 000. Approved change in curriculum. Changes were as follows: Delete Min 220 and add Min 343. Increase total H/SS electives by 1 credit from 15 to 16 hours to meet ABET standards.

CCI 3042, Mining Engineering 224, Underground Mining of Metallic & Industrial Minerals. Approved change in course title and catalog description which reads: Principles utilized in the development of metallic and industrial mineral deposits into productive entities by underground mining methods, including ground support, equipment selection & coordination, economics, safety, and overall operational considerations.

CCI 3043, Mining Engineering 343, Coal Mine Development & Production. Approved change in course title and prerequisites changed to preceded by or accompanied Min 217. Catalog description changed to: An in-depth study in the planning and development of surface and underground coal mines with special consideration for current mechanized methods of face preparation, equipment installation and coal extraction and handling.

CCI 3044, Chemical Engineering 143, Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics II. Approved change in prerequisites to ChE 141, Chem 51, 52, Math/Stat 204, Grade C
or better in ChE 27 and 141.

CC1 3045, Physics 303, Planetary Physics. Approved change in prerequisites to Physics 107 or 207.

CC1 3046, Physics 311, Thermal Physics. Approved change in prerequisites to Physics 107 or 207.

CC1 3047, Physics 367, Plasma Physics. Approved change in prerequisites to Math/Stat 204 and Phy 107 or 207 or Nuc Eng 203.

CC1 3048, Physics 371, Quantum Electronics. Approved change in prerequisites to Phy 107 or 207.

CC1 3049, Physics 381, Elementary Solid State Physics. Approved change in prerequisites to Math/Stat 204 and Phy 107 or 207.

CC1 3050, Mechanical Engineering 307, Vibrations I. Approved change of course title and change in prerequisites to ME 211 and ME 213, or AE 213 and Math/Stat 204. Change in description reads: Equations of motion, free and forced vibration of single degree of freedom systems and multi-degree of freedom systems. Natural frequencies, resonance, modes of vibration and energy dissipation are studied. The vibration of continuous systems is introduced. (Co-listed with AE 307 & EMe 361)

CC1 3051, Aerospace Engineering 307, Vibrations I. Approved change of course title and change of prerequisites to Me 211 and ME 213, or AE 213 and Math/Stat 204. Change in description reads: Equations of motion, free and forced vibration of single degree of freedom systems. Natural frequencies, resonance, modes of vibration and energy dissipation are studied. The vibration of continuous systems is introduced. (Co-listed with ME 307 and EMe 361.)

CC1 3052, Engineering Mechanics 361, Vibrations I. Approved change of course title and change of prerequisites to ME 211 and ME 213, or AE 213 and Math/Stat 204. Change in description reads: Equations of motion, free and forced vibrations of single degree of freedom systems and multi-degree of freedom systems. Natural frequencies, resonance, modes of vibration and energy dissipation are studied. The vibration of continuous systems is introduced. (Co-listed with AE 307 and ME 307.)

CC1 3053, Engineering management 000. Approved change in curriculum substituting Math 213 for Math 215.


CC1 3055, Nuclear Engineering 204, Nuclear Radiation Measurements. Approved change in prerequisites to NE 203 or Phy 107 and English 60 or English 160.

CC1 3056, Nuclear Engineering 351, Reactor Kinetics. Approved change in prerequisite to NE 205.

CC1 3057, Nuclear Engineering 304, Reactor Laboratory I. Approved change in prerequisites to NE 204 and NE 205.
CC1 3058, Life Sciences 211, Cell Biology. Approved change in prerequisites to Preceded or accompanied by Chem 3.

CC1 3059, Geology 432, Carbonate Petrology. Approved change of course title and change of prerequisite to Geol 130, 114, 223 and Chem 3 or equivalent; Geol 275 recommended. Change in description reads: Petrology, chemistry and sedimentology of carbonates and other associated chemical sedimentary rocks.

CC1 3060, Geology 431, Clastic Sedimentary Petrology. Approved change of course title and change of prerequisite to Geol 223. Credit hours change from 1 hour lecture to 1 hour lecture and 2 hour lab. Change in description reads: Petrology and petrography of clastic sedimentary rocks. Emphasis on origin, diagenesis and description of clastic, sedimentary rocks.

CC1 3061, Geology 223, Stratigraphy and Sedimentation. Approved change of course title and change of prerequisite to Accompanied or preceded by Geol 130. Change in description reads: Principles of physical stratigraphy, bio-stratigraphy and introductory sedimentation. Introduction to depositional systems, facies, unconformities, stratigraphic nomenclature and correlation.

CC1 3062, Geology 324, Advanced Stratigraphy and Basin Evolution. Approved change of course title and prerequisites to Geol 223, 220, preceded or accompanied by Geol 275 - recommended. Change in description reads: Advanced topics in sedimentary geology including: tectonic controls on sedimentary basin development, global sequence stratigraphy, regional facies and diagenetic patterns, basin hydrogeology, thermal evolution of basins and distribution of economic resources.

CC1 3064, Engineering Management 375, Total Quality Management. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Math/Stat 215. Description: Examination of various quality assurance concepts and their integration into a comprehensive quality management system: statistical techniques, FMEA's, design reviews, reliability, vendor qualification, quality audits, customer relations, information systems, organizational relationships, motivation.


CC1 3070, Geological Engineering 432, Numerical Methods in Subsurface Flow. Approved new course. 3 credit hours. Prerequisite: GeE 331, CS 73. Description reads: Development of governing balance equations, constitutive laws and mathematical models of groundwater flow and contaminant transport in porous media. Solution of mathematical models by finite difference and finite element methods for various boundary and initial conditions.

David Oglesby, Chairman
MEMO TO: Academic Council Report  
FROM: UMR Curricula Committee  
SUBJECT: UMR Curricula Committee Meeting of January 19, 1989

Listed below are the reviewed ECI's:

ECI 186, Civil Engineering 401, Construction Systems. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: CE 345.

ECI 187, Mechanical Engineering 301, Optimal Design of Mechanical Systems. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: ME 208, CSc 73, CSc 77.

ECI 188, Life Sciences 301, General Virology. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Life Science 110, 221 and Chem 221.

ECI 189, Philosophy 301, Internship. Approved for Winter 1989. 0-6 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior status; must have completed 24 hours in major.

ECI 190, Economics 301, Internship. Approved for Winter 1989. 0-6 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior status; must have completed 24 hours in major.

ECI 191, History/Pol Sci 301, Internship. Approved for Winter 1989. 0-6 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior status; must have completed 24 hours in major.

ECI 192, Psychology 301, Internship. Approved for Winter 1989. 0-6 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior status; must have completed 24 hours in major.

ECI 193, English 301, Internship. Approved for Winter 1989. 0-6 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior status; must have completed 24 hours in major. The committee added this statement to the description: This course will not count as a required elective.

ECI 194, Civil Engineering 301, Professional Aspects of Engineering Practice. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior Standing.

ECI 195, Electrical Engineering 301, Introduction to Neural Nets and Applications. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Math 203 or Math 229. (Co-list with CSci and Engr.Mgt.)

ECI 196, Engineering Management 301, Introduction to Neural Nets and Applications. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Math 203 or Math 229. (Co-list with CSci and EE.)
EC1 197, Aerospace Engineering 301, Composite Materials in Aircraft Structures. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: AE 251, co-requisite AE 253.

EC1 198, Electrical Engineering 301, Digital Speech Processing. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: EE 266 or EE 267.

EC1 199, Electrical Engineering 301, Introduction to CMOS VLSI Design. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: EE 213 and EE 254.

EC1 200, Physics 301, Physics for Elementary School Teachers. Approved for Summer 1989. 3 hours credit. No prerequisite.

EC1 201, Physics 101, Environmental Physics. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. No prerequisite.

EC1 202, Physics 201, Classical Mechanics. Approved for Fall 1989. 4 hours credit. Prerequisites: Math/Stat 204, Phy 24 or 25.

EC1 203, Computer Science 301, Introduction to Neural Nets and Applications. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Math 203 or Math 229. (Co-list with EE and Engr.Mgt.)

EC1 204, Political Science 201ML, Studies in Comparative Politics: Parliamentary and Presidential Systems. Approved for Summer 1989. 3 hours credit. No prerequisites.


EC1 206, Philosophy 101, Introduction to Arts & Sciences. Approved for Fall 1989. 1 hour credit. Prerequisite: Limited to Arts & Sciences Undecided students.

EC1 207, English 301ML, English Comedy: Shakespeare to Shaw. Approved for Summer 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: A semester of literature.

CC1's Reviewed:

CC1 2976, Chemical Engineering 241, Biochemical Engineering Laboratory II. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: ChE 240. Description: Introduction to the unit operations involved with the production of biochemicals. The experiments emphasize enzymatic and whole-cell reactions and the ancillary processing steps used to produce useful products.

CC1 2978, Chemical Engineering 240, Biochemical Engineering Laboratory I. Approve new course. 2 hours credit. Prerequisites: ChE 238. Description: Introduction to the unit operations employed in the separation of chemical and biochemicals. The experiments illustrate the unit operations studied in ChE 238; stage and continuous separation systems are involved.
Attachment III.B

CC1 3000, Chemical Engineering 000. Approved Biochemical Engineering Emphasis in Chemical Engineering.

CC1 3001, Chemical Engineering 238, Fundamentals of Mass Transfer and Separation for Bioprocesses. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: ChE 143, 231, 233, Chem 221, 241. Description: The fundamentals of mass transfer are introduced and applied to various unit operations employed in the separation of chemical compounds as well as in biomolecule separations. Both stage and continuous separation processes are studied.

CC1 3018, Psychology 268, Clinical Psychology. Approved change in course number from 368 to 268. Justification: Reevaluation of course sequencing in their B.A. and B.S. curricula. Aim is to place broad areas of psychology at the 100 and 200 level and more specialized areas at the 300 level.

CC1 3019, Psychology 330, Physiological Psychology. Approved change in course number from 230 to 330. Justification: (See CC1 3018)

CC1 3020, Psychology 360, Personality Theory. Approved change in course number from 260 to 360. Justification: (See CC1 3018)

CC1 3021, Psychology 262, Abnormal Psychology. Approved change in course number from 362 to 262. Justification: (See CC1 3018)

CC1 3039, Mining Engineering 220, Bulk Materials Handling. Approved deletion.

CC1 3040, Mining Engineering 226, Surface Mining of Metallic & Industrial Minerals. Approved change in course title. Prerequisites change to CE 215 or Min 231, accompanied by or preceded by Min 221. Description changes to: Principles utilized in the development of metallic and industrial mineral deposits into productive entities by surface mining methods, including bank stability, benching, equipment selection and coordination, economics, safety and overall operational considerations.

CC1 3041, Mining Engineering 000. Approved change in curriculum. Changes were as follows: Delete Min 220 and add Min 343. Increase total H/SS electives by 1 credit from 15 to 16 hours to meet ABET standards.

CC1 3042, Mining Engineering 224, Underground Mining of Metallic & Industrial Minerals. Approved change in course title and catalog description which reads: Principles utilized in the development of metallic and industrial mineral deposits into productive entities by underground mining methods, including ground support, equipment selection & coordination, economics, safety, and overall operational considerations.

CC1 3043, Mining Engineering 343, Coal Mine Development & Production. Approved change in course title and prerequisites changed to preceded by or accompanied Min 217. Catalog description changed to: An in-depth study in the planning and development of surface and underground coal mines with special consideration for current mechanized methods of face preparation, equipment installation and coal extraction and handling.

CC1 3044, Chemical Engineering 143, Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics II. Approved change in prerequisites to ChE 141, Chem 51, 52, Math/Stat 204, Grade C
or better in ChE 27 and 141.

CC1 3045, Physics 303, Planetary Physics. Approved change in prerequisites to Physics 107 or 207.

CC1 3046, Physics 311, Thermal Physics. Approved change in prerequisites to Physics 107 or 207.

CC1 3047, Physics 367, Plasma Physics. Approved change in prerequisites to Math/Stat 204 and Phy 107 or 207 or Nuc Eng 203.

CC1 3048, Physics 371, Quantum Electronics. Approved change in prerequisites to Phy 107 or 207.

CC1 3049, Physics 381, Elementary Solid State Physics. Approved change in prerequisites to Math/Stat 204 and Phy 107 or 207.

CC1 3050, Mechanical Engineering 307, Vibrations I. Approved change of course title and change in prerequisites to ME 211 and ME 213, or AE 213 and Math/Stat 204. Change in description reads: Equations of motion, free and forced vibration of single degree of freedom systems and multi-degree of freedom systems. Natural frequencies, resonance, modes of vibration and energy dissipation are studied. The vibration of continuous systems is introduced. (Co-listed with AE 307 & EMe 361)

CC1 3051, Aerospace Engineering 307, Vibrations I. Approved change of course title and change of prerequisites to Me 211 and ME 213, or AE 213 and Math/Stat 204. Change in description reads: Equations of motion, free and forced vibration of single degree of freedom systems. Natural frequencies, resonance, modes of vibration and energy dissipation are studied. The vibration of continuous systems is introduced. (Co-listed with ME 307 and EMe 361.)

CC1 3052, Engineering Mechanics 361, Vibrations I. Approved change of course title and change of prerequisites to ME 211 and ME 213, or AE 213 and Math/Stat 204. Change in description reads: Equations of motion, free and forced vibrations or single degree of freedom systems and multi-degree of freedom systems. Natural frequencies, resonance, modes of vibration and energy dissipation are studied. The vibration of continuous systems is introduced. (Co-listed with AE 307 and ME 307.)

CC1 3053, Engineering management 000. Approved change in curriculum substituting Math 213 for Math 215.

CC1 3054, Nuclear Engineering 321, Nuclear Power Plant Design. Approved change in prerequisites to NE 205 and ME 219.

CC1 3055, Nuclear Engineering 204, Nuclear Radiation Measurements. Approved change in prerequisites to NE 203 or Phy 107 and English 60 or English 160.

CC1 3056, Nuclear Engineering 351, Reactor Kinetics. Approved change in prerequisite to NE 205.

CC1 3057, Nuclear Engineering 304, Reactor Laboratory I. Approved change in prerequisites to NE 204 and NE 205.
CCl 3058, Life Sciences 211, Cell Biology. Approved change in prerequisites to Preceded or accompanied by Chem 3.

CCl 3059, Geology 432, Carbonate Petrology. Approved change of course title and change of prerequisite to Geol 130, 114, 223 and Chem 3 or equivalent; Geol 275 recommended. Change in description reads: Petrology, chemistry and sedimentology of carbonates and other associated chemical sedimentary rocks.

CCl 3060, Geology 431, Clastic Sedimentary Petrology. Approved change of course title and change of prerequisite to Geol 223. Credit hours change from 1 hour lecture to 1 hour lecture and 2 hour lab. Change in description reads: Petrology and petrography of clastic sedimentary rocks. Emphasis on origin, diagenesis and description of clastic, sedimentary rocks.

CCl 3061, Geology 223, Stratigraphy and Sedimentation. Approved change of course title and change of prerequisite to Accompanied or preceded by Geol 130. Change in description reads: Principles of physical stratigraphy, bio-stratigraphy and introductory sedimentation. Introduction to depositional systems, facies, unconformities, stratigraphic nomenclature and correlation.

CCl 3062, Geology 324, Advanced Stratigraphy and Basin Evolution. Approved change of course title and prerequisites to Geol 223, 220, preceded or accompanied by Geol 275 -recommended. Change in description reads: Advanced topics in sedimentary geology including: tectonic controls on sedimentary basin development, global sequence stratigraphy, regional facies and diagenetic patterns, basin hydrogeology, thermal evolution of basins and distribution of economic resources.

CCl 3064, Engineering Management 375, Total Quality Management. Approved new course. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Math/Stat 215. Description: Examination of various quality assurance concepts and their integration into a comprehensive quality management system: statistical techniques, FMEA's, design reviews, reliability, vendor qualification, quality audits, customer relations, information systems, organizational relationships, motivation.


CCl 3070, Geological Engineering 432, Numerical Methods in Subsurface Flow. Approved new course. 3 credit hours. Prerequisite: GeE 331, CS 73. Description reads: Development of governing balance equations, constitutive laws and mathematical models of groundwater flow and contaminant transport in porous media. Solution of mathematical models by finite difference and finite element methods for various boundary and initial conditions.
Academic Council Meeting, Thursday, February 2, 1989; 1:30 p.m.; 6-5 H/SS.

I. Approval of minutes of December 8, 1988, (VOL. XVIII, NO. 3) meeting.

II. Reports and Responses
   A. President's Report (10 min.) Orrin Crosser (4459)
   B. Referrals
      1. Conflict of Interest to the Personnel Committee
   B. Administrative Reports
      1. 1.5 Percent Reserve Return (Written) Martin Jischke (4114)
      2. Prestigious Scholarships (5 min.) Robert Lewis (4165)
   C. Administrative Response
      1. Teacher Evaluation (5 min.) John Park (4138)

III. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
   A. .0406.01 Academic Assessment (10 min.) Robert Laudon (4466)
      *1. Appropriate Use of Assessment Results Resolution
   B. .0406.03 Admissions and Academic Standards (No Report) Thomas Herrick (4507)
      1. Revised Regulations for Removing a Student from Academic Probation (April 23, 1987; XVI, 8; IV.A.1)
      2. Excused Absence Procedure (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; II.B.1)
   C. .0406.05 Budgetary Affairs (5 min.) Carol Ann Smith (4869)
      *1. Distribution of Withheld State Funds
      *2. Salary Increase Distribution Policy
      3. Fee Structure Inequities (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.C.2)
      4. Priorities for the 89/90 Campus Budget
      5. FY1991 Budget
   D. .0406.09 Curricula (5 min.) David Oglesby (4598)
      1. CAPS and the Graduation Catalogue
         (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.1)
      2. Time Limitation of the Graduation Catalogue
         (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.2)
      3. Fee Structure Inequities (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.C.1)
      *4. Report No. 4, 1988-89
   E. .0406.15 Personnel (10 min.) Vince Roach (4449)
      1. Smoking/Non Smoking Policy (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; II.B.3)
      *2. Drug-Free Workplace (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.C.3)
      *3. Procedures for Establishing Rank and/or Tenure (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.C.4)

an equal opportunity institution
F. .0406.18 Rules, Procedure and Agenda (5 min.) Lance Williams (4016)
   1. Replacement of Student Affairs Committee Representatives

G. .0406.19 Student Affairs (5 min.) Madison Daily (4571)
   *1. Student Constitution - UMR Volleyball Club

IV. Old Business

V. New Business

R, P & A Cmbt.
LW/cmb/1-19-89

*Supplementary materials sent to Academic Council members and department chairman.
SUMMARY of the reports, actions, referrals and announcements made at the meeting of the Academic Council held on February 2, 1989.

1. Approval of minutes of the February 2, 1989, Council meeting.

2. Reports and responses.
   
   A. President’s report - O. Crosser
   
   B. Referrals
      1. Conflict of interest to the Personnel Committee
      2. Academic freedom and outside teaching assignments to the Personnel Committee
   
   C. Administrative reports
      1. 1.5 percent reserve return - M. Jischke
         (Attachment II.C.1)
      2. Prestigious scholarships - R. Lewis and W. Cogell
         (Attachment II.C.2)
   
   D. Administrative response
      1. Teaching evaluation - W. Johnson
         (Attachment II.D)

3. Reports of standing and special committees.
   
   A. Academic Assessment - R. Laudon
      1. Appropriate use of assessment results resolution
         (Attachment III.A)
   
   B. Budgetary Affairs - C. A. Smith
      1. Distribution of withheld state funds
         (Attachment III.B.1)
      2. Salary increase distribution policy
         (Attachment III.B.2)
   
   C. Curricula - D. Oglesby
      1. Report No. 4, 1988-89
         a. Four experimental courses presented
         b. Thirteen course changes approved
         c. Six new courses approved
         (Attachment III.C)
   
   D. Personnel - V. Roach
      1. Drug-free workplace and procedures for establishing rank/tenure
         (Attachment III.D.1)
      2. Smoking/non-smoking policy
         (Attachment III.D.2)
E. Rules, Procedure and Agenda – L. Williams
   1. Replacement of Student Affairs Committee representation

F. Student Affairs – M. Daily
   1. Constitution – UMR Volleyball Club
      (Attachment III.F)

Attachments: II.C.1
             II.C.2
             II.D
             III.A
             III.B.1
             III.B.2
             III.C
             III.D.1
             III.F
The February 2, 1989, meeting of the Academic Council was called to order at 1:32 p.m. by Prof. Orrin K. Crosser, Academic Council President. The following substitutions were noted: Prof. Richard DuBroff for Prof. Max Anderson; Prof. Jerry Bayless for Dean Robert Davis; and Prof. Wayne Cogell for Dean Marvin Barker. Prof. Colin Benjamin was recognized as temporarily representing the department of Engineering Management. A motion to approve the December 8, 1988, minutes was made, seconded, and passed.

REPORTS AND RESPONSES.

A. PRESIDENT’S REPORT. President Orrin Crosser reminded the Council that all items on the agenda are a matter of public record, as are all items forwarded to the Council by the Chairs of Council Committees. The media may make use of any item that interests them.

He noted that Professor Ralph Alexander, Physics, is a member of a U-Wide Retirement Benefits Study Committee and that UMR faculty and staff may make their recommendations through him.

President Crosser commended those who participated in drafting the campus report for the North Central Association and those who represented the faculty before the NCA visiting committee. With a report to the Curators by Mr. Jerry Passmore, a consultant to Missourians for Higher Education, and pertinent items in the news media in mind, President Crosser made the common-sense observation that faculty need "to think about what we say" and to be prepared to make the most effective presentation of the University’s role and needs.

Interest in undergraduate engineering education at UMSL remains a major concern of the leadership at UMSL, a "significant item on the Agenda for Action, and an on-going activity of the UMR administration." According to the best information available, it "is still at the discussion and negotiation stage. ..."

B. REFERRALS.
1. CONFLICT OF INTEREST to the Personnel Committee
2. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND OUTSIDE TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS to the Personnel Committee

C. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS.
1. 1.5 PERCENT RESERVE RETURN - M. Jischke (Attachment II.C.1)

2. PRESTIGIOUS SCHOLARSHIPS. Robert Lewis, Director of Admissions, reported the creation of a Chancellor’s Scholarship. It will be combined with the Missouri “Bright Flight” and Curators’ Scholarship Programs to attract top quality students to UMR. A more effective and efficient process has been developed to further this goal. Missouri students in the top three percent of their class who have ACT scores of at least 29 are being invited to apply for admission to UMR and to come to the campus for an interview. Approximately 1350 brochures with application forms were mailed last Fall to prospective students from a list provided by the American College Testing Organization. Of these, 82 applications have arrived on time; 10 arrived after the deadline. Once applications are collected, verified, and accepted by the Admissions Office, the process is continued according to procedures outlined by Dean Cogell.

Dr. Wayne Cogell, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences, reported that each phase of the interview process has been reviewed and that the interview criteria have been tested for reliability through mock interviews. He also reports that the goals of the panel have been set and that general interview procedures have been discussed. At the end of January, 90 student hosts, who volunteered over the holidays, met and were assigned guests. Itineraries for both prospective students and parents were to be mailed on Friday February 3 (see attached sample), and panel members were to be notified the following week of their revised schedules. Interviews were to be scheduled from Tuesday, February 14, through Friday, February 17. (Attachment II.C.2)
D. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE.

1. TEACHING EVALUATION. Prof. Walt Johnson announced that, at the suggestion of the Committee of Department Chairs, a Blue Ribbon Committee has been established and charged "to develop an instrument and a procedure for implementing student evaluations of faculty on a formal basis by the end of the next academic year." Since teaching evaluation is viewed as important in terms of personnel decisions and faculty assistance, the membership of this Committee was selected to represent these differing purposes. The following membership was selected on the basis of topical background: Prof. Walt Johnson (Chair), Prof. Walt Gajda, Prof. Lance Williams, Prof. Norm Smith, Prof. Ronald Kosher, Prof. David Oglesby, and Kathy Stone (Student Representative). Ellen Leininger, Program Director of Institutional Assessment, and David Anderson, Senior Computer Systems Analyst, will provide administrative support. Submission of a preliminary report has been requested by April 15th. It is anticipated that the Committee of Department Chairs and the Academic Council will be able to review and discuss this report. (Attachment II.D)

XVIII, 4 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

A. ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT. Having reviewed UMC's Faculty Assessment Task Force report and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges' Statement of Assessment Principles, the Committee's recommendation (1) endorsing seven principles approved by the Executive Board of the NASULGC, and (2) an additional paragraph stipulating the use of assessment as a tool for internal evaluation only was presented for Council consideration by Prof. Robert Laudon. Prof. Lance Williams moved that the resolution be adopted by Council. Prof. Donald Askeland seconded the motion, which passed. Prof. Williams then moved that the entire document (resolution and rational) be forwarded to the University administration. A second was received from Prof. Askeland, and this motion carried. (Attachment III.A)
B. BUDGETARY AFFAIRS. Prof. Carol Ann Smith, anticipating the report of at least two topics at the March Council meeting, noted that her Committee is considering the fee structure equity issue, a resolution on conserving and preventing deterioration of quality in our programs, the UMSL Engineering proposal contained in the "Agenda for Action," salary differences, 1990-91 budget requests, and the 1989-90 campus budget for which tentative priorities of (1) mandatory expenses, (2) salaries, (3) library, (4) expense and equipment, (5) graduate stipend support, and (6) miscellaneous other were identified.

1. DISTRIBUTION OF WITHHELD STATE FUNDS.
   (Attachment III.B.1)

2. SALARY INCREASE DISTRIBUTION POLICY. Prof. Smith in introducing this policy justified both the recommended deletions in Section I (the last two sentences in paragraph one and all of paragraph three) by explaining that these parts were more appropriate to the Chancellor's report than to the policy document and the corrections and additions in Section II by indicating that the policy would be too restricted if it were limited only to faculty and addressed only affirmative action and discrimination. Prof. Glen Haddock moved for adoption, and Prof. Richard Miller provided the second. Prof. Lance Williams moved deletion of the phrase "as the same percentage of salary" (Section II, Enumeration 4). Prof. Charles Morris seconded the motion, but the amendment was defeated. The motion to adopt the two sections as presented carried.

Prof. Glen Haddock moved to approve the substitution for Section III retaining the word "similar" in procedure number five. Prof. Clyde Wade seconded his motion. Prof. Al Crosby moved to amend by removing the word "similar." Prof. Thomas Herrick seconded this motion, which failed. Prof. Vincent Roach then moved to amend number five by replacing "similar" with "equal." His motion failed to receive a second. Then Prof. Al Crosby moved to add this sentence to the end of this same procedure: "the policy adopted must
take into account the fact that the amount of money available for merit raises varies widely from year to year." Prof. Jerry Westphal seconded this motion, which was defeated. Approval of Section III as originally presented then carried. (Attachment III.B.2)

C. CURRICULA.
1. REPORT NO. 4, 1988-89. Prof. David Oglesby moved for approval of the Curricula Committee's report. Prof. Lance Williams seconded the motion, which carried. (Attachment III.C)

D. PERSONNEL.
1. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE AND PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHING RANK/TENURE. Prof. Vince Roach moved for approval of his Committee's report recommending:
   (1) the elimination of Section III (Procedures for Establishing Rank and/or Tenure for Persons Seeking a Position at UMR) of the "Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations" December 6 document redraft; and (2) the endorsement of the "Drug Abuse Policy" November 23 draft. Prof. Lance Williams seconded the motion, which carried. (Attachment III.D.1)

2. SMOKING POLICY. Prof. Roach reported that consideration of this topic is progressing. A mail survey is going to press and will be distributed to every person on campus.

E. RULES, PROCEDURE AND AGENDA.
1. REPLACEMENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPRESENTATION. Prof. Lance Williams nominated Prof. Curt Adams to replace Prof. Madison Daily, who is on leave. The nomination was seconded by Prof. Clyde Wade. Nominations from the floor were requested. Prof. Ray Edwards moved that nominations cease and that Prof. Adams be elected by acclamation. Prof. Richard Miller seconded the motion, which carried. Prof. Williams then nominated Kevin Gibson to replace Mike Aufdembrink, who graduated. The nomination was seconded by Prof. Richard Miller. Nominations from the floor were again requested. Prof. Edwards moved to cease nominations and to elect the nominee by acclamation. Prof. Vince Roach provided the second, and the motion carried.
F. STUDENT AFFAIRS.

1. CONSTITUTION – UMR VOLLEYBALL CLUB. Prof. Lance Williams, temporarily representing the Student Affairs Committee, moved acceptance of the UMR Volleyball Club’s constitution. The motion was seconded by Prof. Lance Haynes and passed. (Attachment III.F)

The meeting adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Clyde G. Wade
Secretary

Attachments: II.C.1
II.C.2
II.D
III.A
III.B.1
III.B.2
III.C
III.D.1
III.F

*Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.*

MEMO TO: Martin Jischke
              Chancellor

FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair
       Budgetary Affairs Committee

RE: Distribution of the Withheld 3%

Martin, should the withheld 3% be released, the Budgetary Affairs Committee recommends:

1. The 3% that was intended for salary increases and was used for the withholding should be returned to S & W and be retroactive to Sept. If there is a legal problem with the retroactive mechanism, we strongly recommend that a one-time payment of the medical benefits increase be made or some other mechanism be found to provide these funds for employee compensation.

and,

2. Inasmuch as the salary increases in recent years have by no means kept pace with the CPI and that 3% represents a small increase in S & W, the 3% should be distributed across the board.

I would appreciate an opportunity to visit with you regarding this matter.

cc. Orrin Crosser, President
       Academic Council
MEMO TO: Orrin Crosser, President  
Academic Council  
FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair  
Budgetary Affairs Committee  
RE: Distribution of Withheld State Funds and Salary Increase  
Distribution Policy.

Orrin, I am enclosing, for Council's information, copies of the Budgetary Affairs Committee recommendation of Dec.16th concerning distribution of the withheld state funds and Chancellor Jischke's response.

I am enclosing, for Council's action, amendments recommended by the Budgetary Committee to the proposed Salary Increase Distribution Policy and background memoes.
MEMO TO: Martin Jischke  
Chancellor

FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair  
Budgetary Affairs Committee

RE: UMR Salary Increase Distribution Policy

Martin, the Budgetary Affairs Committee has conducted an initial review of the proposed statement regarding UMR Salary Increase Distribution Policy. The statement appears to reflect past practices but considerably more discussion needs to take place if such practices are to be fixed policy in the future. Since this issue is so critical to the welfare and morale of the faculty and the quality of education at UMR, it must have full and complete faculty involvement in its development.

The Committee will proceed immediately to study this issue and will develop some recommendations for action by the Academic Council. In the meantime, we recommend that the report to the President and the Board of Curators summarize the practices that have been followed in past years.

I would appreciate an opportunity to visit with you regarding the matter.

CAS/bz

cc: Orrin Crosser  
President Academic Council
MEMO TO: Carol Ann Smith  
Chair, Budgetary Affairs Committee  

FROM: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor  

SUBJECT: Distribution of Withheld Funds  

December 23, 1988

I appreciate the recommendations of the Budgetary Affairs Committee regarding the use of funds released by the Governor. As you are probably aware, the Governor has indeed released one and one-half percent of the three percent that has been withheld. The campus intends to devote all of that to compensation. The University's intentions are to make the increases effective as of September 1. In addition, the General Officers have agreed to recommend to the Board that the guidelines adopted by the Board in September be used for these increases. That means that the increases will be distributed on the basis of merit and market considerations.

Thus, while I both agree with and will follow the recommendation number one in your memo of December 16, I do not believe the guidelines adopted by the Board allow for across the board actions, and, thus, we will be using merit and market considerations in the distribution of the released funds.

I appreciate your quick response to these issues.

MCJ/cal
December 27, 1988

MEMO TO: Carol Ann Smith  
Chair, Budgetary Affairs Committee

FROM: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor

SUBJECT: Salary Increase Distribution Policy

I appreciate the quick response of the Budgetary Affairs Committee to the proposed UMR Salary Increase Distribution Policy. I agree that additional time for a full discussion would be desirable. The General Officers' present plans are now to have this item go to the Board of Curators in March. It is my understanding that the Board will want at that time a report on the actual policies the campuses are following, and, therefore, I would hope to be able to describe to them the policy that we are following and intend to follow in the future rather than simply report on past practices.

Thus, to ensure that the views of the Academic Council are given full and careful consideration in the development of this policy, it would be helpful if any recommendations of the Academic Council could be sent to me by the end of February. I believe this will provide adequate time for the debate and discussion that is needed.

Please call if you have questions regarding this memo.

MCJ/cal

cc: Orrin Crosser  
        Chancellor's Staff Group
UMR SALARY INCREASE DISTRIBUTION POLICY

I. GENERAL GUIDELINES

It is the purpose of this policy to describe the principles that guide campus decisions regarding the distribution of salary increase funds. Such decisions, of course, must adhere to and be consistent with the guidelines adopted by the Board of Curators for the University system. In general, salary increase decisions can be based on four considerations: merit, market conditions, cost-of-living adjustments, and equity/nondiscrimination principles.

Guidelines adopted recently by the Board of Curators have emphasized the role of merit in salary increase decisions, although allowances for market and equity/nondiscrimination principles have been possible. Generally, the Board of Curators guidelines have not called for cost-of-living adjustments.

It has been the goal of the University system and the campus to achieve competitive salaries for faculty and staff. Faculty salaries at the Big 8/Big 10 universities have been used, by rank and discipline, as the basis for assessing the competitiveness of campus faculty salaries. The University has employed appropriate national, regional, and local markets to assess the competitiveness of staff salaries. These various assessments are conducted annually by the office of Vice President for Administrative Affairs and are used to quantify the market position of faculty and the various categories of staff. It is the goal of the campus to achieve competitive salaries and to eliminate differences in market competitiveness for the various categories of employees.

The sources of funds for salary increases include state appropriated tax revenues; tuition and fee income; reallocation at the campus, divisional, and unit levels; and other miscellaneous sources of funds. The first three sources of funds account for the overwhelming share of the campus' revenues.
II. UMR SALARY POLICY FOR SALARY INCREASES

To the extent that funds are available to the campus for salary and wage adjustments, these funds will be distributed in accordance with the guidelines adopted annually by the Board of Curators.

3. Merit salary increases are to be awarded based on individual performance as evaluated within each unit and reviewed at the divisional and campus level. Each division and each unit shall have written procedures describing how such merit evaluations will be made. The unit procedures will be reviewed and approved by the appropriate Vice Chancellor or Dean and, together with the divisional policy, will be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor.

2. Market salary adjustments will be considered annually based on comparisons of faculty salaries by rank and discipline with the Big 8/Big 10 institutions and staff compensation with appropriate comparator groups.

1. The need for salary adjustments for equity/nondiscrimination principles will be determined by an internal annual review and comparison of compensation for the various Department of Labor categories of employees. This review will be done at the campus level by the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action in consultation with the Chancellor.

ADD:

4. Cost-of-living increases shall be made across the board to all faculty and staff as the same percentage of salary.

ADD:

5. Other equity issues such as salary compression shall be handled on an ad hoc basis with input from appropriate groups.
III. UMR PROCEDURES FOR SALARY INCREASES

[NOTE: This is a substitute for the attached original.]

1. The campus distribution of salary increase funds among the five categories in Section II will be determined by the Chancellor after consultation with the Budget Review Committee and the Academic Council. The level of funding for each category shall be announced annually to the campus.

2. Prior to the distribution of funds to the divisions, a pool of funds will be set aside by the Chancellor to address nondiscrimination/Affirmative Action principles, if there has been established a need to make such adjustments.

3. Each unit will receive a similar percentage for cost of living increases.

4. Funds for market adjustments will be distributed to divisions based on their relative market position with respect to comparable units. Funds for other equity issues will be distributed to divisions after the appropriate calculations have been made at the Chancellor’s level.

5. Each division will receive a similar percentage increase in the salary and wage pool for merit to be distributed in accordance with the written policies adopted by the division and the various units within the division.

6. Employees represented by collective bargaining units will have their compensation adjusted centrally and will not be reviewed individually for merit and market adjustments.

7. It is expected that each division will follow similar procedures in distributing salary increase funds among the units of the division. The assessment of the relative market position and merit of individual faculty and staff, however, is most likely to be done accurately and fairly within the unit.

8. It is the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor or Dean of each division to ensure that the campus’ goals are met by the division. The resulting salary increase recommendations from the division will be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor.

[NOTE: The Budgetary Affairs Committee was evenly split on deleting "similar".]
III. UMR PROCEDURES FOR SALARY INCREASES

1. Prior to the distribution of funds to the divisions, a pool of funds will be set aside by the Chancellor to address equity/nondiscrimination principles, if there has been established a need to make such adjustments.

2. Employees represented by collective bargaining units will have their compensation adjusted centrally and will not be reviewed individually for merit and market adjustments.

3. Each division will receive a similar percentage increase in the salary and wage pool for merit to be distributed in accordance with the written policies adopted by the division and the various units within the division.

4. Funds for market adjustments will be distributed to divisions based on their relative market position with respect to comparable units.

The campus distribution of salary increase funds among the categories of merit, market, and equity/nondiscrimination will be determined by the Chancellor after consultation with the Budget Review Committee.

It is expected that each division will follow similar procedures in distributing salary increase funds among the units of the division.

As the assessment of the relative market position and merit of individual faculty and staff is most likely to be done accurately and fairly within the unit, it is expected that at least seventy-five percent of the funds available to the division will be allocated by unit heads. Exceptions to this procedure require prior approval of the Chancellor. The remaining funds available to the division can be held and distributed by the Vice Chancellor/Dean with the advice of the unit heads.

It is the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor/Dean to ensure that the campus' goals for merit, market and equity/nondiscrimination are met by the division. The resulting salary increase recommendations from the division will be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor.
January 24, 1989

Memo to: Orrin Crosser, President
Academic Council

From: Vince Roach, Chair
Personnel Committee

Re: Action on Referrals from Council Meeting, December 6, 1988

The Personnel Committee has considered the two items referred by the Council at the December 6 meeting and makes the following recommendations regarding these two items.

Action: (1) The Personnel Committee recommends elimination of Section III (Procedures for Establishing Rank and/or Tenure for Persons Seeking a Position at UMR) of the "redraft", dated 12/6/88, of "Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations".

Rationale: The committee feels Section III requirements are an unnecessary impediment to the hiring process where timing is often a critical factor. The procedure currently used has been effective except in isolated cases and the committee feels such cases do not warrant a general major change in policy.

Action: (2) The Personnel Committee endorses the draft, dated 11/23/88, of "Drug Abuse Policy" (see attached) proposed for adoption by the University of Missouri.

Rationale: The committee feels a policy is needed, but endorsement by the committee is for this specific statement only and should not be construed to endorse any of the materials which accompanied the draft statement of policy.

DVR: dms

Attachment
The unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession or use of illegal drugs is prohibited on all University property. University employees are also expected to refrain from such unlawful conduct during non-work time, away from the workplace. Violations of this policy may result in discharge or other discipline in accordance with University policies and procedures covering the conduct of faculty, staff and students.

The University has an obligation to provide a healthy and safe environment for all students, employees, and visitors to its campuses. Consistent with this concern, the University offers the following range of resources to employees and students:

A. Student, employee, and management education and information about the dangers of drug abuse in the workplace.

B. Supervisory training to assist in identifying and addressing illegal drug use.

C. Self referrals as well as supervisory referrals to drug counseling and rehabilitation programs available through the University's Employee Assistance Program and community agencies with respect for individual confidentiality.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Greg Grosser, President Academic Council
FROM: Madison Daily, Chairman Student Affairs Comm.
DATE: December 12, 1988
SUBJECT: December Meeting of Student Affairs Comm.

The Student Affairs Committee met on 7 December 1988 and approved the proposed constitution of the UMR Volleyball Club. The Constitution is forwarded to the Academic Council for consideration.
MEMO TO: Professor Orrin Crosser  
President, Academic Council  

FROM: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor  

DATE: January 23, 1989  
SUBJECT: Compensation Adjustment  

Professor Lance Williams suggested that I report to the Academic Council on the use of the funds released to the campus by the Governor in December. As I must be away on February 2, this memorandum is to serve as a report to the Academic Council.

As you know, the Governor has released half of the funds withheld at the beginning of the year. This amounts to $485,080 for the University of Missouri-Rolla and all of these funds have been used for compensation and compensation-based benefits adjustments.

The distribution of the funds followed the policy principles outlined in the most recent draft of the UMR Salary Increase Distribution Policy and the 1988-89 Salary and Wage Principles approved by the Board of Curators. After review, the campus has set aside $11,000 (plus associated benefits) to address equity/discrimination concerns. As the 1987-88 matrices were readjusted by 3.35% in comparison to the 2.00% adjustment in July, each division will receive 1.35% of their salary base for merit adjustments. The base to which this percentage is applied includes only those continuing University employees who were eligible for salary increases in September. This excludes students, line items and open positions (see attached schedule). The remaining funds were used to address market inequities. The resulting distribution of these funds is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity/Discrimination</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35% Merit</td>
<td>332,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>92,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Benefits</td>
<td>48,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$485,080</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These compensation adjustments will be effective as of September 1, 1988 and employees will be receiving a check in February to cover the additional pay for September through January. All recommendations for adjustments were due in the Budget Office by January 16, 1989. Office/technical employees were to be brought up to the new minimum or class rate as appropriate.

MCJ/cal
Attachment II.C.2

ITINERARY
CHANCELLOR'S SCHOLARSHIP

Name:

Housing: None

Host:

Department: Electrical Engineering

Date: Friday, February 17, 1989

Interview Time: 4:00 Place: 110 Engr. Mgt.

Panel: Ronald Kohser, David Oglesby, Harvest Collier

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

9:00 Welcome and Orientation
    (Students and Parents)  Room 204 McNutt

9:30 Visit Classes
    (Students Only)

10:30 Program
    (Students and Parents)

    Freshman Engineering  Room 204 McNutt

    College of Arts & Sciences  Room 231 McNutt

11:00 Honors
    (Students and Parents)  Room 204 McNutt

11:30 Other (Financial Aid, Housing)  Room 204 McNutt

12:00 Lunch

1:30 Visits to campus departments  Room 204 McNutt

2:30 Interviews or campus tours Campus tours leave
    from 204 McNutt at
    2:30 and 3:30

3:30 Interviews or campus tours

Parking provided in Lot #9 (please see attached map).
Visitors permit should be placed in the rear window.

We have made every attempt to satisfy your wishes. We are
sorry if they all could not be fulfilled.
January 25, 1989

MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Walt Johnson, Chair  
Dr. Walt Gajda  
Dr. Lance Williams  
Dr. Norman Smith  
Dr. Ronald Kohser  
Dr. David Oglesby  
Ms. Kathy Stone  

FROM: John T. Park  
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  

SUBJECT: Blue Ribbon Committee on Teacher Evaluation  

I want to thank you for your willingness to serve on the Blue Ribbon Committee on Teacher Evaluation charged with the duty of developing or identifying suitable instruments and procedures for student evaluation instruction, answering questions, and conveying the committee's duties. A copy of the committee charge is attached. I have asked Dr. Ellen Leininger, Program Director of Institutional Assessment, and Mr. David Anderson, Senior Systems Analyst in the Computer Center, to serve as staff to the committee.

The committee should set as its goal the development of instruments and procedures that will permit pilot program usage in the Fall Semester, 1989. I am requesting a preliminary report on April 15, 1989, suitable to share with the Academic Council and department chairs. This preliminary report will provide an opportunity for input to the committee from the campus prior to completion of the committee's activities.

Dr. Walter Johnson has agreed to serve as chair of the committee. I have scheduled the first meeting on Tuesday, February 7, at 3:00 p.m. in 216 Parker Hall.

JTP/bjc
CHARGE TO THE BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ON TEACHER EVALUATION

The Blue Ribbon Committee on Teacher Evaluation is charged with the responsibility for developing procedures and instruments for teacher evaluation which are consistent with the policies recommended by the Academic Council (copy attached) and the November 4, 1988, report of the Committee of Department Chairmen Sub-committee On Student Evaluations (copy attached). These procedures should provide the information required for personnel decisions as well as the feedback required by faculty members to promote improvement in their teaching.

The committee should reconcile any perceived inconsistencies between the policy recommendations of the Academic Council and the procedure/policy recommendations of the Committee of Department Chairmen Sub-Committee On Student Evaluations.

The committee is specifically directed to develop an evaluation instrument for student evaluation of instructors which meets both the need for faculty self-improvement and personnel decisions. The committee is directed to investigate the various evaluative tools available and develop an instrument which is applicable to the UMR campus. A nationally normed evaluation instrument would be acceptable but is not required.

The committee is charged with the development of procedures for administration of the student evaluation teaching instrument. Procedures should be designed to protect student confidentiality and eliminate the possibility of faculty influence on the results by either reward or intimidation.

The committee is directed to develop procedures which allow for voluntary use of peer evaluation, alumni evaluation, and self-evaluation directed toward improving individual faculty teaching. The procedures should allow administrative use of this information in cases where the faculty member disputes the validity of the student teaching evaluation.

The committee should determine the date each semester when the evaluation instrument will be provided so that both faculty and students will be informed and prepared to participate in a knowledgeable and meaningful manner.

The committee is requested to provide a preliminary report to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by April 15, 1989, suitable for distribution to the Academic Council and department chairs. A final report is to be available for action at the first Academic Council meeting of the 1989-90 academic year held in September, 1989, so that a pilot trial of the evaluation instrument could be undertaken during the Fall Semester, 1989.
RESOLUTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE UMR ACADEMIC COUNCIL

The UMR Academic Council endorses the following seven principles on student outcomes assessment. The principles are derived from and have been approved by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) Executive Committee.

1. Institutional, program and student outcomes assessment should focus, primarily, on the effectiveness of academic programs and on the improvement of student learning and performance.

2. States and institutions should rely primarily on incentives rather than regulations or penalties to effect student outcomes assessment and foster improvement.

3. Institutional programs for evaluation and assessment should be developed with the collaboration of the faculty.

4. Assessment requirements should permit colleges and universities to develop institutional programs and define indicators of quality appropriate to their missions and goals and consistent with state-wide objectives and standards.

5. Colleges and universities should be encouraged to use multiple methods of assessment for improving teaching and learning and demonstrating achievement.

6. Requirements for assessment should be fiscally conservative and avoid imposing costly evaluation programs on institutions or state agencies.

7. Within an institution, assessment programs should be linked to strategic planning or program review, or to some comprehensive strategy intended to encourage change and improvement.

It is also the opinion of the UMR Academic Council that assessment should be used primarily as a tool for internal evaluation. It is appropriate to use assessment to identify strengths, weaknesses, truths, and myths within an institution or within a department. It is not appropriate to use assessment as a "score card" for comparison of institutions or departments, and it is not appropriate to allocate state funds based upon comparisons of assessment results. As such, assessment results should be made available to the faculty, but there is little value in the distribution of results to the general public.

RATIONALE

Although Sentence 2 of the ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF CURATORS reads "Institutional evaluation will identify strengths and weaknesses of our general education programs relative to those of peer institutions," and although
(2) UMR recognizes the value and importance of assessment and accountability to the public, and although
(3) Based upon the 1988 results it appears that it may be to the advantage of UMR to compare institutions,
it is the opinion of the UMR Academic Council that assessment should not be used to compare institutions or departments. If assessment is used to "keep score" and financial appropriations are tied to the "scores," then universities and departments will have no choice but to teach toward the standardized tests.

We, as members of the UMR faculty, recognize that there is a strong feeling among the general public, among government officials and among the Board of Curators that higher education needs to be accountable for the funds that it receives. However, this same group of people needs to be aware that assessment results may be misinterpreted and abused.

Recent conferences on assessment have underscored two particular areas where comparison of assessment results from standardized tests may be very misleading. The following two areas are particularly susceptible to abuse:

1. It is very dangerous to use standardized tests to compare departments or universities, simply because different departments and different universities have different missions. Many leading and innovative or "frontier" departments are proud of the fact that their emphasis area is unique in the nation. Such top departments are likely to fare poorly on standardized tests because the core of their curriculum is not standard—it is not taught anywhere else and the subject matter will not appear on standardized tests. Standardized tests simply cannot treat different emphasis areas fairly.

2. Value added, defined as a comparison of what students know when they enter a university relative to what they know when they graduate, is difficult, if not impossible, to assess by using standardized tests.
MEMO TO: Martin Jischke  
Chancellor  

FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair  
Budgetary Affairs Committee  

RE: Distribution of the Withheld 3%  

Martin, should the withheld 3% be released, the Budgetary Affairs Committee recommends:

1. The 3% that was intended for salary increases and was used for the withholding should be returned to S & W and be retroactive to Sept. If there is a legal problem with the retroactive mechanism, we strongly recommend that a one-time payment of the medical benefits increase be made or some other mechanism be found to provide these funds for employee compensation.

and, 2. Inasmuch as the salary increases in recent years have by no means kept pace with the CPI and that 3% represents a small increase in S & W, the 3% should be distributed across the board.

I would appreciate an opportunity to visit with you regarding this matter.

cc. Orrin Crosser, President  
Academic Council

MEMO TO: Orrin Crosser, President  
Academic Council

FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair  
Budgetary Affairs Committee

RE: Distribution of Withheld State Funds and Salary Increase Distribution Policy.

Orrin, I am enclosing, for Council's information, copies of the Budgetary Affairs Committee recommendation of Dec.16th concerning distribution of the withheld state funds and Chancellor Jischke's response.

I am enclosing, for Council's action, amendments recommended by the Budgetary Committee to the proposed Salary Increase Distribution Policy and background memoes.
December 16, 1988

MEMO TO: Martin Jischke
          Chancellor

FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair
       Budgetary Affairs Committee

RE: UMR Salary Increase Distribution Policy

Martin, the Budgetary Affairs Committee has conducted an initial review of the proposed statement regarding UMR Salary Increase Distribution Policy. The statement appears to reflect past practices but considerably more discussion needs to take place if such practices are to be fixed policy in the future. Since this issue is so critical to the welfare and morale of the faculty and the quality of education at UMR, it must have full and complete faculty involvement in its development.

The Committee will proceed immediately to study this issue and will develop some recommendations for action by the Academic Council. In the meantime, we recommend that the report to the President and the Board of Curators summarize the practices that have been followed in past years.

I would appreciate an opportunity to visit with you regarding the matter.

CAS/bz

cc: Orrin Crosser
    President Academic Council
December 23, 1988

MEMO TO: Carol Ann Smith  
Chair, Budgetary Affairs Committee

FROM: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor

SUBJECT: Distribution of Withheld Funds

I appreciate the recommendations of the Budgetary Affairs Committee regarding the use of funds released by the Governor. As you are probably aware, the Governor has indeed released one and one-half percent of the three percent that has been withheld. The campus intends to devote all of that to compensation. The University's intentions are to make the increases effective as of September 1. In addition, the General Officers have agreed to recommend to the Board that the guidelines adopted by the Board in September be used for these increases. That means that the increases will be distributed on the basis of merit and market considerations.

Thus, while I both agree with and will follow the recommendation number one in your memo of December 16, I do not believe the guidelines adopted by the Board allow for across the board actions, and, thus, we will be using merit and market considerations in the distribution of the released funds.

I appreciate your quick response to these issues.

MCJ/cal
I appreciate the quick response of the Budgetary Affairs Committee on the proposed UMR Salary Increase Distribution Policy. I agree that additional time for a full discussion would be desirable. The General Officers' present plans are now to have this item go to the Board of Curators in March. It is my understanding that the Board will want at that time a report on the actual policies the campuses are following, and, therefore, I would hope to be able to describe to them the policy that is following and intend to follow in the future rather than simply reiterate on past practices.

Thus, to ensure that the views of the Academic Council are given and careful consideration in the development of this policy, it would be helpful if any recommendations of the Academic Council could be sent to me by the end of February. I believe this will provide adequate time for debate and discussion that is needed.

Please call if you have questions regarding this memo.

MCJ/cal

cc: Orrin Crosser
    Chancellor's Staff Group
II. UMR SALARY POLICY FOR SALARY INCREASES

To the extent that funds are available to the campus for salary and wage adjustments, these funds will be distributed in accordance with the guidelines adopted annually by the Board of Curators.

3. Merit salary increases are to be awarded based on individual performance as evaluated within each unit and reviewed at the divisional and campus level. Each division and each unit shall have written procedures describing how such merit evaluations will be made. The unit procedures will be reviewed and approved by the appropriate Vice Chancellor or Dean and, together with the divisional policy, will be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor.

2. Market salary adjustments will be considered annually based on comparisons of faculty salaries by rank and discipline with the Big 8/Big 10 institutions and staff compensation with appropriate comparator groups.

1. The need for salary adjustments for equity and nondiscrimination principles will be determined by an internal annual review and comparison of compensation for the various Department of Labor categories of employees. This review will be done at the campus level by the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action in consultation with the Chancellor.

ADD: 4. Cost-of-living increases shall be made across the board to all faculty and staff as the same percentage of salary.

ADD: 5. Other equity issues such as salary compression shall be handled on an ad hoc basis with input from appropriate groups.
III. UMR PROCEDURES FOR SALARY INCREASES

[NOTE: This is a substitute for the attached original.]

1. The campus distribution of salary increase funds among the five categories in Section II will be determined by the Chancellor after consultation with the Budget Review Committee and the Academic Council. The level of funding for each category shall be announced annually to the campus.

2. Prior to the distribution of funds to the divisions, a pool of funds will be set aside by the Chancellor to address nondiscrimination/Affirmative Action principles, if there has been established a need to make such adjustments.

3. Each unit will receive a similar percentage for cost of living increases.

4. Funds for market adjustments will be distributed to divisions based on their relative market position with respect to comparable units. Funds for other equity issues will be distributed to divisions after the appropriate calculations have been made at the Chancellor's level.

5. Each division will receive a similar percentage increase in the salary, and wage pool for merit to be distributed in accordance with the written policies adopted by the division and the various units within the division.

6. Employees represented by collective bargaining units will have their compensation adjusted centrally and will not be reviewed individually for merit and market adjustments.

7. It is expected that each division will follow similar procedures in distributing salary increase funds among the units of the division. The assessment of the relative market position and merit of individual faculty and staff, however, is most likely to be done accurately and fairly within the unit.

8. It is the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor or Dean of each division to ensure that the campus' goals are met by the division. The resulting salary increase recommendations from the division will be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor.

[NOTE: The Budgetary Affairs Committee was evenly split on deleting "similar".]

III. UMR PROCEDURES FOR SALARY INCREASES

1. Prior to the distribution of funds to the divisions, a pool of funds will be set aside by the Chancellor to address equity/nondiscrimination principles, if there has been established a need to make such adjustments.

2. Employees represented by collective bargaining units will have their compensation adjusted centrally and will not be reviewed individually for merit and market adjustments.

3. Each division will receive a similar percentage increase in the salary and wage pool for merit to be distributed in accordance with the written policies adopted by the division and the various units within the division.

4. Funds for market adjustments will be distributed to divisions based on their relative market position with respect to comparable units.

The campus distribution of salary increase funds among the categories of merit, market, and equity/nondiscrimination will be determined by the Chancellor after consultation with the Budget Review Committee.

It is expected that each division will follow similar procedures in distributing salary increase funds among the units of the division.

As the assessment of the relative market position and merit of individual faculty and staff is most likely to be done accurately and fairly within the unit, it is expected that at least seventy-five percent of the funds available to the division will be allocated by unit heads. Exceptions to this procedure require prior approval of the Chancellor. The remaining funds available to the division can be held and distributed by the Vice Chancellor/Dean with the advice of the unit heads.

It is the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor/Dean to ensure that the campus' goals for merit, market and equity/nondiscrimination are met by the division. The resulting salary increase recommendations from the division will be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor.
January 24, 1989

Memo to: Orrin Crosser, President
       Academic Council

From: Vince Roach, Chair
       Personnel Committee

Re: Action on Referrals from Council Meeting, December 6, 1988

The Personnel Committee has considered the two items referred by the Council at the December 6 meeting and makes the following recommendations regarding these two items.

Action: (1) The Personnel Committee recommends elimination of Section III (Procedures for Establishing Rank and/or Tenure for Persons Seeking a Position at UMR) of the "redraft", dated 12/6/88, of "Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations".

Rationale: The committee feels Section III requirements are an unnecessary impediment to the hiring process where timing is often a critical factor. The procedure currently used has been effective except in isolated cases and the committee feels such cases do not warrant a general major change in policy.

Action: (2) The Personnel Committee endorses the draft, dated 11/23/88, of "Drug Abuse Policy" (see attached) proposed for adoption by the University of Missouri.

Rationale: The committee feels a policy is needed, but endorsement by the committee is for this specific statement only and should not be construed to endorse any of the materials which accompanied the draft statement of policy.

DVR:dms

Attachment
DRUG ABUSE POLICY

The unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession or use of illegal drugs is prohibited on all University property. University employees are also expected to refrain from such unlawful conduct during non-work time, away from the workplace. Violations of this policy may result in discharge or other discipline in accordance with University policies and procedures covering the conduct of faculty, staff and students.

The University has an obligation to provide a healthy and safe environment for all students, employees, and visitors to its campuses. Consistent with this concern, the University offers the following range of resources to employees and students:

A. Student, employee, and management education and information about the dangers of drug abuse in the workplace.

B. Supervisory training to assist in identifying and addressing illegal drug use.

C. Self referrals as well as supervisory referrals to drug counseling and rehabilitation programs available through the University's Employee Assistance Program and community agencies with respect for individual confidentiality.
The Student Affairs Committee met on 7 December 1988 and approved the proposed constitution of the UMR Volleyball Club. The Constitution is forwarded to the Academic Council for consideration.
President's Report: 1. President Crosser reminded the Council that all items on the agenda are a matter of public record, as are all items forwarded to the Council by the chairs of Council committees. The media may make use of any item that interests them. 2. He noted that Professor Ralph Alexander of Physics is a member of a U-Wide Retirement Benefits Study Committee and that UMR faculty and staff may make their recommendations through him. 3. President Crosser commended those who participated in drafting the campus report for the North Central Association and those who represented the faculty before the NCA visiting committee. With a report to the Curators by Mr. Jerry Passmore, a consultant to Missourians for Higher Education, and pertinent items in the news media in mind, President Crosser made the common-sense observation that faculty need "to think about what we say" and to be prepared to make the most effective presentation of the University's role and needs. 4. Interest in undergraduate engineering education at UMSL remains a major concern of the leadership at UMSL, a "significant item on the Agenda for Action, and an on-going activity of the UMR administration." According to the best information available, it "is still at the discussion and negotiation stage. . . ."

Referrals Two referrals were made to the Personnel Committee, a document from the System which addresses conflict of interest and a letter from Professor Charles Corry of Geology and Geophysics.

Chancellor's Report The Chancellor's report consists of a memo (23 Jan. 1989) on the use of funds ($485,080) released to the campus by the Governor in December, 1988. Distribution of these funds was as follows: EQUITY/DISCRIMINATION $11,000; MERIT 1.35%, $332,862; MARKET $92,793; STAFF BENEFITS $48,425. "These compensation adjustments will be effective as of September 1, 1988, and employees will be receiving a check in February to cover the additional pay for September through January."

Administration Report A report on "Prestigious Scholarships" was presented by the Director of Admissions, Robert Lewis, and the Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences, Wayne Cogell. The goal is to attract superior students to UMR via a package including the Curators Scholarship program, the Higher Education Scholarship program (Bright Flight), and a new Chancellor's Scholarship program. General criteria for a premier scholarship are a score of at least 29 on the ACT, a standing in the top 3% of a graduating class, and Missouri residency. A brochure and an application form have been developed and sent to prospective students. In excess of 80 applicants are competing in this first year of the program. Dean Cogell described for the Council the
extensive planning that has gone into putting the program into effect.

Administrative Response: Teacher Evaluation  Professor Walt Johnson, Chairman of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Teacher Evaluation, reported that his committee has the responsibility of developing "an evaluation instrument for student evaluation of instructors" that will meet "both the need for faculty self-improvement and personnel decisions." The committee will study the evaluative tools available and "develop an instrument which is applicable to the UMR campus." A preliminary report is to be prepared for the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs by April 15, 1989; it is to be suitable for distribution to the Academic Council and the department chairs. A final report is to be available for Council action at its first meeting of the 1989-1990 academic year.

Assessment Committee  Professor Robert Laudon requested endorsement by the Council of the "seven principles on student outcomes assessment" derived from and approved by NASULGC (and previously made available to the Council). The Council endorsed both the resolution and its cautionary "Rationale." Both will be forwarded to University authorities and the Board of Curators.

Budgetary Affairs  The Committee proposed revisions of the Salary Increase Distribution Policy draft. These revisions include deletions from Section I, a substitute for Section III, a renumbering of items in Section II, and two additions to that section. These additions allow for cost of living increases and equity issues. All recommendations of the Committee were approved by the Council as presented.


Personnel  The Council approved the elimination of Section III of Procedures for Establishing Rank and/or Tenure for Persons Seeking a Position at UMR (the "redraft" dated 12/6/88, of "Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations"). It endorsed the draft dated 11/23/88 of the "Drug Abuse Policy" (attached to the 2 Feb. Council agenda) proposed for adoption by the University of Missouri.

R P & A.  The Council elected Prof. Curt Adams as the faculty representative and Kevin Gibson as the student representative on the Student Affairs Committee.

Student Affairs  The Constitution for the UMR Volleyball Club was approved.
MEMO TO: Dr. O. Crosser, President
Academic Council

FROM: Y. Omurtag

RE: Change in Faculty Representative to Academic Council

Effective immediately, Dr. Colin Benjamin has been appointed as the department's representative to the Academic Council in place of Dr. Madison Daily. This appointment expires upon Dr. Daily's return from development leave in January, 1990. Thank you.

YO:bas
Sworn in for six-year terms as curators were Carrie Francke of Columbia, Webb R. Gilmore of Kansas City and John P. Lichtenegger of Jackson. The swearing-in ceremony was led by Board President Edwin S. Turner. The governor appointed Francke and Gilmore and reappointed Lichtenegger earlier this month.

In his first meeting as board president, Edwin S. Turner told curators, "We as a board have many challenges ahead of us." His goals for meeting those challenges include providing opportunity for the board to pursue open discussion of issues and stronger lines of communication among board members, the administration, faculty, staff and students. Through teamwork and a team spirit, Turner said, "we'll be successful in making this year a year of new beginnings."

President Magrath discussed with the board the Agenda for Action process under way. The board has approved the five-year financial plan component for the Agenda for Action, but Magrath stressed that neither the total projected cost of $40 million for program improvements nor the specific candidates for program improvements are firm. A process is under way to complete this part of the agenda. A working draft of the University Planning Council's report has been distributed to each campus for review. "I have stressed the importance of broad participation by the faculty and the University community in these discussions," Magrath said. "The report of the University Planning Council, I must emphasize, is not the Agenda for Action. The report is an internal working document that will help us shape the Agenda for Action as it will be presented to the board following campus recommendations and discussion among the general officers."

Passmore, consultant to the Missourians for Higher Education, reported on research the MHE conducted in August to determine attitudes of Missourians toward higher education in the state. "The public has an inflated idea of how well we're doing" in supporting higher education, Passmore said, in that 60 percent think Missouri ranks in the top half nationally. Conclusions of the research: Support for higher education is widespread among Missourians although they are not well-informed about the actual status of higher education support. The idea of increased public support for higher education would be supported by 88 percent of the Missourians surveyed, with most people favoring a sales tax to provide the increased investment. MHE, a group representing private and public higher education institutions in the state, will continue to consider how to translate the research data into a solution for financing Missouri higher education.

The board discussed the possibility of reviewing UM System admissions standards in light of UM-Columbia's projections that more students will apply than the campus can enroll this fall. Based upon current projections, applications are strong on the other campuses also.

Board committees for 1989 were approved. Committees will be chaired by Eva Louise Frazer, Executive Committee and Finance Committee; Peter H. Raven, Academic Affairs Committee; James C. Sterling, Physical Facilities Committee; and John P. Lichtenegger, Resources and Planning Committee.

Next meeting: March 9-10, UM-Columbia
Discussions headed by Don Askeland, Chairman of the National Merit Day Committee, Chancellor Jischke, Vice Chancellor Ogrosky, Jerry Bayless and others centered around our recognition of superior students and how we might attract more to the campus. It was generally agreed that UMR needed to develop a premier scholarship to attract superior students that might part of a scholarship package to include the Curators Scholarship program, the Higher Education Scholarship program, (Bright Flight) and what was to be the Chancellor's Scholarship program. This total package would then allow students with these various scholarship packages to have a full scholarship program to UMR.

The premier scholarship would also incorporate the advantages of being a recruitment tool provided students met the general criteria of 29 on the ACT, top 3% of their class, be Missouri residents, then they could apply for this scholarship which would require, in addition to a scholarship form, a campus visit. Recognizing that only ten scholarships would be granted it was felt that having these students and their parents on the campus for the interview might enhance our position in retaining them even if they did not receive the Chancellor's Scholarship but would allow them to participate in both the general scholarship program administered by the financial aid office and departmental scholarships. It was suggested that possibly we could attract applications from approximately 300 qualified students to campus and be interviewed by a faculty committee. At the present time we have in excess of 80 applicants of Missouri students who are competing for this program. It is felt that next year with increased lead time, better publicity, and earlier contact with this highly qualified group of prospective students that we can increase the
applicant pool substantially. Wayne Cogell will now fill you in on the
details regarding the faculty committee, campus visits, and other
activities provided for the students and their parents when they visit
campus.
UMR Faculty

AGENDA

Academic Council Meeting, Thursday, March 23, 1989; 1:30 p.m.; 6-5 H/SS.

I. Approval of minutes of February 2, 1989, (VOL. XVIII, NO. 4) meeting.

II. Reports and Responses
   A. President's Report (10 min.) Orrin Crosser (4459)
   B. Referrals
   C. Administrative Reports
      1. Chancellor's Report on the Saint Louis Engineering Program (20 min.) Martin Jischke (4114)
   D. Administrative Response
      1. Assessment Results Use (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.A)
      2. Salary Increase Distribution Policy (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.C.2)
      3. Procedures for Establishing Rank/Tenure (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.E.3)

III. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
   A. .0406.03 Admissions and Academic Standards
      (No Report) Thomas Herrick (4507)
      1. Revised Regulations for Removing a Student from Academic Probation (April 23, 1987; XVI, 8; IV.A.1)
      2. Excused Absence Procedure (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; II.B.1)
   B. .0406.05 Budgetary Affairs
      (10 min.) Carol Ann Smith (4869)
      1. Fee Structure Inequities (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.C.2)
      *2. Priorities for the 89/90 Campus Budget
      *3. FY1991 Budget
   C. .0406.09 Curricula
      (5 min.) David Oglesby (4593)
      1. CAPS and the Graduation Catalogue
         (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.1)
      2. Time Limitation of the Graduation Catalogue
         (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.2)
      3. Fee Structure Inequities (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.C.1)
   D. .0406.15 Personnel
      (10 min.) Vince Roach (4449)
      1. Smoking/Non Smoking Policy (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; II.B.3)
      *2. Conflict of Interest (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; II.B.1)
      *3. Academic Freedom and Outside Teaching Assignments (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; II.B.2)

IV. Old Business

V. New Business

R, P & A Cmtt.
LW/cmb/3-7-89

*Supplementary materials sent to Academic Council members and department chairmen.
SUMMARY of the reports, actions, referrals and announcements made at the meeting of the Academic Council held on March 23, 1989.

1. Approval of minutes of the February 2, 1989, Council meeting.

2. Reports and responses.
   A. President’s report - D. Crosser
   B. Administrative reports
      1. St. Louis engineering program - M. Jischke

3. Reports of standing and special committees.
   A. Budgetary Affairs - C. A. Smith
      1. Agenda for action
         (Attachment III.A.1)
      2. Priorities for the 89/90 campus budget
         (Attachment III.A.2)
      3. 90/91 budget request
         (Attachment III.A.3)
   B. Curricula - D. Oglesby
      1. Report No. 5, 1988-89
         a. Twenty-two experimental courses presented
         b. Twenty-nine course changes approved
         c. Five new courses approved
         d. One course deletion approved
            (Attachment III.B)
   C. Personnel - V. Roach
      1. Conflict of interest policy and academic freedom/outside teaching assignments
         (Attachment III.C)

Attachments: III.A.1
              III.A.2
              III.A.3
              III.B
              III.C
XVIII, 5  The March 23, 1989, meeting of the Academic Council was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Prof. Orrin K. Crosser, Academic Council President. The following substitutions were noted: Prof. Larry Gragg for Prof. Lance Williams; Prof. Jeff Caulfield for Prof. C. Dale Elifrits; and Prof. Carol Ann Smith for Prof. Richard Miller. A motion to approve the February 2, 1989, minutes was made and seconded. President Crosser noted one correction in the Academic Assessment Committee report, second from the last sentence (4.3.A): "... (resolution and rationale) ..." should be "... (resolution and rationale) ...". The minutes, as corrected, were approved.

XVIII, 5 REPORTS AND RESPONSES.

A. PRESIDENT’S REPORT. President Orrin Crosser announced that the issue of Engineering Education in St. Louis is on the Agenda for the Curators’ meeting May 4-5 at UMR. Other announcements include a forthcoming retirement planning seminar and a conference on funding for higher education sponsored by the AAUP and others. He called attention to newspaper reports and editorials which suggest that tax increases for higher education are attached to plans to restructure the entire higher education system in Missouri. The tax increase for higher education offered by Senator Sneider will be voted on after the break. To inquiries about "mandatory expenses," President Crosser reports that there is no set policy expense list in budget planning; these expenses include building openings, repair of leaking roofs, library books, etc. CBHE is supporting legislation giving them authority to eliminate programs throughout higher education in Missouri. Richard Wallace is the new Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS.
1. ST. LOUIS ENGINEERING PROGRAM. Chancellor Martin Jischke gave a detailed report on "Access to Engineering in the Urban Areas." UMR has responded principally in two ways. Based on the recommendations of a committee appointed by the Chancellor in 1987, the campus has proposed a means of meeting the needs of nontraditional students around the entire state via a telecommunications-based program; the committee
has developed cost estimates for a system to serve as many as 30 sites. That system is less expensive and more flexible in space and time than any fixed, onsite program. Chancellor Jischke pointed to the success of the National Technical University in support of this solution. In response to the Hancock Committee's recommendations for onsite offerings of EE and ME degrees in St. Louis for nontraditional students, UMR has proposed to expand the UMR Education Center at UMSL beyond its current M.S. programs to include upper division undergraduate courses in EE and ME so that students in the St. Louis area can acquire both B.S. and M.S. degrees in the evenings and on the weekends. This onsite proposal, Chancellor Jischke pointed out, "is a high quality, cost effective, quickly implementable solution to the needs of St. Louis." Moreover, it is "consistent with this campus' statewide mission as approved by the Board of Curators." This proposal represents a "University of Missouri System response to these new educational needs" that not only provides access but also "strengthens UMR's leadership role in engineering education in Missouri." UMSL has proposed a cooperative effort between UMSL and Washington University "to establish new, freestanding degree programs in EE and ME at UMSL."

President Magrath has said that access to engineering education in the urban areas is one of the issues "which the University must resolve. ..." An Agenda for Action Committee chaired by Mr. John Hancock has examined the issue and reported its findings (July, 1989). On February 14, 1989, President Magrath held a retreat with the general officers to discuss the Agenda for Action, including Access to Engineering Education. President Magrath is to present a recommendation to the Board of Curators on engineering education in Missouri at the May 4-5 meeting in Rolla.

XVIII, 3 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

A. BUDGETARY AFFAIRS.
1. AGENDA FOR ACTION. Prof. Carol Ann Smith introduced the Committee's recommendation that "all $39,370,572 of the FY90 budget contained in the "Agenda for Action" be used to restore the base and that no new programs be considered until the
base is fully restored." Prof. Don Cronin moved for approval and Prof. Glen Haddock seconded his motion. Prof. Frank Blum requested a definition of the phrase "new programs" and Profs. Jerry Westphal and Peter Schmidt followed with inquiries concerning the existing Financial Aid Program and whether its expansion fell into the category of "new programs." Prof. Smith replied that "the sense of this [resolution] ought to be restoring what we are currently doing" and that "this policy would not prevent increasing student financial aid." The resolution was approved when a show of hands indicated 15 in favor and 6 against. (Attachment III.A.1)

2. PRIORITIES FOR THE 89/90 CAMPUS BUDGET. The resolution, recommending "that the list of tentative priorities (mandatory expenses, salaries, library, E&E, graduate stipend support, and other) be adopted with the deletion of the other category, that the item to receive the most significant increase should be the salaries item, that department needs be addressed on an individual basis, and that some mechanism be found to identify and address the dissimilar needs of various units" was presented by Prof. Smith. Prof. Glen Heddock moved for approval and Prof. Don Cronin provided the second. The resolution was passed without discussion (22 to 4). (Attachment III.C.2)

3. 90/91 BUDGET REQUEST. Prof. Haddock moved for approval of this last resolution recommendation submitted by Prof. Smith: "that the budget request for FY91 be constructed with the sole aim of restoring the base and that no new programs or activities be proposed." Prof. Cronin seconded the motion. Prof. Jerry Westphal proposed an amendment to delete "and that no new programs or activities be proposed," because "no definition was given for new programs, and activities must be proposed for the purpose of discussion." Prof. Vince Roach seconded the amendment, which passed, and the amended resolution was approved by Council (17 to 6). (Attachment III.A.3)
B. CURRICULA.

1. REPORT NO. 5, 1988-89. Prof. David Oglesby moved for approval of the Curricula Committee's report. Prof. Jeffy Westphal seconded the motion, which carried. (Attachment III.B)

C. PERSONNEL.

1. CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM/OUTSIDE TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS. Prof. Vince Roach moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation to reject the proposed Conflict of Interest policy and to accept the recommendation that "the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs formulate guidelines ... regarding teaching assignments outside the faculty member's academic home department" and that "the guidelines should be ... approved by the Academic Council before adoption as a policy." The motion was seconded and passed. (Attachment III.C)

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Clyde G. Wade
Secretary

Attachments: III.A.1
             III.A.2
             III.A.3
             III.B
             III.C

*Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.*
Memo To: Academic Council Members

From: O. K. Crosser

Re: Agenda for Meeting on March 23, 1989

A primary item on the agenda for our next meeting is the discussion during the Chancellor's report of the situation with respect to the Access to Engineering in Urban Areas of the Agenda for Action.

Moreover, the undergraduate engineering program in St. Louis at UMSL is an agenda item for the next Board of Curator's meeting to be held here in Rolla next May 4 & 5. Please be sure all your colleagues are aware of these opportunities to hear directly, discussion of this program which has major implications for the Rolla Campus.
MEMO TO: Academic Council members  
FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair, Budgetary Affairs Committee.  
RE: Resolution on Agenda for Action.  

March 11, 1989.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee notes that the FY90 (89/90 fund year) budget contained in the Agenda for Action (see attached) allots $23,170,572 for repairing the base and $16,200,000 for program improvements. The Committee believes this distribution of funds is inappropriate in light of the deterioration of the University system.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee recommends the following resolutions to the Academic Council:

that ALL $39,370,572 BE USED TO RESTORE THE BASE

and that NO NEW PROGRAMS BE CONSIDERED UNTIL THE BASE IS FULLY RESTORED.

The Committee believes it is inappropriate to expand activities with new programs until current programs are fully funded.
AGENDA FOR ACTION - BUILDING A NEW MISSOURI
FY1990 - FY1994
(in FY89 Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEEDS</th>
<th>5-YR. PLAN</th>
<th>FY1990</th>
<th>FY1991-94 BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPAIRING THE BASE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>$51,400,000</td>
<td>$17,670,572</td>
<td>$33,729,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Support</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Computing</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Maint. &amp; Repair</td>
<td>19,600,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>17,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Restoration</td>
<td>$102,000,000</td>
<td>$23,170,572</td>
<td>$78,829,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVEMENTS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$14,705,173</td>
<td>$25,294,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>1,494,827</td>
<td>3,505,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Improvements</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td>$16,200,000</td>
<td>28,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Needs</td>
<td>$147,000,000</td>
<td>$39,370,572</td>
<td>$107,629,428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESOURCES
State Appropriations           | $117,000,000| $35,370,572| $81,629,428       |
Other Sources                  | 30,000,000  | 4,000,000  | 26,000,000        |
Total Resources                | $147,000,000| $39,370,572| $107,629,428      |

IV. "AGENDA FOR ACTION--PROPOSED PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS"

Programmatic areas in which the University might consider taking initial actions to assist in building a new Missouri were outlined for the Board of Curators by President C. Peter Magrath on January 11, 1988. He indicated that: "This University has clear priorities and goals, and ... [W]e must formulate an agenda for action and follow that agenda." His remarks contained the following specific suggestions:

- Access to engineering education and technological education in our two urban areas forms the core of an issue that must be resolved. The University's response to the needs of industry for research, human resources (i.e. well-trained personnel), and for problem solving educational services must be shaped deliberately and effectively in ways that will strengthen the state's economy and service the needs of our two largest cities.

- The University of Missouri's historic--but redefined--role of working with food, agriculture and production is fundamental, not because we are a land-grant university, but because it is absolutely essential to the future of Missouri. Practical research and development in...
MEMO TO: Academic Council members  
FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair,  
Budgetary Affairs Committee  
RE: Resolutions on Budget Priorities for 89/90  

The Budgetary Affairs Committee has reviewed the tentative priorities for the campus 89/90 fund year presented at the open budget hearings in December (see attached). The Committee has recommended, in our response to the budget in the Agenda for Action, that the only priority for the 89/90 year should be restoring the base. The items on the tentative priorities list are consistent with our recommendation (except for the "other" category) and the Committee endorses these items as priorities.

The Committee recommends the following resolutions to the Academic Council:

that THE LIST OF TENTATIVE PRIORITIES BE ADOPTED WITH THE DELETION OF THE "OTHER" CATEGORY  
and that THE ITEM TO RECEIVE THE MOST SIGNIFICANT INCREASE SHOULD BE THE SALARIES ITEM.

With respect to the other three items, given the disparate needs of various departments, the Committee recommends:

that DEPARTMENT NEEDS BE ADDRESSED ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS AND THAT SOME MECHANISM BE FOUND TO IDENTIFY AND ADDRESS THE DISSIMILAR NEEDS OF VARIOUS UNITS.
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - ROLLA

FUND YEAR 1989-1990

TENTATIVE PRIORITIES

• MANDATORY EXPENSES
• SALARIES
• LIBRARY
• EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT
• GRADUATE STIPEND SUPPORT
• OTHER
MEMO TO: Academic Council members

FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair,
Budgetary Affairs Committee

RE: Resolutions on the 90/91 Budget Request.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee has discussed the Budget Request for the 90/91 fund year and, in line with our other resolutions (attached), the Committee believes the only priority for the 90/91 Request should be repairing the base. The Committee believes it would be inappropriate to expand activities with new programs until the deterioration of the University is arrested and current programs and activities are adequately funded. The Committee believes this is even more imperative if the proposed five year Agenda for Action increase is not realized and the University must struggle with a smaller increase.

Thus, the Committee recommends the following resolutions to the Academic Council:

that THE BUDGET REQUEST FOR FY91 BE CONSTRUCTED WITH THE SOLE AIM OF RESTORING THE BASE
and that NO NEW PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES BE PROPOSED.
February 27, 1989

Memo To: Orrin Crosser, President  
       Academic Council

From: Vince Roach, Chair  
       Personnel Committee

Re: Action on Referrals from Council Meeting,  
    February 2, 1989

The Personnel Committee has considered the two items referred by the Council at the February 2 meeting and makes the following recommendations regarding these two items.

Item (1): Proposed Conflict of Interest Policy

Recommendation:

The committee recommends rejection by the Academic Council of the "Proposed Conflict of Interest Policy" (copy attached) as forwarded from the office of the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, January 3, 1989.

The proposed policy is viewed by the committee as far too restrictive and as a disincentive to faculty participation with outside agencies in projects beneficial to both the university and the outside agency.

Rationale for Recommendation: The committee members (with limited additional input from faculty peers), found many specific problems with the proposed policy. Only a few specific examples of potential or real problems are noted here:

i) [See Section IV A.1. (p. 2)] Many university employees have "indirect" financial interest in private firms or corporations via stock holdings. If this represents a conflict, the policy would certainly discourage seeking outside funding for research or other programs.

ii) [See Section IV A.4. (p. 4)] Active faculty members are often sought to participate in short course presentations which bring visibility to the University of Missouri as well as financial compensation for the faculty member. Most cases are not likely to have a conflict of interest and the policy regulations would serve as a disincentive to participate in such activities.
iii) [See Section IV A and IV B] Most faculty members have been hired with the understanding of an allowed 20% effort for consulting activities if desired. Does the proposed policy intentionally remove such a guideline and replace it with one to be determined by an immediate supervisor?

iv) [See Section IV B.3] The time period (6 months) for publication is unrealistic. Perhaps a period of two years is more realistic.

v) [See Section V B.4] Classified Research policy should not be part of this Conflict of Interest Policy Statement (see attached memo from Dr. Summers to Dean Warner).

vi) [See Section IV A.3] In view of restrictions imposed by preceding paragraphs of proposed policy, is there any need to have section 3 with undefined terms such as "full time" and exempt? 

Item (2): Memo from Charles Corry regarding academic freedom and outside teaching assignments (see attached memo)

Recommendation: The committee recommends that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs formulate guidelines for administrators and faculty regarding teaching assignments outside the faculty member’s academic home department. The guidelines should be formulated with input from faculty and administration and approved by the Academic Council before adoption as a policy. The committee found the suggestions of Professor Corry useful as a starting point for discussion. Additionally, the committee would like to include proper allowances of credit for teaching such courses to both the faculty member as well as the home academic department. The committee feels that such assignments should not normally be made to regular untenured faculty members.

DVR:dms

Attachments
MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Leonard Koederitz, Chairman, Academic Freedom Committee
From: Charles E. Corry, Associate Professor of Geophysics
Subject: Academic freedom and outside teaching assignments

During times of reduced enrollment in any area of study, it is frequently necessary to consider giving faculty teaching assignments outside their academic departments. However, no guidelines exist as to how faculty should be reassigned, or what constitutes a reasonable expectation of a faculty members ability to teach a subject outside of their academic department. I am requesting that your committee consider formulating such guidelines for submittal to Academic Council.

Without attempting to be comprehensive, I think such guidelines should address at least the following issues:

1. Faculty should not be given teaching assignments outside their areas of expertise. That is, history professors should not be assigned to teach geophysics, geophysics faculty should not be assigned to teach mechanical engineering, and mechanical engineers should not be assigned to teach brain surgery. The guidelines should define what can reasonably be considered within a faculty members area of expertise. For example, can faculty reasonably be required to teach every course they list as prerequisites for their courses? I think not.

2. Conversely, the right of faculty to teach new or developing subjects must not be infringed upon. For example, a geophysics professor might well participate in a history of science course, or a mechanical engineer might well be involved in biomedicine and wish to develop a course on the subject.

3. The interest of the faculty member in teaching an outside course should be considered. The assignment must not be arbitrary and capricious.

4. At least a semester, and commonly longer periods, should be allowed for retraining the faculty member. The faculty member should be compensated for the retraining period. For example, it seems unreasonable to give faculty an outside teaching assignment in May for the fall semester, and expect them to prepare for the course over the summer without compensation. At present, however, that seems to be the rule.

5. If the period that the faculty will be expected to teach the outside course is small, say less than three years, then alternatives to an outside teaching assignment should be sought. Such alternatives might include, but should not be limited to, sabbatical leave, rotation of teaching assignments within the department, compensated release time to write a book, do research, or similar projects, uncompensated leave without penalty toward tenure, promotion, or retirement to work in industry or government on a cooperative basis, or other options for faculty development. In my opinion, limited periods of reduced enrollment should be used by the university to compensate and reward faculty for the extra effort required of them when enrollments are high. For the sake of the quality and future of the university, faculty on terminal or temporary appointments should not be given short-term outside teaching assignments.

6. At present, outside teaching assignments have (or are perceived to have) a negative impact on tenure, promotion, and salary increases. Because of this, outside assignments are generally regarded as a form of punishment. The injustices, real or perceived, should be addressed by appropriate guidelines so that faculty feel they are treated fairly in circumstances where outside teaching is required of them.

cc: Dr. Lance Williams, Chairman, Rules, Procedures, and Agenda Committee
    Dr. John T. Park, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
I. CONFLICT OF INTEREST - GENERAL PROVISIONS

A. POLICY. University employees shall actively avoid the appearance or the fact of conflicting interests. They shall faithfully discharge their duties and shall refrain from engaging in any outside matters of financial interest incompatible with the impartial, objective, and effective performance of their duties. They shall not realize undue personal gain in any form which would influence, or appear improperly to influence, the conduct of their University duties. They shall not use University property, funds, position or power for personal or political gain. They shall inform their supervisors of potential conflicts.

B. Sanctions. Conduct by an employee which violates the University's policies, regulations or rules pertaining to conflict of interest shall constitute a breach of the employment contract and may lead to disciplinary actions including termination of employment for cause.

II. USE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. No employee shall use confidential information obtained by reason of his employment with intent to cause financial gain to himself or another.

III. UNIVERSITY PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS.

A. Business Policy and Procedure Manual 01-03 and 01-03.01 shall be repealed, and replaced by the
following: No University employee shall have any direct or indirect financial interest in any sale of goods or services to the University. See §172.320, RSMo.

IV. CONSULTING, OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AND OUTSIDE BUSINESS INTERESTS.

The following policy is recommended as a replacement for PE 115 (Personnel Policy Manual) and Section 360.020E (Collected Rules and Regulations - UM):

A. Outside Business Interests of University Personnel.

An employee's outside employment or business activities or interests must not interfere with the employee's regular duties nor represent a conflict of interest.

1. Grants and Contracts. When it is proposed that the University of Missouri enter into research contracts or grants, or contracts, including those for technological transfer, with private firms or corporations in which a University employee has a significant direct or indirect financial interest, the following procedure shall be followed:

a. Before the proposed contract is executed by the University, the University employee shall make a full disclosure of such financial interest, in writing, which disclosure shall be forwarded to the official having approval authority.
b. If there is a change in the financial interest of a University employee during the term of the contract, the change shall be reported promptly, in writing, and forwarded to the official having approval authority.

c. If the financial interest of the University employee in the private firm or corporation is such that it could influence, or appear to influence, the decision making process of the private firm or corporation, and the employee could also influence, or appear to influence, the decision making process of the University in entering into or performing the contract, consideration shall be given to:

i. The University not entering into the contract, or cancelling the contract, if the terms of the contract so permit; or

ii. The University employee taking such action as is necessary to remove him or her from a relationship with the private firm or corporation which could influence, or appear to influence, the decision making process of the private firm or corporation; or
iii. The establishment of a procedure by the University to remove any opportunity for the University employee to influence, or appear to influence, the entering into the contract by the University or the manner in which the contract is performed by the University.

2. **Competing Business Activities.** Before an employee enters into a business activity which competes with the University, the employee shall make full disclosure, in writing, to his supervisor.

3. **Full-time Employment - Faculty and Exempt Personnel.** Full-time faculty and full-time exempt personnel may not be concurrently employed full time with another employer.

4. **Teaching.** An employee of the University who teaches either credit or non-credit courses or programs not connected with the University is likely to have a conflict of interest. To avoid conflicts of interests an employee must disclose the proposed teaching activity and secure written approval in advance from his or her immediate supervisor. Approval for such teaching shall be granted by the employee's immediate supervisor unless the proposed teaching is not in the best interests of the
University. In reaching the decision, the immediate supervisor should consider all relevant matters including such concerns as duplication of University courses or programs and accreditation standards.

B. Faculty and Exempt Personnel Consultation

Consultation, whether income producing or otherwise, is the application of professional and scholarly expertise in the external community. It is a significant means of professional improvement as well as a form of community service. However, consultation may in some instances also constitute a business interest requiring disclosure and approval when the entity for which the employee consults transacts business with the University or is in competition with the University, or where the consultation itself competes with the work of the University. In these instances the procedure in Paragraph IV A.1 is applicable.

It is the policy of the University to permit consulting activities which:

1. are related to the professional interest and development of the faculty member or other exempt person,
2. do not interfere with regular duties,
3. do not utilize University materials, facilities or resources except as provided in the Univer-
4. are in agreement with the American Association of University Professors/American Council on Education (AAUP/ACE) Statement on Conflict of Interest and with the requirements of accreditation for the particular school or unit in question,

5. do not compete with the work of the University, and are not otherwise contrary to the best interest of the University,

6. do not violate federal or state law, and

7. do not represent a conflict of interest under other policies of the University.

Each division shall make an annual report to the Chancellor, or appropriate Vice President, indicating the aggregate time and the nature of the service performed for each individual engaged in consulting, including the area of technological transfer. These reports shall be transmitted annually to the President.

V. RESEARCH CONTRACTS AND GRANTS, COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, PATENTS, AND COPYRIGHTS

A. It is recommended that Section 160.030.B of the Collected Rules and Regulations - UM be revised to reflect that responsibility for grants and contracts now rests with each campus rather than with the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Administrative
Affairs. Accordingly, Section 160.030.B should be amended to provide:

Policy related to sponsored grants, cooperative agreements, and contract programs is established by the Board of Curators upon the recommendation of the President. Implementation of policy is a responsibility of the Chancellors. Faculty efforts to obtain and utilize external support are facilitated by staff designated for this purpose on each campus.

B. It is recommended that Section 160.030.B be amended by the addition of the following two paragraphs in order to clarify present policy:

B.3 Faculty members are encouraged to seek support from business firms for research and creative projects. Such projects are to be conducted in accordance with the principles of Section 160.030.B.2, although, for some projects, it is recognized that the publication of research results may be delayed for short periods, usually no more than six months, and that the University may grant licenses for the use of University patents to firms which support research projects. Campuses will assist faculty members in their efforts by negotiating appropriate agreements with business firms.

B.4 Since classified research is generally inconsistent with the principles of Section
160.030.B.2, faculty members are not encouraged to seek such support. However, with the approval of a Chancellor, support for a classified project may be accepted if (1) it is demonstrated that the University has facilities or faculty expertise that are necessary in the interest of national defense and that would otherwise be unavailable or (2) it is demonstrated that the project may be conducted consistent with the principles of Section 160.030.B.2.

VI. USE OF UNIVERSITY STATIONERY. Official University stationery may not be used in outside business and other private or political activities of employees. However, for use in such activities, faculty may have printed at their own expense personal business stationery carrying their academic title, university address and telephone number.
MEMO TO: Academic Council members

FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair, Budgetary Affairs Committee.

RE: Resolution on Agenda for Action.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee notes that the FY90 (89/90 fund year) budget contained in the Agenda for Action (see attached) allots $23,170,572 for repairing the base and $16,200,000 for program improvements. The Committee believes this distribution of funds is inappropriate in light of the deterioration of the University system.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee recommends the following resolutions to the Academic Council:

that ALL $39,370,572 BE USED TO RESTORE THE BASE

and that NO NEW PROGRAMS BE CONSIDERED UNTIL THE BASE IS FULLY RESTORED.

The Committee believes it is inappropriate to expand activities with new programs until current programs are fully funded.
AGENDA FOR ACTION - BUILDING A NEW MISSOURI
FY1990 - FY1994
(in FY89 Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEEDS</th>
<th>5-YR. PLAN</th>
<th>FY1990</th>
<th>FY1991-94 BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPAIRING THE BASE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>$ 51,400,000</td>
<td>$ 17,670,572</td>
<td>$ 33,729,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Support</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Computing</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Maint. &amp; Repair</td>
<td>19,600,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>17,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Restoration</strong></td>
<td>$102,000,000</td>
<td>$ 23,170,572</td>
<td>$ 78,829,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVEMENTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>$ 40,000,000</td>
<td>$ 14,705,173</td>
<td>$ 25,294,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>1,494,827</td>
<td>3,505,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Improvements</strong></td>
<td>$ 45,000,000</td>
<td>$ 16,200,000</td>
<td>$ 28,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Needs</strong></td>
<td>$147,000,000</td>
<td>$ 39,370,572</td>
<td>$107,629,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
<td>$117,000,000</td>
<td>$ 35,370,572</td>
<td>$ 81,629,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>26,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources</strong></td>
<td>$147,000,000</td>
<td>$ 39,370,572</td>
<td>$107,629,428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. "AGENDA FOR ACTION--PROPOSED PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS"

Programmatic areas in which the University might consider taking initial actions to assist in building a new Missouri were outlined for the Board of Curators by President C. Peter Magrath on January 11, 1988. He indicated that: "This University has clear priorities and goals, and ... . [W]e must formulate an agenda for action and follow that agenda." His remarks contained the following specific suggestions:

- Access to engineering education and technological education in our two urban areas forms the core of an issue that must be resolved. The University's response to the needs of industry for research, human resources (i.e. well-trained personnel), and for problem solving educational services must be shaped deliberately and effectively in ways that will strengthen the state's economy and service the needs of our two largest cities.

- The University of Missouri's historic--but redefined--role of working with food, agriculture and production is fundamental, not because we are a land-grant university, but because it is absolutely essential to the future of Missouri. Practical research and development in
MEMO TO: Academic Council members

FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair,
Budgetary Affairs Committee

RE: Resolutions on Budget Priorities for 89/90

The Budgetary Affairs Committee has reviewed the tentative priorities for the campus 89/90 fund year presented at the open budget hearings in December (see attached). The Committee has recommended, in our response to the budget in the Agenda for Action, that the only priority for the 89/90 year should be restoring the base. The items on the tentative priorities list are consistent with our recommendation (except for the "other" category) and the Committee endorses these items as priorities.

The Committee recommends the following resolutions to the Academic Council:

that THE LIST OF TENTATIVE PRIORITIES BE ADOPTED WITH THE DELETION OF THE "OTHER" CATEGORY

and that THE ITEM TO RECEIVE THE MOST SIGNIFICANT INCREASE SHOULD BE THE SALARIES ITEM.

With respect to the other three items, given the disparate needs of various departments, the Committee recommends:

that DEPARTMENT NEEDS BE ADDRESSED ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS AND THAT SOME MECHANISM BE FOUND TO IDENTIFY AND ADDRESS THE DISSIMILAR NEEDS OF VARIOUS UNITS.
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - ROLLA

FUND YEAR 1989-1990

TENTATIVE PRIORITIES

- MANDATORY EXPENSES
- SALARIES
- LIBRARY
- EXPENSE & EQUIPMENT
- GRADUATE STIPEND SUPPORT
- OTHER
MEMO TO: Academic Council members

FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair, Budgetary Affairs Committee

RE: Resolutions on the 90/91 Budget Request.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee has discussed the Budget Request for the 90/91 fund year and, in line with our other resolutions (attached), the Committee believes the only priority for the 90/91 Request should be repairing the base. The Committee believes it would be inappropriate to expand activities with new programs until the deterioration of the University is arrested and current programs and activities are adequately funded. The Committee believes this is even more imperative if the proposed five year Agenda for Action increase is not realized and the University must struggle with a smaller increase.

Thus, the Committee recommends the following resolutions to the Academic Council:

that THE BUDGET REQUEST FOR FY91 BE CONSTRUCTED WITH THE SOLE AIM OF RESTORING THE BASE

and that NO NEW PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES BE PROPOSED.
February 27, 1989

Memo To: Orrin Crosser, President
       Academic Council

From: Vince Roach, Chair
       Personnel Committee

Re: Action on Referrals from Council Meeting,
    February 2, 1989

The Personnel Committee has considered the two items referred by the Council at the February 2 meeting and makes the following recommendations regarding these two items.

Item (1): Proposed Conflict of Interest Policy

Recommendation:

The committee recommends rejection by the Academic Council of the "Proposed Conflict of Interest Policy" (copy attached) as forwarded from the office of the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, January 3, 1989.

The proposed policy is viewed by the committee as far too restrictive and as a disincentive to faculty participation with outside agencies in projects beneficial to both the university and the outside agency.

Rationale for Recommendation: The committee members (with limited additional input from faculty peers), found many specific problems with the proposed policy. Only a few specific examples of potential or real problems are noted here:

i) [See Section IV A.1. (p. 2)] Many university employees have "indirect" financial interest in private firms or corporations via stock holdings. If this represents a conflict, the policy would certainly discourage seeking outside funding for research or other programs.

ii) [See Section IV A.4. (p. 4)] Active faculty members are often sought to participate in short course presentations which bring visibility to the University of Missouri as well as financial compensation for the faculty member. Most cases are not likely to have a conflict of interest and the policy regulations would serve as a disincentive to participate in such activities.
iii) [See Section IV A and IV B] Most faculty members have been hired with the understanding of an allowed 20% effort for consulting activities if desired. Does the proposed policy intentionally remove such a guideline and replace it with one to be determined by an immediate supervisor?

iv) [See Section IV B.3] The time period (6 months) for publication is unrealistic. Perhaps a period of two years is more realistic.

v) [See Section V B.4] Classified Research policy should not be part of this Conflict of Interest Policy Statement (see attached memo from Dr. Summers to Dean Warner).

vi) [See Section IV A.3] In view of restrictions imposed by preceding paragraphs of proposed policy, is there any need to have section 3 with undefined terms such as "full time" and exempt? 

Item (2): Memo from Charles Corry regarding academic freedom and outside teaching assignments (see attached memo)

Recommendation: The committee recommends that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs formulate guidelines for administrators and faculty regarding teaching assignments outside the faculty member’s academic home department. The guidelines should be formulated with input from faculty and administration and approved by the Academic Council before adoption as a policy. The committee found the suggestions of Professor Corry useful as a starting point for discussion. Additionally, the committee would like to include proper allowances of credit for teaching such courses to both the faculty member as well as the home academic department. The committee feels that such assignments should not normally be made to regular untenured faculty members.
MEMORANDUM

To:  Dr. Leonard Koederitz, Chairman, Academic Freedom Committee

From: Charles E. Corry, Associate Professor of Geophysics

Subject: Academic freedom and outside teaching assignments

During times of reduced enrollment in any area of study, it is frequently necessary to consider giving faculty teaching assignments outside their academic departments. However, no guidelines exist as to how faculty should be reassigned, or what constitutes a reasonable expectation of a faculty member's ability to teach a subject outside of their academic department. I am requesting that your committee consider formulating such guidelines for submittal to Academic Council.

Without attempting to be comprehensive, I think such guidelines should address at least the following issues:

(1) Faculty should not be given teaching assignments outside their areas of expertise. That is, history professors should not be assigned to teach geophysics, geophysics faculty should not be assigned to teach mechanical engineering, and mechanical engineers should not be assigned to teach brain surgery. The guidelines should define what can reasonably be considered within a faculty member's area of expertise. For example, can faculty reasonably be required to teach every course they list as prerequisites for their courses? I think not.

(2) Conversely, the right of faculty to teach new or developing subjects must not be infringed upon. For example, a geophysics professor might well participate in a history of science course, or a mechanical engineer might well be involved in biomedicine and wish to develop a course on the subject.

(3) The interest of the faculty member in teaching an outside course should be considered. The assignment must not be arbitrary and capricious.

(4) At least a semester, and commonly longer periods, should be allowed for retraining the faculty member. The faculty member should be compensated for the retraining period. For example, it seems unreasonable to give faculty an outside teaching assignment in May for the fall semester, and expect them to prepare for the course over the summer without compensation. At present, however, that seems to be the rule.

(5) If the period that the faculty will be expected to teach the outside course is small, say less than three years, then alternatives to an outside teaching assignment should be sought. Such alternatives might include, but should not be limited to, sabbatical leave, rotation of teaching assignments within the department, compensated release time to write a book, do research, or similar projects, uncompensated leave without penalty toward tenure, promotion, or retirement to work in industry or government on a cooperative basis, or other options for faculty development. In my opinion, limited periods of reduced enrollment should be used by the university to compensate and reward faculty for the extra effort required of them when enrollments are high. For the sake of the quality and future of the university, faculty on terminal or temporary appointments should not be given short-term outside teaching assignments.

(6) At present, outside teaching assignments have (or are perceived to have) a negative impact on tenure, promotion, and salary increases. Because of this, outside assignments are generally regarded as a form of punishment. The injustices, real or perceived, should be addressed by appropriate guidelines so that faculty feel they are treated fairly in circumstances where outside teaching is required of them.

cc: Dr. Lance Williams, Chairman, Rules, Procedures, and Agenda Committee
    Dr. John T. Park, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
I. CONFLICT OF INTEREST - GENERAL PROVISIONS

A. POLICY. University employees shall actively avoid the appearance or the fact of conflicting interests. They shall faithfully discharge their duties and shall refrain from engaging in any outside matters of financial interest incompatible with the impartial, objective, and effective performance of their duties. They shall not realize undue personal gain in any form which would influence, or appear improperly to influence, the conduct of their University duties. They shall not use University property, funds, position or power for personal or political gain. They shall inform their supervisors of potential conflicts.

B. Sanctions. Conduct by an employee which violates the University's policies, regulations or rules pertaining to conflict of interest shall constitute a breach of the employment contract and may lead to disciplinary actions including termination of employment for cause.

II. USE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. No employee shall use confidential information obtained by reason of his employment with intent to cause financial gain to himself or another.

III. UNIVERSITY PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS.

A. Business Policy and Procedure Manual 01-03 and 01-03.01 shall be repealed, and replaced by the
following: No University employee shall have any direct or indirect financial interest in any sale of goods or services to the University. See §172.320, RSMo.

IV. CONSULTING, OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AND OUTSIDE BUSINESS INTERESTS.

The following policy is recommended as a replacement for PE 115 (Personnel Policy Manual) and Section 360.020E (Collected Rules and Regulations - UM):

A. Outside Business Interests of University Personnel.

An employee's outside employment or business activities or interests must not interfere with the employee's regular duties nor represent a conflict of interest.

1. Grants and Contracts. When it is proposed that the University of Missouri enter into research contracts or grants, or contracts, including those for technological transfer, with private firms or corporations in which a University employee has a significant direct or indirect financial interest, the following procedure shall be followed:

a. Before the proposed contract is executed by the University, the University employee shall make a full disclosure of such financial interest, in writing, which disclosure shall be forwarded to the official having approval authority.
b. If there is a change in the financial interest of a University employee during the term of the contract, the change shall be reported promptly, in writing, and forwarded to the official having approval authority.

c. If the financial interest of the University employee in the private firm or corporation is such that it could influence, or appear to influence, the decision making process of the private firm or corporation, and the employee could also influence, or appear to influence, the decision making process of the University in entering into or performing the contract, consideration shall be given to:

i. The University not entering into the contract, or cancelling the contract, if the terms of the contract so permit; or

ii. The University employee taking such action as is necessary to remove him or her from a relationship with the private firm or corporation which could influence, or appear to influence, the decision making process of the private firm or corporation; or
iii. The establishment of a procedure by the University to remove any opportunity for the University employee to influence, or appear to influence, the entering into the contract by the University or the manner in which the contract is performed by the University.

2. **Competing Business Activities.** Before an employee enters into a business activity which competes with the University, the employee shall make full disclosure, in writing, to his supervisor.

3. **Full-time Employment - Faculty and Exempt Personnel.** Full-time faculty and full-time exempt personnel may not be concurrently employed full time with another employer.

4. **Teaching.** An employee of the University who teaches either credit or non-credit courses or programs not connected with the University is likely to have a conflict of interest. To avoid conflicts of interests an employee must disclose the proposed teaching activity and secure written approval in advance from his or her immediate supervisor. Approval for such teaching shall be granted by the employee's immediate supervisor unless the proposed teaching is not in the best interests of the
University. In reaching the decision, the immediate supervisor should consider all relevant matters including such concerns as duplication of University courses or programs and accreditation standards.

B. Faculty and Exempt Personnel Consultation

Consultation, whether income producing or otherwise, is the application of professional and scholarly expertise in the external community. It is a significant means of professional improvement as well as a form of community service. However, consultation may in some instances also constitute a business interest requiring disclosure and approval when the entity for which the employee consults transacts business with the University or is in competition with the University, or where the consultation itself competes with the work of the University. In these instances the procedure in Paragraph IV A.1 is applicable.

It is the policy of the University to permit consulting activities which:

1. are related to the professional interest and development of the faculty member or other exempt person,

2. do not interfere with regular duties,

3. do not utilize University materials, facilities or resources except as provided in the Univer-
are in agreement with the American Association of University Professors/American Council on Education (AAUP/ACE) Statement on Conflict of Interest and with the requirements of accreditation for the particular school or unit in question,

5. do not compete with the work of the University, and are not otherwise contrary to the best interest of the University,

6. do not violate federal or state law, and

7. do not represent a conflict of interest under other policies of the University.

Each division shall make an annual report to the Chancellor, or appropriate Vice President, indicating the aggregate time and the nature of the service performed for each individual engaged in consulting, including the area of technological transfer. These reports shall be transmitted annually to the President.

V. RESEARCH CONTRACTS AND GRANTS, COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, PATENTS, AND COPYRIGHTS

A. It is recommended that Section 160.030.B of the Collected Rules and Regulations - UM be revised to reflect that responsibility for grants and contracts now rests with each campus rather than with the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Administrative
Affairs. Accordingly, Section 160.030.B should be amended to provide:

Policy related to sponsored grants, cooperative agreements, and contract programs is established by the Board of Curators upon the recommendation of the President. Implementation of policy is a responsibility of the Chancellors. Faculty efforts to obtain and utilize external support are facilitated by staff designated for this purpose on each campus.

B. It is recommended that Section 160.030.B be amended by the addition of the following two paragraphs in order to clarify present policy:

B.3 Faculty members are encouraged to seek support from business firms for research and creative projects. Such projects are to be conducted in accordance with the principles of Section 160.030.B.2, although, for some projects, it is recognized that the publication of research results may be delayed for short periods, usually no more than six months, and that the University may grant licenses for the use of University patents to firms which support research projects. Campuses will assist faculty members in their efforts by negotiating appropriate agreements with business firms.

B.4 Since classified research is generally inconsistent with the principles of Section
160.030.B.2, faculty members are not encouraged to seek such support. However, with the approval of a Chancellor, support for a classified project may be accepted if (1) it is demonstrated that the University has facilities or faculty expertise that are necessary in the interest of national defense and that would otherwise be unavailable or (2) it is demonstrated that the project may be conducted consistent with the principles of Section 160.030.B.2.

VI. USE OF UNIVERSITY STATIONERY. Official University stationery may not be used in outside business and other private or political activities of employees. However, for use in such activities, faculty may have printed at their own expense personal business stationery carrying their academic title, university address and telephone number.
President's Report

President Crosser announced that the issue of Engineering Education in St. Louis is on the Agenda for the Curators meeting May 4-5 at UMR. Other announcements include a forthcoming retirement planning seminar and a conference on funding for higher education sponsored by the AAUP and others. He called attention to newspaper reports and editorials which suggest that tax increases for higher education are attached to plans to restructure the entire higher education system in Missouri. The tax increase for higher education offered by Senator Snider will be voted on after the break. To inquiries about "mandatory expenses," President Crosser reports that there is no set policy expense list in budget planning; these expenses include building openings, repair of leaking roofs, library books, etc. CBHE is supporting legislation giving them authority to eliminate programs throughout higher education in Missouri. Richard Wallace is the new Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Chancellor's Report

Chancellor Jischke gave a detailed report on "Access to Engineering in the Urban Areas." UMR has responded principally in two ways. Based on the recommendations of a committee appointed by the Chancellor in 1987, the campus has proposed a means of meeting the needs of nontraditional students around the entire state via a telecommunications-based program: the committee has developed cost estimates for a system to serve as many as 30 sites. That system is less expensive and more flexible in space and time than any fixed, onsite program. Chancellor Jischke points to the success of the National Technical University in support of this solution. In response to the Hancock Committee's recommendations for onsite offerings of EE and ME degrees in St. Louis for nontraditional students, UMR has proposed to expand the UMR Education Center at UMSL beyond its current M. S. programs to include upper division undergraduate courses in EE and ME so that students in the St. Louis area can acquire both B. S. and M. S. degrees in the evenings and on the weekends. This onsite proposal, Chancellor Jischke points out, "is a high quality, cost effective, quickly implementable solution to the needs of St. Louis." Moreover, it is "consistent with this campus' statewide mission as approved by the Board of Curators." This proposal represents a "University of Missouri System response" to these new educational needs" that not only provides access but also "strengthens UMR's leadership role in engineering education in Missouri." UMSL has proposed a cooperative effort between UMSL and Washington University "to establish new, freestanding degree programs in EE and ME at UMSL."

President MaGrath has said that access to engineering education in the urban areas is one of the issues "which the
University must resolve..." An Agenda for Action Committee chaired by Mr. John Hancock has examined the issue and reported its findings (July, 1988). On February 14, 1989, President MaGrath held a retreat with the general officers to discuss the Agenda for Action, including Access to Engineering Education. President MaGrath is to present a recommendation to the Board of Curators on engineering education in Missouri at the May 4-5 meeting in Rolla.

Budgetary Affairs Committee Report

Three resolutions were offered by the Budgetary Affairs Committee. (1) The first, entitled "Resolution on Agenda for Action," recommended that the Academic Council approve "that ALL $39,370,572 [Agenda for Action monies in the FY89/90 Budget] BE USED TO RESTORE THE BASE AND THAT NO NEW PROGRAMS BE CONSIDERED UNTIL THE BASE IS FULLY RESTORED." This resolution was approved by a margin of almost 3 to 1. (2) Because the items on the tentative priorities list [mandatory expenses, salaries, library, E & E, graduate student stipend support, other] for the campus in 89/90 are consistent with the "Resolution on Agenda for Action (above)," the Budgetary Affairs Committee proposed as their second resolution "that THE LIST OF TENTATIVE PRIORITIES BE ADOPTED WITH THE DELETION OF THE 'OTHER' CATEGORY and that THE ITEM TO RECEIVE THE MOST SIGNIFICANT INCREASE SHOULD BE THE SALARIES ITEM." Included in this second resolution is the recommendation "that DEPARTMENT NEEDS BE ADDRESSED ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS AND THAT SOME MECHANISM BE FOUND TO IDENTIFY AND ADDRESS THE DISSIMILAR NEEDS OF VARIOUS UNITS." This resolution was approved by a margin of more than 5 to 1. (3) The third proposed resolution was "that THE BUDGET REQUEST FOR FY91 BE CONSTRUCTED WITH THE SOLE AIM OF RESTORING THE BASE and that NO NEW PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES BE PROPOSED." By an amendment proposed from the floor, the clause "that no new programs or activities be proposed" was deleted. The amended resolution "that THE BUDGET REQUEST FOR FY91 BE CONSTRUCTED WITH THE SOLE AIM OF RESTORING THE BASE" was then approved (17 to 6) by the Council.

Curricula Committee Report


Personnel Committee Report

Having considered two items referred to it at the February 2, 1989, meeting [Conflict of Interest: Academic Freedom and Outside Teaching Assignments], the Personnel Committee moved (1) that the "Proposed Conflict of Interest Policy as forwarded from the office of the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, January 3, 1989" be rejected; (2) "that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs formulate guidelines for administrators and faculty regarding teaching assignments outside the faculty member's home department. The guidelines should be formulated with input from faculty and administration and approved by the Academic Council before adoption as a policy." Both recommendations were approved by the Council.
ACADEMIC COUNCIL REPORT
ON
ACCESS TO ENGINEERING EDUCATION IN THE URBAN AREAS
MARCH 23, 1989

THE ISSUE OF ACCESS TO ENGINEERING EDUCATION IN THE URBAN AREAS, ESPECIALLY ST. LOUIS, HAS BEEN THE SUBJECT OF SOME ATTENTION IN THE NEWSPAPERS AND CONTINUES TO BE OF INTEREST TO THIS CAMPUS BECAUSE OF UMR'S FOCUS IN ENGINEERING EDUCATION. FOR THESE REASONS, I WANT TO REPORT TO THE COUNCIL ON THIS MATTER AND RESPOND TO QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE.
The engineering education needs of the urban areas, particularly of the place-bound nontraditional students, has been of concern to me for nearly two years. After a year here at UMR, it became clear that the two major urban areas, as well as many other communities in Missouri, were concerned about the availability of engineering education. They were concerned about opportunities for nontraditional students as well as the impact of the availability of engineering education on their economic development programs. While it has been and remains my view that the traditional students of Missouri were well served, I was seeing increased efforts to call attention to the needs of nontraditional students.

The concern in St. Louis, I came to realize, was not new. Apparently the issue of undergraduate engineering in St. Louis is at least twenty-five years old. I also learned that this campus in 1982, at Chancellor Marchello's direction, and with involvement from St. Louis industry, proposed to begin a cooperative program with the St. Louis campus to offer undergraduate engineering degrees in four areas. This proposal apparently foundered for lack of money.
In response to this growing interest in educational opportunities for nontraditional students, I appointed a committee in August of 1987 of engineering faculty, chaired by then Acting Dean Ron Fannin to suggest ways by which UMR might respond to the needs of nontraditional students for engineering education. The committee reported in March 1988 and concluded that, except possibly for St. Louis, no community in Missouri which was currently unserved was likely to have sufficient numbers of qualified nontraditional students to justify an on-site program. The committee indicated that the new Very Small Aperture Terminal (VSAT) technology provided a cost-effective means of extending engineering education opportunities to nontraditional students across Missouri. Building on our model transfer programs, lecture courses would be delivered by telecommunications to a number of sites across the state. Laboratory work would be offered in intensive, on-campus courses. Cost estimates were developed for a VSAT system that would serve thirty sites in Missouri.
The campus' FY 90 budget request includes funds to begin such a telecommunications-based effort. While the likelihood of funding is unclear, I continue to believe that modern telecommunications is an attractive, cost-effective means of meeting educational needs in an educationally effective manner. The experience of the National Technological University reinforces this belief. Nonetheless, some, including representatives from UMSL, have argued that a telecommunications approach is not as attractive as on-site instruction. While I understand this argument, on-site instruction is more expensive and less flexible in space and time than a telecommunication approach. And the telecommunications approach can deal with the needs of the entire state. We continue to pursue private funding to initiate this VSAT proposal.

In January of 1988, the President announced his Agenda for Action including the question of Access to Engineering Education in the Urban Areas which he described as "forming the core of a series of issues which the University must resolve over the next several years."
As a consequence, the campus did not pursue a separate study of the possibility of on-site instruction in St. Louis at the undergraduate level for nontraditional students. Instead UMR participated in the Agenda for Action Committee effort chaired by John Hancock, Executive Vice President of United Telecom in Kansas City. Each campus had representatives on the committee. Our representatives were Dean Fannin, Professor Tom Herrick, and MSM/UMR Alumni Association President Art Baehler. The Hancock Committee reported to the President and the Board of Curators last July. Their major conclusions were:

1. The needs of traditional students in Missouri were being met.
2. In Kansas City there was a need for expanded efforts at the graduate level and a need to consolidate efforts on the Volker campus.
3. In St. Louis, there was a need for undergraduate programs in Mechanical and Electrical Engineering for nontraditional students which should be met by a cooperative program involving UMSL, UMR, and UMC, possibly using the facilities of Washington University.
4. The current engineering programs were not adequately funded and thus any new efforts would clearly require new resources.

After John Hancock reported to the Board last July, I wrote to Chancellor Barnett inquiring as to her interest in a cooperative effort to serve the engineering education needs of nontraditional students in St. Louis, along the lines of the UMC/UMKC effort in Kansas City. Efforts this past fall by representatives from UMR to formulate a cooperative program with representatives from UMSL quickly reached an impasse because of UMSL’s insistence that they control the budget, the faculty, and the curriculum. I have never received a written reply to our proposal. It became clear to me then that only the President could resolve these kinds of questions and we have cooperated with Jay Barton and, later, Richard Wallace in their efforts to reach a resolution.
In February of this year, February 14 to be precise, the President held a retreat with the General Officers to discuss the Agenda for Action including, in particular, this issue of Access to Engineering Education in the Urban Areas. At that meeting, I presented a proposal describing a cooperative program to expand the UMR Engineering Education Center in St. Louis beyond its current M.S. programs to include upper division EE and ME instruction so that nontraditional students in St. Louis who complete a pre-engineering program could obtain these two degrees in the evenings and on the weekend. The degrees would be identical to the current UMR degrees. UMR would be responsible for all upper division engineering instruction and UMSL would be responsible for all other instruction. I had concluded that provided

1. New funds were available to support the program
2. The program focused on nontraditional students
3. The academic standards are comparable to existing UMR degrees

it would be both appropriate and wise for UMR to participate in such a cooperative venture.
At that same meeting, Chancellor Barnett described a cooperative effort involving UMSL and Washington University to establish new, freestanding degree programs in EE and ME at UMSL. This proposal was formally submitted to President Magrath on February 13.

I have argued for the UMR proposal and against the UMSL proposal for a number of reasons.

1. The UMR proposal is a high quality, cost effective, quickly implementable solution to the needs in St. Louis

2. The UMR proposal is consistent with this campus' statewide mission as approved by the Board of Curators

3. The UMR proposal will be viewed as a University of Missouri system effort because it emphasizes the use of the resources of the UM System to meet new educational needs in the state and avoids unnecessary competition for traditional students
4. The UMR proposal enhances UMR's role in engineering education in Missouri and thereby advances the campus' goal of providing the state with a technological university of national distinction.

The President has committed himself to presenting a recommendation to the Board of Curators on the issue of Engineering Education in Missouri at the May 4, 5 meeting which is to be held in Rolla. Clearly, his recommendation and the Board's subsequent action -- to approve, amend, table, or regret -- will do much to resolve these issues which have commanded much attention and interest.

As many of you are aware, this subject has received attention in the St. Louis papers and in the Legislature. Rep. Jay Russell of Florissant proposed to the House Budget Committee that it add $2 million to the UMSL budget to begin an undergraduate engineering program. That amendment failed 22-2 as did a subsequent effort to add $1 million for the same purpose to "send a message" to the University.
I opposed these efforts as did President Magrath and Board President Turner. There was and remains a concern within the University System and Board that there has been no Curator-approved budget request for this purpose. As you know, the University has a budget process which includes a requirement of Board of Curators approval as well as policies regarding efforts to influence the legislative process.

The House Budget Committee under the leadership of Rep. Nilges and Speaker Griffin has recommended that the Board of Curators receive $100,000 "for the purpose of funding a statewide engineering education needs assessment study to assist the University of Missouri system in developing a plan to meet engineering education needs in the St. Louis and Kansas City areas through cooperation between campuses, contracting with private institutions, or some combination thereof. The assessment study shall be completed and reported to the General Assembly by January 1, 1990." The subsequent actions in the Senate and by the Governor have not yet been made.
Among the concerns that have been expressed to me on this issue is the worry that any new program, especially one in St. Louis, might take students away from this campus. I understand this concern. Although there are no guarantees, it is my opinion that provided a new effort were genuinely focused on nontraditional students, there would be little direct effect on the enrollment of this campus. I base this judgment, in part, on the experience at the graduate level at the Engineering Education Center in St. Louis.

I should also add that there is no way to completely avoid competition for students. We have very successfully competed for students for a long time and will, under any circumstances, continue to face competition from UMC, Washington University, Purdue, Illinois, and other fine universities. I have long believed that the most effective way to compete for the most able students is to continue our tradition of superior education and opportunities. And this is largely in our own hands. I remain quite confident that we can and will compete extremely well under any circumstance. To tell the truth, I rather enjoy competition and winning.
Some have asked why have we proposed these new efforts to serve nontraditional students; specifically the VSAT telecommunications proposal and the on-site cooperative program in St. Louis. Why don't we focus on our work on this campus, argue against any new efforts especially in light of our budget needs, and not become involved in new programs. I understand and respect those who hold these views but I disagree strongly and for fundamentally important reasons.

UMR is a public university with a fundamental obligation to serve, as best it can, the legitimate educational needs of the people of Missouri. We fail our public trust as educators if we ignore these needs. And, in addition, our mission as approved by the Board of Curators is a statewide mission. We must serve the needs of the entire state to the extent we can. Provided these new efforts

1. are funded with incremental new money
2. focus on nontraditional students
3. preserve the UMR academic standards
I believe it is appropriate and wise for this campus to respond to these needs. Indeed, it can enhance UMR and move us toward our goal of a public technological university of national distinction.

We continue to seek faculty input through involvement in the discussion of the Agenda for Action. Certainly, any curricular questions will be referred to appropriate faculty committees and groups. I continue to seek the advice and counsel of faculty as the campus deals with these issues.

I would be happy to try to respond to your questions.
The General Assembly is focusing an enormous amount of attention on the revenue needs for higher education in Missouri, and President C. Peter Magrath told the board he will continue to take an active role in working for legislation that will enable the University to better serve the state. "There is a growing realization that Missouri's economic and cultural future in today's intensely competitive environment is directly related to the future of higher education. I am glad the current revenue proposals are on the table, and I am glad that those in public leadership positions in the General Assembly recognize the need, as well as the benefit, associated with major improvements in the funding of higher education."

A discussion following a review of the University's assessment program ended with a request from curators that the academic affairs staff and campus faculty representatives look at how the assessment program might evolve in the future. In a review of assessment efforts begun in 1987-88, Nancy A. Marlin, assistant vice president for academic affairs, told curators the assessment programs not only provide public accountability, but also have served to improve student learning. Although there are problems with appropriate measures of general education, students on all campuses score above average in tests of general education. The greatest benefit of assessment has been within specific fields in which students major. When measures of proficiency in the major field show student performance is below faculty expectations, curriculum changes have been made, and the effectiveness of changes will be judged by future assessment. "Few institutions of the size and complexity of the University of Missouri System have implemented such a broad-based assessment program," Marlin reported.

University's research reactor will soon be an administrative responsibility of UM-Columbia. The reactor, which had been a UM System administration unit, will be transferred to the Columbia campus July 1, subject to approval by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Curators approved the transfer, recommended as a way to strengthen academic programs that utilize the reactor as a research facility.

t's announced to the curators total nearly $2 million. The W.K. Kellogg Foundation has granted University Extension $975,000 to enhance efforts to revitalize rural Missouri communities. A $918,962 grant from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development will allow UM-Columbia to continue a study, conducted jointly with Washington University and Harvard University, on the routine use of ultrasound scans on women experiencing normal pregnancies.

Awards and honors: Sudarshan Loyalka, UM-Columbia professor of nuclear engineering, received this year's Weldon Spring Presidential Award for Research and Creativity. He is an internationally recognized scholar in nuclear engineering. William James received the 1989 Thomas Jefferson Award, given to a faculty member who exemplifies the principles and ideals of Thomas Jefferson. James is professor emeritus of chemistry and research scientist at UM-Rolla.

Next meeting: May 4-5, UM-Rolla
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Approved ECI's:


ECI 210, Economics 301ML, Comparative Financial Systems. Approved for Summer 1989. 3 hours credit.

Submitted ECI's for review:

ECI 212, Economics 301, Government Regulation of Business and Industry. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hrs. credit. Prerequisites: Pol Sci 90.


ECI 214, Aerospace Engineering 301, Theoretical Aerodynamics. Approved for Winter 1990. 3 hrs. credit. Prerequisite: AE 231.


ECI 216, Metallurgical Engineering 401A, Recent Developments in Chemical Metallurgy. Approved for Summer 1989. 2 hrs. credit. Prerequisite: Met 203.

Approved CCI's:

CCI 3014, Civil Engineering 102, Advanced Surveying. Approved deletion for Fall 1989. (Previously approved 1-19-89 meeting pending CCI 3016).

CCI 3016, Civil Engineering 306, Surveying Systems. Approved for Fall 1989. New course. 2 hrs. lec. 1 hr. lab. Prerequisites: CE 211 with grade of "C" or better. Description: Principles and practices of land surveying, subdivision of land, metes and bounds descriptions, celestial observations, modern instrumentation and electronic surveying techniques, total stations, and state-of-the-art computational methods.

CCI 3068, Engineering Management 372, Production Planning and Scheduling.
Approved for Fall 1989. New course. 2 hr. lec. 1 hr. lab. Prerequisites: EMgt 282 or Graduate Standing. Description: Introduction to mathematical models in production planning and scheduling, decision analysis in manufacturing system design, mathematical programming models for aggregate planning, sequencing and scheduling, constructive algorithms for job-shops dynamic and integer programming approaches, heuristic algorithms, artificial intelligence in scheduling.

CCI 3069, Engineering Management 434, Advanced Manufacturing Systems Integration. Approved for Fall 1989. New course. 2 hr. lec. 1 hr. lab. Prerequisites: EMgt 334. Description: The integration of new technology and information processing concepts for controlling the manufacturing systems. Advanced topics in computer integrated manufacturing systems, industrial robots, CNC machine tools, programmable controllers, material handling systems, manufacturing planning and control.

Submitted CCl's for review:

CCI 3071, History 275, History of Science. Approved for Fall 1989. Change of course title and prerequisites which are History III or 112 or 175 or 176. New description reads: A survey of science from ancient times to the 20th century focusing on the leading conceptual developments within science, the scientific revolution, and science's role in society.

CCI 3072, History 276, History of Science II. Approved deletion for Fall 1989.

CCI 3073, Computer Science 385, Computer Communications and Networks. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 3 hrs. lecture. Prerequisites: CSc 253, CSc 284. Description reads: Network architecture model including physical protocols for data transmission and error detection/correction, data link concepts, LAN protocols, internetworking, reliable end to end service, security, and application services. Students will implement course concepts on an actual computer network.


CCI 3075, Military Science 20, Military Marksmanship. Approved for Winter 1990. Change of course title. Credit hours changed from .5 lab. and .5 l ec. to 1 hr. lecture. New description reads: Fundamentals of military marksmanship. Includes firing the .22 caliber rifle and pistol as well as other Army weapons.

CCI 3076, Military Science 30, Wilderness Survival & Life-Saving Techniques. Approved for Winter 1990. Credit hours changed from .5 lab. and .5 l ec. to 1 hr. lecture. New description reads: Basic life-saving techniques that will enable the student to assist an injured person or himself in an emergency, and survival techniques that will help the student survive in the wilderness.

CCI 3077, Military Science 40, Military Science 40. Approved for Winter 1990. Credit hours changes from .5 lab. and .5 l ec. to 1 hr. lecture. New description reads: The culmination of the Military Science basic course. It is designed to investigate career options, prepare students for the opportunity to progress
Attachment III.C

into the Advanced military courses and pursue a commission as a Second Lieutenant.

CCl 3078, Military Science 50, Army Physical Readiness Program. Approved new course for Winter 1990. 1 hr lab. No prerequisite. Description reads: Course instruction includes planning, implementing and managing the Army physical fitness program; the conducting of an Army physical fitness test; physical fitness training to include conditioning, calisthenics, and cross-country running. Fundamentals of drills and ceremony will also be taught.

CCl 3079, English 213, Literature for Adolescents. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 3 hrs. credit. Prerequisites: English I and a semester of college literature. Description reads: Selection and organization of materials for teaching literature to adolescents. Emphasizes literature written for adolescents and includes a unit on literature of American ethnic groups.

CCl 3080, Engineering Management 357, Advanced Facilities Planning & Design. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 1 hr. lec. 2 hrs. lab. Prerequisites: EMgt 257 or instructor's permission. Description reads: Development of an integrated approach to the planning and design of facilities; examination of advanced techniques and tools for facility location, space allocation, facility layout, materials handling system design, work place design eg, mathematical programming, simulation modelling, CAD systems, ergonomics.

CCl 3081, Mechanical Engineering 212, Introductory Finite Element Analysis. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 3 hrs. lecture. Prerequisite: ME 208. Description reads: Introduction to finite element analysis concepts with examples from solid mechanics, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics. A brief consideration of preprocessing, analysis and post processing using PC based software is included.


CCl 3083, Psychology 000. Approved curriculum change for Winter 1989 to: six credit hours of advanced ROTC may be credited toward a degree. Effective Winter 1989. Change of curriculum which aligns Psychology's allowance for advanced ROTC credit with other degree programs on campus.

CCl 3084, English 380, Contemporary American Literature. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in course title and new description reads: Studies in American prose (fiction and non-fiction), drama, poetry, and screen plays published within the last fifteen years.

CCl 3085, English 382, Contemporary British Literature. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 3 hrs. credit. Prerequisites: English I and a semester of college literature. Description reads: Studies in British prose (fiction and non-fiction), drama, poetry, and screen plays published within the last fifteen years.

CCl 3086, Chemistry 238, Inorganic Chemistry Laboratory. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 1 hour credit. Prerequisites: Chem 237 (prec. or accom.) Description reads: Synthesis and characterization of inorganic chemicals, high and low temperature syntheses, inert atmosphere and vacuum manipulations, electro-chemistry, magnetochemistry, spectroscopy (NMR, IR, UV/VIS), superconductivity.
Attachment III.C

CC1 3087, English 000. Approved for Fall 1989 changes in curriculum. The department adopted a new curriculum which increases the minimum hours of American Literature from 6 to 12, allows for 9 hours rather than 3 at the 200 level, reduces the minimum hours of British Literature from 21 hrs. to 18, and introduces a choice between linguistics or a writing course at the 200/300 level rather than a required linguistics course.

CC1 3088, Mechanical Engineering 353, Computer Numerical Control of Manufacturing Processes. Approved new course for Fall 1989. Credit hours are 2 hr. lec. 1 hr. lab. Prerequisites: ME 253. Description reads: Fundamental theory and application of computer numerical controlled machine tools from the viewpoint of design principles, machine structural elements, control systems and programming. Projects include manual and computer assisted part programming and machining using EASY-CAM and APT softwares.

CC1 3089 Geology 52, Evolution of the Earth. Approved for Winter 1990. Change in prerequisite from GeE 50 or Geol 51 to GeE 50 or Geol 51 or LS 110 (recommended but not required). Change in description reads: A survey of the physical and biological history of the earth from the coalescence of the solar system to the present. A one day field trip at student expense is required.

CC1 3090 Economics 000. Approved change in curriculum for Fall 1989 minus the Minors program and one editorial change. The words "areas of emphasis" should be replaced with "concentrated areas" or "areas of concentration" on page 5 of the attached curriculum.

CC1 3091, Economics 90, Consumer Economics. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in catalog descriptions which reads: Identifies current economic issues confronting individuals and households, examines alternative methods of dealing with these issues. Covers use of credit, insurance, estate planning, budgeting income, personal investing, and all aspects of consumer purchasing. DOES NOT COUNT FOR ECONOMICS MAJORS.

CC1 3092, Economics 100, Special Problems. Approved deletion for Fall 1989.


CC1 3094, Economics 121, Principles of Microeconomics. Approved for Winter 1990. Change in course number from 111 to 121. Change in course title from Principles of Economics II. Change in description reads: An examination of how resources and products are priced and how income is distributed within various types of market structures.

CC1 3095, Economics 200, Special Problems. Approved deletion for Fall 1989.

CC1 3096, Economics 210, Seminar. Approved deletion for Fall 1989.

CC1 3097, Economics 315, Mathematical Economics. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in course number from 215 to 315. Course title changed from Quantitative Economic Analysis. Prerequisites change from Econ 110,111, and Math/Stat 4 to
Econ 221, 222, and Math 8.

CCI 3098, Economics 222, Intermediate Macroeconomic Theory. Approved for Winter 1990. Change in course number from 230 to 222. Course title changed from National Income and Employment. Prerequisites change from Econ 110, 111 and 215 to Econ 121 and 122. Change in description reads: Examines the theoretical framework of national income and product generation, and the use of this theory to construct approaches such as, monetary and fiscal policy to attain economic, political and social goals.

CCI 3099, Economics 330, Public Finance. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in course number from 235 to 330. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110 and 111 to Econ 221. Change in description reads: Study of government expenditures and sources of revenue. Particular emphasis is given to governmental decision making—how these decisions affect the economy and the behavior of individuals, firms, and families within the economy; and how these decisions may be evaluated.


CCI 3103, Economics 320, Money and Banking. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110, 203 to Econ 222. Change in description reads: Study of the origin, principles, and functions of money, emphasizing the role of banks in the effectuation of monetary policies geared to achieve various economic and political goals.

CCI 3104, Economics 322, International Economics. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in course title from International Economics and Finance. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110 to Econ 221 and 222. Change in description reads: Examines the basis of international commerce, capital flows, balance of payments, foreign exchange valuations, international disequilibriums, and liquidity, and the interactive effect of these on domestic economic conditions.

CCI 3105, Economics 335, Cost-Benefit Analysis. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 111 and junior standing to Econ 221.

CCI 3106, Economics 340, Economics of Natural Resource Use. Approved change of prerequisites from Econ 203 and 204 to Econ 221.

CCI 3107, Economics 345, Energy Economics. Approved change in prerequisites from Econ 110 or 111 to Econ 221. Change in description reads: Examines the
impact of industrial organization and government regulation on energy production and consumption within domestic and global settings.

CC1 3108, Economics 351, Economic Development. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110 to Econ 221 or 222.

CC1 3109, Economics 355, Economics of Crime. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110, 111 and 240 recommended to Econ 121 and 122; Econ 221 recommended.

CC1 3110, Economics 360, Comparative Economic Systems. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110 or 111 to Econ 222.

CC1 3111, Economics 370, Economic Thought. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110 or 111 to Econ 121 or 122.

CC1 3112, Economics 375, Labor Economics. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110 to Econ 221 and 222.

CC1 3113, Economics 389, Problems in Economic Policy. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Senior standing to Seniors with 24 or more hours in Econ.


David B. Oglesby, Chairman
MEMO TO: Academic Council

FROM: Curricula Committee

SUBJECT: Meeting of April 6, 1989

Approved ECI's:


ECI 210, Economics 301ML, Comparative Financial Systems. Approved for Summer 1989. 3 hours credit.

Submitted ECI's for review:

ECI 212, Economics 301, Government Regulation of Business and Industry. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hrs. credit. Prerequisites: Pol Sci 90.


ECI 214, Aerospace Engineering 301, Theoretical Aerodynamics. Approved for Winter 1990. 3 hrs. credit. Prerequisite: AE 231.


ECI 216, Metallurgical Engineering 401A, Recent Developments in Chemical Metallurgy. Approved for Summer 1989. 2 hrs. credit. Prerequisite: Met 203.

Approved CCI's:

CCI 3014, Civil Engineering 102, Advanced Surveying. Approved deletion for Fall 1989. (Previously approved 1-19-89 meeting pending CCI 3016).

CCI 3016, Civil Engineering 306, Surveying Systems. Approved for Fall 1989. New course. 2 hrs. lec. 1 hr. lab. Prerequisites: CE 211 with grade of "C" or better. Description: Principles and practices of land surveying, subdivision of land, metes and bounds descriptions, celestial observations, modern instrumentation and electronic surveying techniques, total stations, and state-of-the-art computational methods.

CCI 3068, Engineering Management 372, Production Planning and Scheduling.
Approved for Fall 1989. New course. 2 hr. lec. 1 hr. lab. Prerequisites: EMgt 282 or Graduate Standing. Description: Introduction to mathematical models in production planning and scheduling, decision analysis in manufacturing system design, mathematical programming models for aggregate planning, sequencing and scheduling, constructive algorithms for job-shops dynamic and integer programming approaches, heuristic algorithms, artificial intelligence in scheduling.

CC1 3069, Engineering Management 434, Advanced Manufacturing Systems Integration. Approved for Fall 1989. New course. 2 hr. lec. 1 hr. lab. Prerequisites: EMgt 334. Description: The integration of new technology and information processing concepts for controlling the manufacturing systems. Advanced topics in computer integrated manufacturing systems, industrial robots, CNC machine tools, programmable controllers, material handling systems, manufacturing planning and control.

Submitted CC1's for review:

CC1 3071, History 275, History of Science. Approved for Fall 1989. Change of course title and prerequisites which are History 111 or 112 or 175 or 176. New description reads: A survey of science from ancient times to the 20th century focusing on the leading conceptual developments within science, the scientific revolution, and science's role in society.

CC1 3072, History 276, History of Science II. Approved deletion for Fall 1989.

CC1 3073, Computer Science 385, Computer Communications and Networks. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 3 hrs. lecture. Prerequisites: CSc 253, CSc 284. Description reads: Network architecture model including physical protocols for data transmission and error detection/correction, data link concepts, LAN protocols, internetworking, reliable end to end service, security, and application services. Students will implement course concepts on an actual computer network.


CC1 3075, Military Science 20, Military Marksmanship. Approved for Winter 1990. Change of course title. Credit hours changed from .5 lab. and .5 lec. to 1 hr. lecture. New description reads: Fundamentals of military marksmanship. Includes firing the .22 caliber rifle and pistol as well as other Army weapons.

CC1 3076, Military Science 30, Wilderness Survival & Life-Saving Techniques. Approved for Winter 1990. Credit hours changed from .5 lab. and .5 lec. to 1 hr. lecture. New description reads: Basic life-saving techniques that will enable the student to assist an injured person or himself in an emergency, and survival techniques that will help the student survive in the wilderness.

CC1 3077, Military Science 40, Military Science 40. Approved for Winter 1990. Credit hours changes from .5 lab. and .5 lec. to 1 hr. lecture. New description reads: The culmination of the Military Science basic course. It is designed to investigate career options, prepare students for the opportunity to progress
into the Advanced military courses and pursue a commission as a Second Lieutenant.

CC1 3078, Military Science 50, Army Physical Readiness Program. Approved new course for Winter 1990. 1 hr lab. No prerequisite. Description reads: Course instruction includes planning, implementing and managing the Army physical fitness program; the conducting of an Army physical fitness test; physical fitness training to include conditioning, calisthenics, and cross-country running. Fundamentals of drills and ceremony will also be taught.

CC1 3079, English 213, Literature for Adolescents. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 3 hrs. credit. Prerequisites: English 1 and a semester of college literature. Description reads: Selection and organization of materials for teaching literature to adolescents. Emphasizes literature written for adolescents and includes a unit on literature of American ethnic groups.

CC1 3080, Engineering Management 357, Advanced Facilities Planning & Design. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 1 hr. lec. 2 hrs. lab. Prerequisites: EMgt 257 or instructor's permission. Description reads: Development of an integrated approach to the planning and design of facilities; examination of advanced techniques and tools for facility location, space allocation, facility layout, materials handling system design, work place design eg, mathematical programming, simulation modelling, CAD systems, ergonomics.

CC1 3081, Mechanical Engineering 212, Introductory Finite Element Analysis. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 3 hrs. lecture. Prerequisite: ME 208. Description reads: Introduction to finite element analysis concepts with examples from solid mechanics, heat transfer, and fluid mechanics. A brief consideration of preprocessing, analysis and post processing using PC based software is included.


CC1 3083, Psychology 000. Approved curriculum change for Winter 1989 to: six credit hours of advanced ROTC may be credited toward a degree. Effective Winter 1989. Change of curriculum which aligns Psychology's allowance for advanced ROTC credit with other degree programs on campus.

CC1 3084, English 380, Contemporary American Literature. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in course title and new description reads: Studies in American prose (fiction and non-fiction), drama, poetry, and screen plays published within the last fifteen years.

CC1 3085, English 382, Contemporary British Literature. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 3 hrs. credit. Prerequisites: English 1 and a semester of college literature. Description reads: Studies in British prose (fiction and non-fiction), drama, poetry, and screen plays published within the last fifteen years.

CC1 3086, Chemistry 238, Inorganic Chemistry Laboratory. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 1 hour credit. Prerequisites: Chem 237 (prec. or accom.) Description reads: Synthesis and characterization of inorganic chemicals, high and low temperature syntheses, inert atmosphere and vacuum manipulations, electro-chemistry, magnetochemistry, spectroscopy (NMR, IR, UV/VIS), superconductivity.
CC1 3087, English 000. Approved for Fall 1989 changes in curriculum. The department adopted a new curriculum which increases the minimum hours of American Literature from 6 to 12, allows for 9 hours rather than 3 at the 200 level, reduces the minimum hours of British Literature from 21 hrs. to 18, and introduces a choice between linguistics or a writing course at the 200/300 level rather than a required linguistics course.

CC1 3088, Mechanical Engineering 353, Computer Numerical Control of Manufacturing Processes. Approved new course for Fall 1989. Credit hours are 2 hr. lec. 1 hr. lab. Prerequisites: ME 253. Description reads: Fundamental theory and application of computer numerical controlled machine tools from the viewpoint of design principles, machine structural elements, control systems and programming. Projects include manual and computer assisted part programming and machining using EASY-CAM and APT softwares.

CC1 3089 Geology 52, Evolution of the Earth. Approved for Winter 1990. Change in prerequisite from GeE 50 or Geol 51 to GeE 50 or Geol 51 or LS 110 (recommended but not required). Change in description reads: A survey of the physical and biological history of the earth from the coalescence of the solar system to the present. A one day field trip at student expense is required.

CC1 3090 Economics 000. Approved change in curriculum for Fall 1989 minus the Minors program and one editorial change. The words "areas of emphasis" should be replaced with "concentrated areas" or "areas of concentration" on page 5 of the attached curriculum.

CC1 3091, Economics 90, Consumer Economics. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in catalog descriptions which reads: Identifies current economic issues confronting individuals and households, examines alternative methods of dealing with these issues. Covers use of credit, insurance, estate planning, budgeting income, personal investing, and all aspects of consumer purchasing. DOES NOT COUNT FOR ECONOMICS MAJORS.

CC1 3092, Economics 100, Special Problems. Approved deletion for Fall 1989.


CC1 3094, Economics 121, Principles of Microeconomics. Approved for Winter 1990. Change in course number from 111 to 121. Change in course title from Principles of Economics II. Change in description reads: An examination of how resources and products are priced and how income is distributed within various types of market structures.

CC1 3095, Economics 200, Special Problems. Approved deletion for Fall 1989.

CC1 3096, Economics 210, Seminar. Approved deletion for Fall 1989.

CC1 3097, Economics 315, Mathematical Economics. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in course number from 215 to 315. Course title changed from Quantitative Economic Analysis. Prerequisites change from Econ 110,111, and Math/Stat 4 to
Econ 221, 222, and Math 8.

CCI 3098, Economics 222, Intermediate Macroeconomic Theory. Approved for Winter 1990. Change in course number from 230 to 222. Course title changed from National Income and Employment. Prerequisites change from Econ 110, 111 and 215 to Econ 121 and 122. Change in description reads: Examines the theoretical framework of national income and product generation, and the use of this theory to construct approaches such as, monetary and fiscal policy to attain economic, political and social goals.

CCI 3099, Economics 330, Public Finance. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in course number from 235 to 330. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110 and 111 to Econ 221. Change in description reads: Study of government expenditures and sources of revenue. Particular emphasis is given to governmental decision making—how these decisions affect the economy and the behavior of individuals, firms, and families within the economy; and how these decisions may be evaluated.


CCI 3103, Economics 320, Money and Banking. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110, 203 to Econ 222. Change in description reads: Study of the origin, principles, and functions of money, emphasizing the role of banks in the effectuation of monetary policies geared to achieve various economic and political goals.

CCI 3104, Economics 322, International Economics. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in course title from International Economics and Finance. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110 to Econ 221 and 222. Change in description reads: Examines the basis of international commerce, capital flows, balance of payments, foreign exchange valuations, international disequilibriums, and liquidity, and the interactive effect of these on domestic economic conditions.

CCI 3105, Economics 335, Cost-Benefit Analysis. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 111 and junior standing to Econ 221.

CCI 3106, Economics 340, Economics of Natural Resource Use. Approved change of prerequisites from Econ 203 and 204 to Econ 221.

CCI 3107, Economics 345, Energy Economics. Approved change in prerequisites from Econ 110 or 111 to Econ 221. Change in description reads: Examines the
impact of industrial organization and government regulation on energy production and consumption within domestic and global settings.

CCI 3108, Economics 351, Economic Development. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110 to Econ 221 or 222.

CCI 3109, Economics 355, Economics of Crime. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110,111 and 240 recommended to Econ 121 and 122; Econ 221 recommended.

CCI 3110, Economics 360, Comparative Economic Systems. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110 or 111 to Econ 222.

CCI 3111, Economics 370, Economic Thought. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110 or 111 to Econ 121 or 122.

CCI 3112, Economics 375, Labor Economics. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Econ 110 to Econ 221 and 222.

CCI 3113, Economics 389, Problems in Economic Policy. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in prerequisites from Senior standing to Seniors with 24 or more hours in Econ.


David Oglesby, Chairman
Academic Council Meeting, Thursday, April 20, 1989; 1:30 p.m.; 6-5 H/SS.

I. Approval of minutes of March 23, 1989, (VOL. XVIII, NO. 5) meeting.

II. Reports and Responses
   *A. President's Report (5 min.) Orrin Crosser (4459)

   B. Referrals
      1. Qualifications for Professorial Ranks to Personnel Committee
      2. Sexual Harassment to Personnel Committee

   C. Administrative Reports
      1. Chancellor's Report on the FY90 Budget (15 min.) Martin Jischke (4114)

   D. Administrative Response
      1. Assessment Results Use (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.A)
      2. Salary Increase Distribution Policy  (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.C.2)
      3. Procedures for Establishing Rank/Tenure (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.E.3)
      4. Conflict of Interest (March 23, 1989; XVIII, 5; III.C)
      5. Academic Freedom and Outside Teaching Assignments (March 23, 1989; XVIII, 5; III.C)

III. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
   A. .0406.02 Academic Freedom (10 min.) Leonard Koederitz (4774)
      *1. Institutional Review Boards

   B. .0406.03 Admissions and Academic Standards (No Report) Thomas Herrick (4507)
      1. Revised Regulations for Removing a Student from Academic Probation (April 23, 1987; XVI, 8; IV.A.1)
      2. Excused Absence Procedure (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; II.B.1)

   C. .0406.05 Budgetary Affairs (10 min.) Carol Ann Smith (4869)
      *1. Fee Structure Inequities (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.C.2)

   D. .0406.09 Curricula (5 min.) David Oglesby (4598)
      1. CAPS and the Graduation Catalogue (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.1)
      2. Time Limitation of the Graduation Catalogue (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.2)
      3. Fee Structure Inequities (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.C.1)
      *4. Report No. 6, 1988-89

   E. .0406.15 Personnel (15 min.) Vince Roach (4449)
      *1. Smoking/Non Smoking Policy (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; II.B.3)

an equal opportunity institution
F. .0406.13 Rules, Procedure and Agenda (5 min.) Lance Williams (4816)
   *1. By-Laws Revisions

G. .0406.19 Student Affairs (5 min.) Curt Adams (4825)
   *1. Constitution - Table Tennis Club

H. Intercampus Faculty Council (5 min.) Jim Fogue (4784)

IV. Old Business

V. New Business

R, P & A Cmtt.
LW/cmb/4-6-89

*Supplementary materials sent to Academic Council members and department chairmen.
SUMMARY of the reports, actions, referrals and announcements made at the meeting of the Academic Council held on April 20, 1989.

1. Approval of minutes of the March 23, 1989, Council meeting.

2. Reports and responses.
   A. Administrative responses
      1. Agenda for action, priorities for 89/90 campus budget, and 90/91 budget request
      2. Assessment results use
      3. Conflict of interest
      4. Procedures for establishing rank/tenure
   B. President’s report — D. Crosser
   C. Referrals
      1. Qualifications for professorial ranks to the promotion and Tenure Committee
      2. Sexual harassment to the Personnel Committee
   D. Administrative reports
      1. Budget — M. Jischke

3. Reports of standing and special committees.
   A. Academic Freedom — L. Koederitz
      1. Institutional review boards
         (Attachment III.A)
   B. Budgetary Affairs — C. A. Smith
      1. Fee structure inequities
         (Attachment III.B)
   C. Curricula — D. Oglesby
      1. Report No. 6, 1988-89
         a. Seven experimental courses presented
         b. Thirty-one course/curriculum changes approved
         c. Eleven new courses approved
         d. Six course deletions approved
         (Attachment III.C)
   D. Personnel — V. Roach
      1. Smoking/non smoking policy
         (Attachment III.D)
E. Rules, Procedure and Agenda – L. Williams
   1. By-laws revisions
      (Attachment III.E)

F. Student Affairs – C. Adams
   1. Constitution – Table Tennis Club
      (Attachment III.F)

G. Intercampus Faculty Council (ICFC) – J. Pogue

   A. Resolution concerning the budget crisis – T. Herrick

Attachments: III.A
             III.B
             III.C
             III.D
             III.E
             III.F
The April 20, 1989, meeting of the Academic Council was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Prof. Orrin K. Crosser, Academic Council President. Prof. Dave Wulfman was recognized as substituting for Prof. Frank Blum. The motion to approve the March 23, 1989, minutes was made by Prof. Glen Haddock, seconded by Prof. Lance Williams, and approved.

**REPORTS AND RESPONSES.**

1. **AGENDA FOR ACTION, PRIORITIES FOR 89/90 CAMPUS BUDGET, AND 90/91 BUDGET REQUEST.** As reported by President Orrin Crosser, these Budgetary Affairs Committee recommendations have been "acknowledged by Chancellor Martin Jischke and shared with the Budget Review Committee."

2. **ASSESSMENT RESULTS USE.** This resolution has been forwarded to President C. Peter Magrath by Chancellor Jischke.

3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST.** Academic Council reaction to this policy proposal has been relayed to Vice-President Wallace by Chancellor Jischke.

4. **PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHING RANK/TENURE.** Academic Council recommendations have been sent to and received by Vice-Chancellor John Park, who presently is preparing a revised draft.

**B. PRESIDENT’S REPORT.** "The Council officers wish to extend their deepest sympathy to our Secretary, Professor Clyde Wade, and the family, for the tragic loss of their daughter this past week," President Crosser remarked.

President Crosser then reported that the Engineering Laboratory Equipment Bill (SB52), "as of last week, is expected to be voted out of committee soon ... ; the Scholarship package bill (HB541) remains a possibility ...," and "Senate action is anticipated;" the $2 million St. Louis Engineering proposal failed to garner house approval, and the $100,000 assessment study, which did receive house support, was rejected by the Senate Appropriations Committee.
"The question of Access to Engineering in Urban Areas, specifically St. Louis," reminded President Crosser, "is presumed to be on the Curator’s Agenda . . . ."

A public rally was being planned (April 26) by UMC students, staff, and faculty into taking "positive action on a tax increase for higher education.

C. REFERRALS.
1. QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROFESSORIAL RANKS TO THE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE. Upon the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, this item was referred to the Tenure Committee.

2. SEXUAL HARASSMENT TO THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

D. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS.
1. BUDGET. Chancellor Martin Jischke discussed the implications of the tax adjustment mandated by the Supreme Court. This adjustment creates a financial crisis for UMR. The seriousness of this problem cannot be overemphasized -- a loss of over 170 million dollars in state revenues is likely, with at least 45 million being lost from higher education. UMR's budget may be reduced by 2.5 million or more. If no action is taken, no increases in salaries, E & E, or library support will occur and cut-backs may be required. At the present time, UMR appears to have only two alternatives -- accepting the cut-backs or massively increasing tuition and fees.

On Monday, April 24, Governor Ashcroft is expected to announce his plan in dealing with this crisis. Chancellor Jischke asked the UMR community to do three things: (1) understand the seriousness of this problem; (2) urge that State leaders deal with the problem before the current legislative session ends; (3) support the details of the Governor's plan when it is announced. Chancellor Jischke hopes that, with our support, this potentially terrible problem can still be dealt with.

XVIII, 6 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

A. ACADEMIC FREEDOM.
1. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARDS. As noted by Prof. Leonard Koederitz, the members of the Academic
Freedom Committee, being concerned with infringement by Executive Order 10 and the four, UM-campus Institutional Review Boards, recommended that Executive Order 10 be reviewed, that a policy be developed providing, "definitive regulations concerning the extent of the jurisdiction of Institutional Review Boards which will not infringe upon academic freedom without substantial justification," that Board regulations be consistent with this policy, that an appeal process be formulated, and that these recommendations be forwarded to our sister campuses and the UM administration. Prof. Lance Williams moved for adoption, Prof. Vince Roach seconded the motion, and the motion carried without discussion. (Attachment III.A)

B. BUDGETARY AFFAIRS.

1. FEE STRUCTURE INEQUITIES. The fee differential was initiated in 1985 by way of a task force recommendation, was based upon the principle that fees should reflect the cost differences between teaching lower and upper division courses, and was instituted on the basis of class rank as recommended by our UM President. The current cost difference is approximately $6 per credit hour.

Prof. Glen Haddock moved for approval of the following recommendations presented by Prof. Carol Ann Smith on behalf of the Budgetary Affairs Committee: (1) the fee differential basis on lower division and upper division rank be eliminated; (2) a uniform fee structure be instituted that is revenue neutral; and (3) this resolution be forwarded to the other campuses, the President, and the Board of Curators for their action. His motion was seconded by Prof. Lance Williams and passed. (Attachment III.B)

C. CURRICULA.

1. REPORT NO. 6, 1988-89. Prof. David Oglesby moved for approval of this Committee report. A second was received from Prof. Jerry Westphal, and the motion carried. (Attachment III.C)
D. PERSONNEL.

1. SMOKING/NON-SMOKING POLICY. Prof. Vince Roach moved for endorsement of a policy in which "smoking is prohibited in all buildings owned, operated, or leased by the University of Missouri-Rolla except in designated smoking areas. Designated smoking areas will be established for each building by the person(s) responsible for administration of the building (for example, Chancellor Martin Jischke and Parker Hall). Areas which may be designated as smoking areas include the following: (a) Each building should have at least one designated smoking area provided there is adequate ventilation so as not to cause health or safety problems for building users; (b) Smoking is allowed in enclosed private and semi-private offices as long as non-smokers are not affected by the side-stream smoke." Prof. Lance Williams seconded the motion. Prof. Glen Haddock moved to address items a and b separately. Prof. Thomas Herrick seconded the motion, which carried. Prof. Roach editorially changed, at Prof. Jim Pogue's suggestion, item a to read: "Public areas provided there is adequate ventilation so as not to cause health or safety problems for building users." Item a, as reworded, was endorsed by Council vote. Prof. Haddock proposed to amend item b as follows: "Smoking is allowed in enclosed private offices. In multiply-occupied offices, non-smokers decisions will rule." Prof. Herrick provided the second. With concurrence from Profs. Haddock and Herrick, Prof. Donald Askeland editorially substituted item b with: "Smoking is allowed in private and semi-private offices, provided all occupants agree." Item b then received Council approval. Prof. Roach moved for endorsement of the smoking policy as amended. His motion, which was seconded by Prof. Williams, carried. Prof. Williams then moved that the policy implementation occur at the beginning of the Fall 1989 Semester and that "postings be discrete and unobtrusive." Prof. Roach seconded the motion. Prof. Herrick moved to separate the question. No second was received due to Prof. Williams' withdrawal of the posting requirement proposal. The implementation date was approved by Council. (Attachment III.E)
E. RULES, PROCEDURE AND AGENDA.

1. BY-LAWS REVISIONS. Prof. Williams moved that the Council recommend to the General Faculty on April 25th the revision of the by-laws with regards to the membership/structure of the following committees: Campus Safety, Student Awards and Financial Aids, and Computer. Prof. Glen Haddock seconded the motion, which carried. (Attachment III.E)

F. STUDENT AFFAIRS.

1. CONSTITUTION - TABLE TENNIS CLUB. Prof. Curt Adams moved for approval of the Table Tennis Club constitution. Prof. Richard Miller seconded the motion, and the motion carried. (Attachment III.F)

G. INTERCAMPUS FACULTY COUNCIL (ICFC). As reported by Prof. Jim Pogue, past ICFC meetings have consisted of "lengthy discussion on the budget and the tax initiative for the state."

The Conflict of Interest proposal has been laid aside. A three to four person committee, including faculty representation, will be appointed to study and redraft the document for presentation next Fall.

XVIII, 6 NEW BUSINESS.

A. RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE BUDGET CRISIS. In light of the current state economic crisis, Prof. Thomas Herrick recommended that "it would be appropriate for the Council to formulate a resolution ... to pass on to the Chancellor expressing the concern the faculty has for the potential [budgetary] disaster ... on the floor, or done in private." Prof. Lance Williams seconded his motion. Prof. Herrick further indicated that, in light of possible cuts, the resolution should address faculty concern regarding action(s) to increase fees. Prof. Richard Miller mentioned that it would also be appropriate to recommend that "this problem be dealt with by the current legislative session ... ." President Orrin Crosser called for the question, and the motion carried.
The meeting adjourned at 2:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Donald R. Askeland
President-Elect

Attachments: III.A
            III.B
            III.C
            III.D
            III.E
            III.F

*Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.*
Resolution #889R3

Mandatory Assessment

Meeting Date: March 21, 1989

WHEREAS: The purpose of assessment is to assess the quality of education and not to grade the students;

WHEREAS: Assessment has been made mandatory despite last year's 44% turn out in bad weather when assessment was voluntary;

WHEREAS: For those who are presently sophomores, juniors, and seniors assessment was not listed as a graduation requirement in the catalog when they were freshmen;

WHEREAS: Some departments are basing grades on assessment results, therefore,

Be it resolved that the UMR Student Council is firmly opposed to the mandatory assessment program being used at UMR. The UMR Student Council strongly suggests that the administration exempt current sophomores, juniors, and seniors from mandatory assessment, and that a non-mandatory assessment test be administered; and that a reward, such as a day off, be used as persuasion rather than the current registration penalization.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Gibson  
Vice President of External Affairs

Bob Phillips  
Vice President of Internal Affairs

Jeannine Dubuque  
Treasurer

Rebecca Vanderwall  
Secretary
March 3, 1989

Memo To: O. K. Crosser
        President, Academic Council

From: L. F. Koederitz, Chmn., Academic Freedom Committee

RE: Recommendation Concerning Institutional Review Boards

Attached is the recommendation of the Academic Freedom Committee concerning the Institutional Review Board requirements.

cc: Academic Freedom Committee
    W. Bledsoe  A. Culp
    E. Epstein  D. Myers
    J. Rockaway  C. A. Smith

Institutional Review Board
R. Montgomery
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE
CONCERNING THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Academic freedom is the foundation for pursuit of knowledge and truth in higher education institutions. The Academic Freedom Committee believes it is important to guard this highly valued liberty. Any unnecessary limitations on academic liberty, no matter how innocuous, should be resisted if there is no substantial justification for such limitation.

The Academic Freedom Committee after considerable study concludes that academic freedom is unnecessarily being infringed upon by the ambiguous language and the uninhibited application of Executive Order No. 10, dated August 10, 1972. The assumed right by the Institutional Review Boards to prevent potential research involving humans only indirectly or in an innocuous setting, without the right of appeal, is considered a serious potential obstruction of academic freedom and permits the exercise of arbitrary discretionary power.

The present application of Executive Order No. 10 apparently allows Institutional Review Boards to review the following situations with the unilateral right to prevent further pursuit of the subject:

1. Nonobtrusive surveys where anonymity is preserved and where individuals can refuse to participate;
2. Aggregate data collection relative to an organization which does not impinge upon an individual;
3. Any survey published in the Miner; and
4. Surveys employed by professors as a course assignment.

Clearly if the Institutional Review Board has jurisdiction over these situations, potential obstruction of academic freedom exists.

The Academic Freedom Committee by a vote of 7 to 0 (with one committee member desiring extensive changes to this document) responsibly recommends the following:

1. A review of the purpose of Executive Order No. 10 to insure that there is an appropriate consideration for academic freedom;
2. Development of a policy for the determined purposes that will provide definitive regulations concerning the extent of the jurisdiction of Institutional Review Boards which will not infringe upon academic freedom without substantial justification;
3. Development of an expeditious process for the right of appeal of Institutional Review Board rulings; and

The Academic Freedom Committee further recommends that the above be forwarded to U-wide and the other UM campuses.
April 10, 1989

MEMO TO: Academic Council Members

FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair,
      Budgetary Affairs Committee

RE: Fee Structure

Prompted by the alleged inequity in situations where students in the same course pay different fees depending on their class rank, the Budgetary Affairs Committee has reviewed the issue of the student fee differential based on class rank. The Committee does not believe that the fee differential between lower division students (freshmen and sophomores) and upper division students (junior and seniors) should be retained given the difficulties for students, for their families, for the Registrar and for the University.

The fee differential between lower and upper division students has created innumerable difficulties in billing. Bills are sent to students in mid-July and at Thanksgiving. The Thanksgiving billing projects the Student's class rank based on successful completion of the fall term's course work and must be edited after the term is over. The projections can be wrong obviously if the student drops a course, fails a course or withdraws from school. The July billing is made after the spring semester is over but, again, needs editing pending completion of summer school and/or credit transferred in from another university prior to the four week University-mandated "freeze" point in the semester. This continual "tinkering" and rebilling is both a burden to the Registrar's Office and a frustration to the students.

Students do not understand the details of and rationale for class rank determinations. For example, the following count toward determining class rank: all transfer credit even that which does not count toward a degree; credit received for Math 4 and 6; Fundamentals of Engineering taken in high school even though Freshman Engineering must be taken. Worse, some aspects of the billing system appear arbitrary, unfair and open to abuse: some students who transfer credit in before the four week freeze point may have their rank (and billing) changed for that semester while those whose transfer credit is delayed until after the four week freeze point do not have their rank (and billing) changed until the following semester.

an equal opportunity institution
Academic Council,
April 10, 1989,
page 2.

Nor do families understand the billing system. The bill received undoubtedly determines their planning and, if paid, may be taken to be their total obligation - not an unreasonable assumption to make about a bill received. The rebilling of an extra amount caused by summer credit or transferred credit (perhaps in conjunction with the overlooked credit mentioned in the above paragraph) causes frustration and even anger toward the University. The system may be deemed arbitrary (hinging as it does on the difference between 59 and 60 hours of credit), capricious (credits that do not count toward a degree are counted for class rank determination), non-understandable and vexatious.

The fee differential was instituted in part to recognize that upper division education is more costly than lower division education. However, the fee difference is such a small amount that it hardly addresses the difference in cost. But if it is not large enough to address the difference in cost, it is large enough to cause anger, frustration and ill-will toward the University.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee has reviewed a number of alternatives, none of which, the Committee believes, will remove the above difficulties without creating further problems. The Committee, therefore, recommends:

that the fee differential based on lower division and upper division rank be eliminated,

that a uniform fee structure be instituted that is revenue neutral,

and that this resolution be forwarded to the other campuses, the President and the Board of Curators for their action.
April 11, 1989

TO: Academic Council members
RE: By-laws Revision proposals

Colleagues, following are proposed changes. If Council accepts, they will be presented to the General Faculty on April 25th for a ballot vote thereafter.

.07 Campus Safety and Risk Management Committee
   .0701 The principal responsibility of this committee is to assist the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Academic Council, Business Officer, and the Safety Representative with the implementation of the Risk Management Program.
   .0702 The members of the Committee shall be determined by the Chancellor; however, members of the UM University Safety and Risk Management Committee shall be appointed to serve on the Campus Committee, but no more than three such members shall be appointed. The Committee shall include at least one undergraduate student. The Chairman shall be appointed by the Chancellor and the Safety Representative shall serve as Secretary without privilege of vote.

PROPOSED
   .07 Campus Safety Committee
   .0501 The principal responsibility of this Committee is to advise the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services and the Academic Council on matters pertaining to the Safety Program on Campus.
   .0502 The membership of the Committee shall be determined by the Chancellor and shall include two faculty members from each School/College; two students, at least one of whom is an undergraduate student; two members of the staff; and a representative from the Environmental Health/Risk Management Department. The Chairperson shall be appointed by the Chancellor; the Environmental Health/Risk Management representative serves as Secretary.

[The Safety and Risk Management Committee has discussed the need for changes and approved this proposal November 22, 1988.]

.20 Student Awards and Financial Aids Committee
   .2002 The Committee consists of nine members: three faculty members elected from and by the Academic Council, two elected from and by the General Faculty, two students selected by the Student Council, one student selected by the Council of Graduate Students, and one administrative member appointed by the Chancellor. Student members serve as members of the Committee when new policy or policy revisions are being considered. Student members shall not serve when the Committee is acting on student appeals, except at the discretion of the appealing student. Elected faculty members serve a two-year term with approximately one-half elected each year. Student members shall serve for a one-year period.

PROPOSED
   .2002 The Committee consists of three faculty members elected from and by the Academic Council, two faculty elected from and by the General Faculty, two undergraduates selected by the Student Council, one graduate student selected by the Council of Graduate Students, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Director of Student Financial Aid, and such other appointees as the Chancellor appoints. All members have voice and vote when considering new or revised policy. When considering student appeals only the elected faculty members, the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the Director of Student Financial Aid have voice and vote. At the request of the appealing student, the undergraduate members—for an undergraduate student—or graduate student member—for graduate students—may participate with voice and vote. Faculty are elected for two-year terms, students are selected annually.

[Purpose is to assure voting members are available for late summer, inter-semester appeals decisions; and to give flexibility to appointees by the Chancellor, e.g. Development or Admissions.]

Rules, Procedures & Agenda Committee
   Lance Williams, Chair

Lance Williams
October 6, 1988

Memorandum To: Orrin Crosser  
President, Academic Council

From: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor

Re: Computer Committee

In order to be consistent with the existing administrative structure, I would suggest the following editorial changes be made in the committee's description (additional wording is underlined):

.08 Computer Advisory Committee

.0801 This committee advises the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and assists the Director of the Computer Center in the formulation and implementation of policies regarding computer activities on the Campus.

.0802 The committee consists of one member elected from each academic department desiring representation, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services and Director of the Computer Center as ex officio members, one student selected by the Student Council, and one graduate student selected by the Council of Graduate Students. Faculty members serve for a three-year term with approximately one-third of the membership elected each year. Subcommittees may be formed by the committee to assist in timely decision making.

Please let me know if there are any questions or concerns regarding this request.

MCJ/mlc
Article I

Name

The name of this organization is the University of Missouri-Rolla Table Tennis Club (UMR-TTC). The UMR-TTC will become affiliated with the USTTA. Hereafter, the University of Missouri-Rolla Table Tennis Club will be referred to as the UMR-TTC.

Article II

Purposes

The UMR-TTC will provide an opportunity for members to share their knowledge about table tennis with others, and to practice and prepare for tournaments. It will provide good competition and help for each member.

Article III

Membership

Membership will consist of two classes: Regular and Associate members.

Regular members must be UMR students who are devoted to the sport of table tennis and have paid dues for the current semester. All regular members will have the right to vote and hold office.

Associate members are members of faculty or staff at UMR who desire membership. Associate members cannot vote.

Any member whose conduct brings reproach upon the club or who fails to pay dues will be put on an impeachment list and then the UMR-TTC must vote to drop the member with a simple majority. Any member will have the right to defend himself.

Article IV

Faculty Advisor

The UMR-TTC will have at least one faculty advisor. Faculty Advisors shall be elected each April for the upcoming year.
March 3, 1989

Memo To: O. K. Crosser
President, Academic Council

From: L. F. Koederitz, Chmn., Academic Freedom Committee

RE: Recommendation Concerning Institutional Review Boards

Attached is the recommendation of the Academic Freedom Committee concerning the Institutional Review Board requirements.

cc: Academic Freedom Committee
    W. Bledsoe    A. Culp
    E. Epstein    D. Myers
    J. Rockaway   C. A. Smith
Institutional Review Board
R. Montgomery
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE
CONCERNING THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Academic freedom is the foundation for pursuit of knowledge and truth in higher education institutions. The Academic Freedom Committee believes it is important to guard this highly valued liberty. Any unnecessary limitations on academic liberty, no matter how innocuous, should be resisted if there is no substantial justification for such limitation.

The Academic Freedom Committee after considerable study concludes that academic freedom is unnecessarily being infringed upon by the ambiguous language and the uninhibited application of Executive Order No. 10, dated August 10, 1972. The assumed right by the Institutional Review Boards to prevent potential research involving humans only indirectly or in an innocuous setting, without the right of appeal, is considered a serious potential obstruction of academic freedom and permits the exercise of arbitrary discretionary power.

The present application of Executive Order No. 10 apparently allows Institutional Review Boards to review the following situations with the unilateral right to prevent further pursuit of the subject:

1. Nonobtrusive surveys where anonymity is preserved and where individuals can refuse to participate;
2. Aggregate data collection relative to an organization which does not impinge upon an individual;
3. Any survey published in the Miner; and
4. Surveys employed by professors as a course assignment.

Clearly if the Institutional Review Board has jurisdiction over these situations, potential obstruction of academic freedom exists.

The Academic Freedom Committee by a vote of 7 to 0 (with one committee member desiring extensive changes to this document) responsibly recommends the following:

1. A review of the purpose of Executive Order No. 10 to insure that there is an appropriate consideration for academic freedom;
2. Development of a policy for the determined purposes that will provide definitive regulations concerning the extent of the jurisdiction of Institutional Review Boards which will not infringe upon academic freedom without substantial justification;
3. Development of an expeditious process for the right of appeal of Institutional Review Board rulings; and

The Academic Freedom Committee further recommends that the above be forwarded to U-wide and the other UM campuses.
Memo to: Academic Council Members

From: Carol Ann Smith, Chair, Budgetary Affairs Committee

Re: Fee Structure

Prompted by the alleged inequity in situations where students in the same course pay different fees depending on their class rank, the Budgetary Affairs Committee has reviewed the issue of the student fee differential based on class rank. The Committee does not believe that the fee differential between lower division students (freshmen and sophomores) and upper division students (junior and seniors) should be retained given the difficulties for students, for their families, for the Registrar and for the University.

The fee differential between lower and upper division students has created innumerable difficulties in billing. Bills are sent to students in mid-July and at Thanksgiving. The Thanksgiving billing projects the Student's class rank based on successful completion of the fall term's course work and must be edited after the term is over. The projections can be wrong obviously if the student drops a course, fails a course or withdraws from school. The July billing is made after the spring semester is over but, again, needs editing pending completion of summer school and/or credit transferred in from another university prior to the four week University-mandated "freeze" point in the semester. This continual "tinkering" and rebilling is both a burden to the Registrar's Office and a frustration to the students.

Students do not understand the details of and rationale for class rank determinations. For example, the following count toward determining class rank: all transfer credit even that which does not count toward a degree; credit received for Math 4 and 6; Fundamentals of Engineering taken in high school even though Freshman Engineering must be taken. Worse, some aspects of the billing system appear arbitrary, unfair and open to abuse: some students who transfer credit in before the four week freeze point may have their rank (and billing) changed for that semester while those whose transfer credit is delayed until after the four week freeze point do not have their rank (and billing) changed until the following semester.
Nor do families understand the billing system. The bill received undoubtedly determines their planning and, if paid, may be taken to be their total obligation - not an unreasonable assumption to make about a bill received. The rebilling of an extra amount caused by summer credit or transferred credit (perhaps in conjunction with the overlooked credit mentioned in the above paragraph) causes frustration and even anger toward the University. The system may be deemed arbitrary (hinging as it does on the difference between 59 and 60 hours of credit), capricious (credits that do not count toward a degree are counted for class rank determination), non-understandable and vexatious.

The fee differential was instituted in part to recognize that upper division education is more costly than lower division education. However, the fee difference is such a small amount that it hardly addresses the difference in cost. But if it is not large enough to address the difference in cost, it is large enough to cause anger, frustration and ill-will toward the University.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee has reviewed a number of alternatives, none of which, the Committee believes, will remove the above difficulties without creating further problems. The Committee, therefore, recommends:

that the fee differential based on lower division and upper division rank be eliminated,

that a uniform fee structure be instituted that is revenue neutral,

and that this resolution be forwarded to the other campuses, the President and the Board of Curators for their action.
April 13, 1989

Memo to: Orrin Crosser, President, Academic Council

From: Vince Roach, Chair, Personnel Committee

RE: Smoking Policy for UMR

The Personnel Committee recommends to the UMR Academic Council the following Smoking Policy for endorsement by the Council.

University of Missouri-Rolla Smoking Policy

Purpose and Philosophy: A comfortable environment at UMR is dependent upon the thoughtfulness and cooperation of both smokers and non-smokers. Because smoking is a health and potential fire hazard, it shall be restricted in order to create and maintain an environment that is in the best interest of the health, safety and well-being of all concerned.

Policy: Smoking is prohibited in all buildings owned, operated or leased by the University of Missouri-Rolla except in designated smoking areas. Designated smoking areas will be established for each building by the person/s responsible for administration of the building.

Areas which may be designated as smoking areas include the following:

a. Each building should have at least one designated smoking area provided there is adequate ventilation so as not to cause health or safety problems for building users.

b. Smoking is allowed in enclosed private and semi-private offices as long as non-smokers are not affected by the side-stream smoke.

Responsibility: All members of the university community share in the responsibility of adhering to and enforcing this policy and have the responsibility for bringing it to the attention of visitors. As with any university policy, violators and any complaints should be reported to the appropriate university authority. If conflicts or problems should arise, environmental, safety and health considerations will prevail.
TO: Academic Council members  
RE: By-laws Revision proposals

Colleagues, following are to By-laws proposed changes. If Council accepts, they will be presented to the General Faculty on April 25th for a ballot vote thereafter.

.07 Campus Safety and Risk Management Committee

.0701 The principal responsibility of this committee is to assist the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Academic Council, Business Officer, and the Safety Representative with the implementation of the Risk Management Program.

.0702 The members of the Committee shall be determined by the Chancellor; however, members of the UM University Safety and Risk Management Committee shall be appointed to serve on the Campus Committee, but no more than three such members shall be appointed. The Committee shall include at least one undergraduate student. The Chairman shall be appointed by the Chancellor and the Safety Representative shall serve as Secretary without privilege of vote.

PROPOSED

.07 Campus Safety Committee

.0701 The principal responsibility of this Committee is to advise the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services and the Academic Council on matters pertaining to the Safety Program on Campus.

.0702 The membership of the Committee shall be determined by the Chancellor and shall include two faculty members from each School/College; two students, at least one of whom is an undergraduate student; two members of the staff; and a representative from the Environmental Health/Risk Management Department. The Chairperson shall be appointed by the Chancellor; the Environmental Health/Risk Management representative serves as Secretary.

[The Safety and Risk Management Committee has discussed the need for changes and approved this proposal November 22, 1988.]

.20 Student Awards and Financial Aids Committee

.2002 The Committee consists of nine members: three faculty members elected from and by the Academic Council, two elected from and by the General Faculty, two students selected by the Student Council, one student selected by the Council of Graduate Students, and one administrative member appointed by the Chancellor. Student members serve as members of the Committee when new policy or policy revisions are being considered. Student members shall not serve when the Committee is acting on student appeals, except at the discretion of the appealing student. Elected faculty members serve a two-year term with approximately one-half elected each year. Student members shall serve for a one-year period.

PROPOSED

.2002 The Committee consists of three faculty members elected from and by the Academic Council, two faculty elected from and by the General Faculty, two undergraduate students selected by the Student Council, one graduate student selected by the Council of Graduate Students, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Director of Student Financial Aid, and such other appointees as the Chancellor appoints. All members have voice and vote when considering new or revised policy. When considering student appeals only the elected faculty members, the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the Director of Student Financial Aid have voice and vote. At the request of the appealing student, the undergraduate student members--for undergraduate students---or graduate student member--for graduate students--may participate with voice and vote. Faculty are elected for two-year terms, students are selected annually.

[Purpose is to assure voting members are available for late summer, inter-semester appeals decisions; and to give flexibility to appointees by the Chancellor, e.g. Development or Admissions.]

Rules, Procedures & Agenda Committee

-Lance Williams, chr

[Signature]
Memorandum To: Orrin Crosser  
President, Academic Council

From: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor

Re: Computer Committee

In order to be consistent with the existing administrative structure, I would suggest the following editorial changes be made in the committee's description (additional wording is underlined):

.08 Computer Advisory Committee

.0801 This committee advises the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and assists the Director of the Computer Center in the formulation and implementation of policies regarding computer activities on the Campus.

.0802 The committee consists of one member elected from each academic department desiring representation, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services and Director of the Computer Center as ex officio members, one student selected by the Student Council, and one graduate student selected by the Council of Graduate Students. Faculty members serve for a three-year term with approximately one-third of the membership ejected each year. Subcommittees may be formed by the committee to assist in timely decision making.

Please let me know if there are any questions or concerns regarding this request.

MCJ/mlc
Attachment III.F

Article I

Name

The name of this organization is the University of Missouri-Rolla Table Tennis Club (UMR-TTC). The UMR-TTC will become affiliated with the USTTA. Hereafter, the University of Missouri-Rolla Table Tennis Club will be referred to as the UMR-TTC.

Article II

Purposes

The UMR-TTC will provide an opportunity for members to share their knowledge about table tennis with others, and to practice and prepare for tournaments. It will provide good competition and help for each member.

Article III

Membership

Membership will consist of two classes: Regular and Associate members.

Regular members must be UMR students who are devoted to the sport of table tennis and have paid dues for the current semester. All regular members will have the right to vote and hold office.

Associate members are members of faculty or staff at UMR who desire membership. Associate members cannot vote.

Any member whose conduct brings reproach upon the club or who fails to pay dues will be put on an impeachment list and then the UMR-TTC must vote to drop the member with a simple majority. Any member will have the right to defend himself.

Article IV

Faculty Advisor

The UMR-TTC will have at least one faculty advisor. Faculty Advisors shall be elected each April for the upcoming year.
Article V

Officers

Section 1: Officers of the UMR-TTC will consist of a President, Vice-President, Treasurer, and Secretary.

Section 2: Officers will be elected each November and April for the upcoming semesters.

Section 3: Nominations for officers shall be made from the floor by any UMR-TTC regular member.

Section 4: Officers must win with at least a simple majority.

Section 5: Duties of the officers are as follows:

1 President- Presides over all meetings, calls meetings, appoints committees, and dissolves committees. He must also approve of all withdrawals from the UMR-TTC’s treasury.

2 Vice President- Presides in the absence of the President; coordinates club’s activities (tournaments, etc.); performs any other task assigned by the President.

3 Secretary- Prepares minutes of all meetings; coordinates preparation and distribution of UMR-TTC’s publications.

4 Treasurer- Receives and distributes all the club’s funds; makes financial reports at all meetings; supervises fund-raising activities.

Article VI

Committees

Section 1: Committees of the UMR-TTC will include Public Relations, Equipment, and Fund Raising.

Section 2: Duties of Committees are as follows:

1 Public Relations- Implements all UMR-TTC publicity; advertises club activities

2 Equipment: Sets up all of the equipment and cleans up after meetings; purchases equipment for
3 Fund Raising- Plans and coordinates all fund raising for the club.

Section 3: Each committee will have one chairman. All members of committees, including chairmen, are appointed by the president.

Article VII

Dues

Each regular member of the UMR-TTC will pay dues each semester and dues shall be paid to the Treasurer within three weeks after the beginning of each semester. If a member joins during a semester, dues shall be paid to the Treasurer within three weeks after joining. Amount for dues shall be determined by vote.

Article VIII

Meetings

Section 1: UMR-TTC will hold regular meetings once every two weeks.

Section 2: Practice are actual playing times and will be held at least once a week.

Section 3: All meetings are called by the President.

Section 4: Two thirds of the regular members constitutes a quorum.

Article IX

By-laws

By-laws must be approved by two-thirds majority of regular members present at regular meetings. All by-laws must be approved by Student Affairs and Student Activities.

Article X

This constitution and all by-laws may be amended by a two-thirds affirmative vote of regular members present at a regular meeting. The amendment must be approved by the Student Affairs Committee and the Academic Council or their designated representatives.
President Crosser reminded the faculty that the Board of Curators will meet in Rolla on May 4 and 5 and that Access to Engineering in Urban Areas is presumed to be on the Curators' agenda. Open meetings will be held in Centennial Hall and interested parties are encouraged to attend.

Chancellor Jischke discussed the implications of the tax adjustment mandated by the Supreme Court. This adjustment creates a financial crisis for UMR. The seriousness of this problem cannot be overemphasized -- a loss of over 190 million dollars in state revenues is likely, with at least 45 million being lost from higher education. UMR's budget may be reduced by 2.5 million or more. If no action is taken, no increases in salaries, E & E, or Library support will occur and cut-backs may be required. At the present time, UMR appears to have only two alternatives -- accepting the cut-backs or massively increasing tuition and fees.

On Monday, April 24, Governor Ashcroft is expected to announce his plan in dealing with this crisis. Chancellor Jischke asked the UMR community to do three things: (1) understand the seriousness of this problem, (2) urge that State leaders deal with the problem before the current legislative session ends; and (3) support the details of the Governor's plan when it is announced. Chancellor Jischke hopes that, with our support, this potentially terrible problem can still be dealt with.

Committee Reports

The Council passed a resolution from the Academic Freedom Committee regarding the Institutional Review Board's right to prevent research involving humans only indirectly or in an innocuous setting. The resolution asks for a review of the purpose of the existing policy to insure that there is an appropriate consideration for academic freedom; development of a policy for the determined purposes that will provide definitive regulations concerning the extent of the jurisdiction of Institutional Review Boards which will not infringe upon academic freedom without substantial justification; development of an expeditious process for appeals; and development of Institutional Review Board regulations consistent with policy.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee recommended that the fee differential based on lower and upper division rank be eliminated and be replaced by a uniform fee structure that is revenue neutral; this recommendation was approved by Council and will be forwarded to the other campuses, the President, and the Board of Curators for their action.

Council approved 7 ECl's and 48 CCl's submitted by the Curriculm Committee.
The Smoking Policy for UMR prepared by the Personnel Committee was approved after some revision. Beginning in the Fall, 1989, semester, areas may be designated as smoking areas in each building, provided there is adequate ventilation. Smoking will also be permitted in private and semi-private offices, provided all occupants agree.

Council voted to forward the three changes in the By-Laws presented by the Rules, Procedure, & Agenda Committee to the General Faculty for a ballot vote.

The constitution for the UMR Table Tennis Club, presented by the Student Affairs Committee, was approved.

Finally, the officers of the Academic Council were asked by Council to draft a resolution concerning the budget crisis and forward the resolution to Chancellor Jischke; President Crosser agreed.
April 19, 1989 announcements & Presidents report for April 20, 1989

The Council Officers wish to extend their deepest sympathy to our Secretary, Professor Clyde Wade, and the family, for the tragic loss of their daughter this past week.

I wish to report that:

The Budgetary Affairs resolutions which we passed last meeting have been acknowledged by the Chancellor and shared with the Budget Review Committee.

The Chancellor has forwarded the resolution on assessment to President Magrath.

Academic Council comments about the Conflict of Interest policy have been forwarded by the Chancellor to Vice President Wallace.

Council recommendations about the draft about Procedures for Promotion and Tenure for new faculty who are being considered for appointment with tenure have been sent to Vice Chancellor Park who is redrafting them.

Engineering Laboratory Equipment bill (SB52) was supported by testimony by Eugene Bae, (our ASUM intern). The bill is expected to be voted out of committee soon.

The Scholarship package bill (HB 641) remains a possibility having survived the third reading. Senate action is anticipated soon.

With respect to the Engineering in St. Louis, the $2m proposal was rejected by the House floor, the $100k assessment study was approved by the House floor and rejected by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Further debate is anticipated following the Curators meeting here May 4th and 5th.

By way of information, although the final arrangements for the Curators’ open meetings have not been completed, these will be held in the west side of the Centennial Hall. All traffic will enter and leave through the double doors at the west end. The Curators will probably be sitting in front of the South window, and substantial seating for visitors will be to the left as we enter the doors. I remind Council that the question of Access to Engineering in Urban Areas (specifically St. Louis) is presumed to be on the Curators’ Agenda for this meeting.

This week’s announcement of a new imperative tax adjustment may leave us with significantly fewer funds. The Chancellor travelled to the Governor’s Office this morning to discover our position — that will be the reason he is not here. We must anticipate reductions to the point of no increase or negative.

The UMC Faculty Chair (Professor Gordon Kimber) tells me that the student staff and faculty are considering a public rally at noon on Wednesday April 26, 1989. The purpose of
the gathering is to suggest that students, student families, staff, Alumni write, call, or visit their legislators to get positive action on a tax increase for higher education.

Item B: please note that on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee the item Qualifications for Professorial Ranks, has been referred to the Promotion and Tenure Committee chaired by Professor Walter Eversman of Mechanics, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering.

I have no other referrals
To: Orrin Crosser  
President, Academic Council  
Date: April 6, 1989  

From: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor  
Subject: Budget Resolutions  
Budgetary Affairs Committee  

The resolutions from the Budgetary Affairs Committee have been received and copies have been shared with the Budget Review Committee. They will become part of the information upon which decisions will be made for the FY90 and FY91 budgets.
To: Orrin K. Crosser  
President, Academic Council

Date: April 7, 1989

From: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor

Subject: Resolutions

I have received your memo of April 5 describing the four resolutions adopted by the Academic Council regarding the FY90 and FY91 budgets. These resolutions will be taken into account as we proceed to develop these two budgets. I appreciate your sharing them with me.

MCJ/mlc
To: Orrin Crosser
President, Academic Council

From: Martin C. Jischke
Chancellor

Subject: Assessment Results Use
(February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.A)

The Resolution on Student Assessment passed by the Academic Council on February 2 has been forwarded to President Magrath and he has acknowledged its receipt.

MCJ/mlc
To: Orrin Crosser  
President, Academic Council  

From: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor  

Subject: Proposed Conflict of Interest Policy  

The comments received from the Academic Council were incorporated into the campus response which I forwarded to Vice President Richard Wallace in February. Dr. Wallace has acknowledged receipt of my memorandum indicating it would be some months before the document would be ready for consideration by the Board of Curators.

MCJ/mlc
April 20, 1989

MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Orrin Cressey
FROM: John T. Park
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
SUBJECT: Academic Council's Action Concerning the Conflict of Interest Policy

I have forwarded the comments of the Personnel Committee relative to the conflict of interest policy to Nancy Marlin. It is my understanding that there will be representatives from the four campuses working on revisions to this policy, taking the comments from all four campuses into account. I am certain that the comments from the Academic Council will be given thorough consideration by the group in their deliberations.

I am working on a draft of guidelines for administrators and faculty regarding teaching assignments outside the faculty member's academic home department. I would anticipate that a draft will be available for your consideration in the near future.

JTP/bjc
February 13, 1989

MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Orrin Crosser

FROM: John T. Park
    Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

Thank you for your comments on Section III of the Procedures For Promotion And/OR Tenure Recommendations. I will share your comments with the Chancellor's Staff Group. I feel somewhat uncomfortable leaving procedures for establishing rank and/or tenure for persons seeking a position at UMR entirely unspecified. However, I recognize the timing problems inherent in the proposed procedures.

It is possible that I will come back to you with a set of revised procedures which would be more sensitive to the problems in timing offers made to candidates for positions at UMR. In this sense, the revised procedures would not be parallel to the procedures existing for faculty already holding positions on the UMR campus but would formally require faculty input into these decisions.

Thank you again for your advise and counsel.

JTP/bjc

cc: Chancellor Martin C. Jischke
To: Orrin Crosser  
President, Academic Council 

Date: April 7, 1989

From: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor

Subject: Administrative Response

This memo is to respond to the recommendations of the Academic Council regarding the draft of the "Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations." I have forwarded the Academic Council's recommendations to Vice Chancellor Park who has redrafted these procedures to take account of the suggestion of the Academic Council. We have revised the procedures to merely formalize the requirement for faculty input into the decision-making process when new faculty are being considered for appointment with tenure. I believe that this will adequately deal with the concerns that have been raised about the current process.

MCJ/mlc

cc: Vice Chancellor John T. Park
4/7/89

Dear [Name]:

Dave Wolfman will substitute for me (I hope) at the April faculty council meeting.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Resolution §8889R3

Mandatory Assessment

Meeting Date: March 21, 1989

WHEREAS: The purpose of assessment is to assess the quality of education and not to grade the students;

WHEREAS: Assessment has been made mandatory despite last year's 44% turn out in bad weather when assessment was voluntary;

WHEREAS: For those who are presently sophomores, juniors, and seniors assessment was not listed as a graduation requirement in the catalog when they were freshmen;

WHEREAS: Some departments are basing grades on assessment results, therefore,

Be it resolved that the UMR Student Council is firmly opposed to the mandatory assessment program being used at UMR. The UMR Student Council strongly suggests that the administration exempts current sophomores, juniors, and seniors from mandatory assessment, and that a non-mandatory assessment test be administered; and that a reward, such as a day off, be used as persuasion rather than the current registration penalization.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Gibson
Vice President of External Affairs

Bob Phillips
Vice President of Internal Affairs

Jeannine Dubuque
Treasurer

Rebecca Vanderwall
Secretary
A comfortable environment at UMR is dependent upon the thoughtfulness and cooperation of both smokers and non-smokers. Because smoking is a health and potential fire hazard, it shall be restricted in order to create and maintain an environment that is in the best interest of the health, safety and well-being of all concerned.

Policy:

Smoking is prohibited except in designated smoking areas in all buildings owned, operated or leased by the University of Missouri - Rolla.

General Guidelines

1. Smoking is prohibited in the following areas:

   a. General access areas including restrooms, stairways, and elevators.

   b. All classrooms, cafeterias, dining areas, conference rooms, auditoriums, libraries, gymnasiums, museums, and teaching/research laboratories.

   c. All work areas/offices that serve the public or are regularly frequented by nonsmokers.

   d. All work areas/offices that are private but house at least one nonsmoker.

   e. In areas where combustible fumes can collect, such as in garages or storage areas using chemicals or solvents, and all other areas where an occupational safety, fire or health hazard may exist.

   f. All locations not specifically discussed in section #2 below.

2. Areas which may be designated as smoking areas include the following:

   a. Each building should have at least one designated smoking area provided there is adequate ventilation so as not to cause health or safety problems for building users.
March 24, 1989

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - ROLLA
SMOKING POLICY
(DISCUSSION DRAFT)

b. Smoking is allowed in enclosed private and semi-private offices as long as nonsmokers are not affected by the side-stream smoke.

c. Residents of University owned and operated residence halls and apartments should establish, in conjunction with the Office of Residential Life, specific smoking policies for residence hall rooms and apartments.

Responsibility

All members of the University community share in the responsibility of adhering to and enforcing this policy, and have the responsibility for bringing it to the attention of visitors. As with any University policy violators and any complaints should be reported to the appropriate University authority. If conflicts or problems should arise, environmental, safety and health considerations will prevail.
The Board of Curators of the University of Missouri System today concluded a two-day working session held for the purpose of addressing the problem of state funding for the University's four-campus System. The board discussed the problems and concerns generated by 10 years of significant underfunding of the System, the need to communicate effectively the situation to the elected public authorities and the people of Missouri, and the course of action that must be pursued if the situation is not rectified. After discussion of a broad array of issues, the Board's deliberations culminated in agreement with the recommendation of System President C. Peter Magrath, who was directed to prepare a report to the Board that outlines the actions necessary to generate an additional $150 million to fund the Agenda for Action, in the absence of substantial state appropriations increases for higher education. The report will be received at the October 1989 meeting of the Board of Curators.

The Board unanimously concluded that the status quo is unacceptable and agreed to pursue one of two courses of action. To ensure the excellence of the University and service of the educational needs of the state, the University must receive substantial additional state funding or significantly limit the scope of the University's programs and increase non-state funding to achieve the resources necessary for excellence.

The basic elements of the report are to include, among other items, a discussion of the following:

1. The University's role and potential in serving the needs of the State of Missouri with proper funding; and

2. Recommendations of actions of last resort that may be necessary to maintain quality and excellence in the event that adequate funding is not forthcoming, including consolidation or elimination of programs, schools and colleges, expanded use of telecommunications, substantial tuition increases, further limitations on enrollments, etc.

It is the expectation of the Board of Curators that this report, once reviewed, revised and approved by the Board, would be adopted by the Board as a statement of its policy regarding future direction of the University of Missouri System and would be communicated to the Governor, the General Assembly and the citizens of Missouri. The Board of Curators recognizes and appreciates that the Governor and the General Assembly have the difficult task and responsibility of allocating scarce state resources to all needs of Missourians and demands on such state resources.

(See page 2)
News from the special April 28-29 Board of Curators meeting, Kansas City

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING The Board of Curators met in special session to lay the groundwork for the future of the University. All nine curators, the student representative to the board, the president and vice presidents for the University System and the four campus chancellors met Friday evening and most of Saturday to discuss the direction the University will take in coming years. The statement reprinted on the previous page was the outcome of the board's discussions. Following is a summary of some of the steps that led to that outcome.

BOARD PRESIDENT Board President Ed Turner set the tone by saying the University is plagued by old wives' tales and myths that the University has too many programs, Missouri has too many public institutions of higher education, Missouri's aging population means there are fewer students to educate, and the University's largest campus is adding programs willy-nilly. The facts and the statistics prove otherwise, Turner said. "Compared to our current available resources, maybe we do have too many programs and too many campuses across this state. But as compared to who we're competing with, we certainly do not," Turner said. "If we sacrifice access, we're going to have an economic development problem in this state because we're going to have a population that isn't educated for the future."

UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT University President C. Peter Magrath said the state's past and present level of funding for Missouri public higher education in general and the University in particular has left the board with three choices for the future direction of the institution: 1) proceed on the current course with "educational business as usual," 2) seek the investment dollars needed to meet our missions and to be competitive in the real world or 3) "reduce and eliminate entire, though needed, programs and parts of all of our four campuses and maybe think the unthinkable about closing a campus (University Extension included), raising educational fees and having, therefore, a smaller University, more expensive in terms of access and one that will candidly contribute much less to the state."

Magrath said he favors the second choice. "I believe that an investment tax increase is needed. I think that's possible. We have enormous resources if we wish to invest them." The third choice, however, is a realistic alternative. "I think that choice is a better choice than a slide into mediocrity. I think it's a poorer choice than being the University the state deserves, needs and can afford."

THE ACTIONS Through formal motions, the board:

* readopted, in principle, the long-range plan, "Toward Excellence: The Next Decade of the University," last revised in December 1986.
* reaffirmed its approval of the five-year financial plan, adopted last year by the board as a statement of the University's financial needs for funding the long-range plan's goals and objectives.
* endorsed efforts to seek the state's portion of the five-year financial plan ($117 million more each year). The board stressed the importance of demonstrating to the governor and legislature that the University continues to pursue assessment, administrative efficiency and reallocation efforts.
* agreed to petition the Coordinating Board for Higher Education for a change in its formula for recommending distribution of higher education appropriations. A change would give the University equitable treatment with other public colleges and universities.
* voiced support of a tax increase that would raise state revenues for all of Missouri higher education.
* endorsed supporting the governor and General Assembly in efforts to respond to a shortfall in the state budget and urging lawmakers to create a response that will not be at the expense of education.

NOTEWORTHY Curator Carrie Francke asked President Magrath and Board President Turner to communicate to the faculty and staff the board's commitment to improving compensation.
CONSTITUTION OF THE STUDENT COUNCIL

University of Missouri - Rolla

May 2, 1989

Amended January 1995

ARTICLE I: NAME

The name of the organization shall be "The Student Council of the University of Missouri-Rolla" which shall hereafter be referred to as the "Council" or the "Student Council."

ARTICLE II: PURPOSE

The purpose of this Council shall be to:
1. represent the interests of the student body in student, university, and governmental affairs,
2. provide services that improve the quality of life of UMR students,
3. keep the student body informed of relevant issues,
4. coordinate and regulate student activities and funds in the interests of the student body,
5. maintain a positive relationship between the student body and the local community, and
6. serve as the chief representative body of students at UMR.

ARTICLE III: DUTIES AND POWERS OF THE COUNCIL

Section 1. It shall be the duty of the Council to keep the student body informed on topics of particular interest to the student body.

Section 2. It shall be the prerogative of the Student Council to appoint non-voting student members to the Miner Board, Rollamo Board, KMNR Board, St. Pat's [Board] Committee, and to any other boards or committees which administer student activity fee revenue or receive appropriations from the Student Council.

Section 3. The Student Council shall recommend allocation of funds, equipment, facilities, and other resources available for student use or provided by the student body. The Student Council shall have access to all records pertaining to these resources.

Section 4. The Student Council may request the Academic Council and the Student [Activities office] Affairs Committee to revoke the constitution of any organization if a situation warrants such action. The recommended revocation will require a 3/4 vote of all voting Council Representatives.

ARTICLE IV: MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. The requirements for membership on Student Council shall be specified in the Bylaws. Changes in the membership requirements can only become effective at the beginning of the academic year. It is the intent of the Council that each member of the student body can be represented by one and only one Representative.

Section 1. The UMR Student Council's voting representation shall be composed of housing representatives, organization representatives, and members-at-large.

Section 2. All university-approved housing units will be allowed to have housing representatives. They shall have representation and voting privileges according to the following:

- 15-59 members: 1 voting representative
- 60+ members: 2 voting representatives

Section 3. The steps for an organization to receive voting representation on Council are as follows:
1. The organization must not serve as a governmental or coordinating body.
2. Any organization interested in receiving a vote must first apply to have a non-voting associate member. Only after having an associate member as the declared organization representative for a full semester will the organization be allowed to apply for a vote.
3. The organization must prove that they have at least 15 members, as defined by their constitution or bylaws, who do not live in University-approved housing.
4. The organization must receive a 2/3 vote of Council.

Organizations that do not have 15 members living off-campus may petition to have a voting representative on the grounds that their organization represents a minority student population not effectively represented by other voting representatives on Council. A 2/3 vote of Council is required to approve an organization by this method.

Section 4. Member-at-large positions may be filled by any student who does not live in university approved housing or any
student who has served on Student Council for a full semester. The intent of these positions is to first represent off-campus students, and secondly to improve retention of experienced members. Members-at-large shall be elected by a plurality of a ballot vote of Council when a position becomes vacant. Members-at-large shall continue to serve until they resign or are expelled from Council. The number of Member-at-large positions shall be specified in the bylaws.

Section 5. Associate members shall be the fourth classification of membership and shall not have a vote in Council. Any student who has not been expelled from Council may apply to be automatically accepted as an associate member. Associate members shall have all powers and duties of regular members except for the right to vote.

Section 6. All members shall continue to serve on Council until they resign, are expelled by Council, are replaced by their organization, or terminate their enrollment at UMR.

ARTICLE V: DUTIES OF REPRESENTATIVES

Section 1. Upon assuming the title of Student Council Representative, each Representative shall:
1. attend regular Council meetings unless excused by the President or Recorder; a Representative may have no more than 3 unexcused absences [or 2 consecutive unexcused absences from regular meetings] during an academic year,
2. be active on and attend the meetings of at least one Council committee unless otherwise excused by the committee chairman, [the Vice President of Internal Affairs,] or the Recorder [or the President]; a Representative may have no more than 2 unexcused committee meeting absences during a semester,
3. voice the opinions of his or her constituents during Student Council discussions and vote accordingly,
4. inform constituents of the results of these vote,
5. regularly report to inform constituents of issues and proceedings of Council, campus-wide activities, referendums, and other issues affecting the student body,
6. assume any additional duties that the executive committee, the bylaws or Council may demand.

ARTICLE VI: OFFICERS AND ADVISORS

Section 1. The Officers of the Council shall consist of a President, Vice President of External Affairs, Vice President of Internal Affairs, Treasurer, and Recorder.

Section 2. The President of Student Council shall act as the Student Body President and shall be elected by campus-wide ballot vote of the student body. Campaign rules and election procedures of the President shall be determined in the bylaws.

Section 2[3]. [Nominations for other officers shall be during the first regular meeting in March. Elections shall be during the next regular meeting last regular meeting in March]. Officers other than the President shall be elected by a plurality of a ballot vote at the first regular Council meeting after the campus-wide elections of president[simple majority]. Election procedures beyond these requirements shall be determined by the Bylaws. [The retiring Executive Committee shall determine election procedures not covered in this Constitution or the Bylaws.]

Section 4. The terms of the new Officers shall begin immediately following the election of all officers.[with the Student Council Banquet which shall be in April. The Council shall decide the date of the banquet. A replacement Representative shall be selected by the constituents of each new officer. The replacements shall become Representatives when the officer's term begins.]

Section 5. Any Officer who does not fulfill the duties described in Section 8 of this article shall be subject to a vote of expulsion. In order to expel an Officer three-fourths of all voting Council Representatives must vote in favor of the expulsion. The vote must be taken at a regular meeting.

Section 6. In the event that the President vacates his or her elected office, the Vice President of External Affairs shall [temporarily] assume the duties of the President for the remainder of the term [as Acting-President, in addition to the duties of Vice President of External Affairs.] In the event that any other Officer vacates his or her office, the President shall appoint a student to temporarily assume the duties of that office. At the next regular meeting of the Council, nominations and elections shall be held for the vacant office. [Elections for this office shall be held at the next regular meeting after the nominations and shall follow any Election procedures established in the Bylaws.]

Section 7. The Officers shall not vote at Council meetings, except that the chairman shall vote in the case of a tie. The order of succession with respect to the chairmanship of a Council meeting is the order in which the Officers are listed in Section 1.

Section 8. Officer Duties

A. The President shall be responsible for all actions of Student Council and shall:
1) hold full executive authority in Student Council subject to the Executive Committee
2) act as chairman at meetings of the Council,
3) represent the student body in all intercampus and extracampus capacities as the Student Body President,
4) report to the Council on intercampus and extracampus issues,
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chair the Executive Committee and call its meetings,
work in conjunction with the treasurer and members of the executive committee to prepare Council’s budget,
have authority to authorize and sign for expenditures within the Council budget,
see that the constitution and Bylaws of the Council are followed,
see that the other officers fulfill their responsibilities,
see that the Council as a whole accomplishes its goals and fulfills its responsibilities and purposes,
call special meetings of Student Council,
appoint ad hoc committees and executive positions as necessary, and
assume any additional responsibilities that the bylaws or the Council may demand.

B. The Vice President of External Affairs shall be responsible for all issues and affairs not related to the internal workings of Student Council and shall:

act as chairman in the absence of or at the request of the President,
be prepared to assume the duties of the President at any time,
see that the student body is represented and informed in campus decisions and affairs,
report to the Council on campus issues,
serve as parliamentarian and have in his or her possession at each Council meeting a copy of Robert’s Rules of Order, this Constitution, and a current copy of the Bylaws,
appoint students to University committees,
be responsible for publicity of issues and events outside of Student Council pertaining to Student Council or the student body of UMR,
coordinate with the Vice President of Internal Affairs and chairs the distribution of student issues among the committees,
maintain channels for students to express opinions, and
assume any additional responsibilities that the President, Bylaws, or the Council may demand.

C. The Vice President of Internal Affairs shall be responsible for all issues and affairs related to the internal workings of Student Council and shall:

chair the Student Council Cabinet which is composed of chairmen of all Student Council ad hoc and standing committees,
coordinate and oversee the work of all Student Council committees,
recommend to the Executive Committee or the Council any changes in the committee system or personnel which may cause the committees to be more effective,
see that each committee performs the duties required of it by the Bylaws or the Council,
report the progress of the committees to the President, Executive Committee, and the Council,
see that all Representatives are assigned to at least one Council committee unless excused under Article V,
report to the Executive Committee and to the Council when any Representative fails to meet the committee duties described in Article V, and
coordinate, oversee, and recommend changes in the work of all Student Council committees,
see that all representatives are assigned to at least one Council committee unless excused by the Executive Committee,
see that the constitution and Bylaws of the Council are followed,
serve as parliamentarian at Student Council meetings,
be responsible for public relations and informing students of all projects and events within Student Council,
coordinate all recruiting of Student Council members at the start of each semester,
chair and call meetings of the Executive committee, and
assume any additional responsibilities that the President, Bylaws or the Council may demand.

D. The Treasurer shall be responsible for overseeing all funding related to Student Council and shall:

see that all expenditures of Student Council funds, including expenditures of Council funds other organizations, are in accordance with university and Council policy and do not conflict with any budgets approved by the Council,
serve as a liaison with all boards, committees, and other decision making groups which appropriate or recommend the appropriation of Student Activity Fee revenue,
see that all financial transactions of the Council are executed in a timely fashion,
see that Council members and Council committee members understand the university accounting system and financial policies well enough to be able to properly carry out their responsibilities,
report regularly to the President and to the Council transactions involving the Council funds which have taken place since the previous report,
recommend for Council approval any changes in the Council’s approved budget or in the budget of any organization provided with Council funds, and
assume any additional responsibilities that the Bylaws or the Council may demand.

E. The Recorder shall be responsible for maintaining all Council records and shall:

record the minutes of all meetings of the Council,
see that all minutes, agendas, and related materials are distributed to all Council members early enough to allow
Section 9. There shall be two faculty Advisors elected by the Student Council who will have the right to attend meetings of the Council and of the Executive Committee but shall not vote. They shall have the right to speak at Council Meetings. They shall be elected by a simple majority and shall serve until replaced.

ARTICLE VII: COMMITTEES

Section 1. There shall be an Executive Committee of the Student Council. The membership of this committee will be determined in the bylaws. It shall be composed of the President, Vice President of External Affairs, Vice President of Internal Affairs, Recorder, Treasurer, and the faculty Advisors. Advisors shall have the right to speak but not to vote. The chairman of this committee shall be the President, Vice President of Internal Affairs of the Council. The Executive Committee shall meet prior to all regularly scheduled Student Council meetings.

Section 2. The standing committees of the Student Council shall be established as prescribed in the Bylaws. The President shall establish ad hoc committees as necessary. Chairmen of both standing and ad hoc committees are appointed by the Executive Committee.

Section 3. There shall be a Cabinet composed of the chairmen of all Council committees. The Cabinet shall facilitate the work of all Council committees and encourage communication among the chairmen, and shall meet at least once every 4th week during the academic year.

Section 3. All Student Council members shall have the right to sit in on any committee meeting, excluding Executive Committee meetings. A Student Council member attending a committee of which he or she is not a member shall not have the right to speak unless granted permission by the committee chairman. He or she shall not have the right to vote.

ARTICLE VIII: MEETINGS

Section 1. The Council shall hold regular meetings twice a month as prescribed by the calendar of meetings.

Section 2. Special meetings may be called by the President at any time and the President must call a meeting at the written request of a majority of the voting Council Representatives. Council members must be notified of the topic, place, and time of a special meeting at least three days before the meeting. An agenda must be provided to Council members prior to the meeting. Only those items contained on this agenda shall be discussed or acted upon at the meeting.

Section 3. A quorum for transaction of business shall consist of 2/3 of the total number of the voting Representatives.

Section 4. Unless conflicting with this Constitution or the Council Bylaws, the latest edition of Robert’s Rules of Order shall be used to govern the proceeding of Student Council meetings.

ARTICLE IX: CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Section 1. Proposed amendments submitted to the Council shall require a 2/3 majority vote of Council or a petition of at least 10% of the student body to be put on the ballot for approval. A petition must state the exact amendment along with the signatures.

Section 2. The text of a proposed amendment approved by the Council shall then be submitted for publication in the campus student newspaper and posted on school bulletin boards for at least one week prior to the campus-wide election of the Student Council President.

Section 3. Constitutional amendments may be passed by one of two methods.
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1. They may be submitted to campus-wide vote during the election of the Student Council President. A 2/3 majority of the student body voting during such an election is required for passage.

2. In the event that an amendment needs to be approved prior to a campus-wide election, it may be put before the vote of Council which will require a unanimous minus one vote for passage.

[Section 3. A ballot referendum of the student body shall then be conducted no later than two weeks after the posting of the proposed amendment.

Section 4. Final approval of a proposed amendment may occur by either of the following two methods:

a. a 2/3 majority vote of a valid referendum or
b. a 2/3 majority vote of any invalid referendum with a unanimous minus one vote at the regular Council meeting immediately following the referendum returns.

Section 5. If a proposed amendment receives less than a 2/3 majority vote on a valid referendum, it may not be resubmitted for consideration for at least one entire academic semester.

Section 6. If a proposed amendment receives less than a 2/3 majority vote of an invalid referendum, or if a proposed amendment is not approved as under Section 4, subsection b of this article, a second referendum of the student body may be conducted within four weeks if so decided by a vote of the Council.

Section 7. If as a result of the second referendum the proposed amendment is not approved, it may not be resubmitted for consideration for at least one entire academic semester.

Section 8. An amendment may be proposed by a petition signed by at least 10% of the student body. Such an amendment does not require approval of the Council.

Section 9. Upon receipt of a petition the Council shall conduct a ballot referendum as prescribed in Section 3 through Section 7 of this article.

ARTICLE X: BYLAWS

Section 1. The Council shall adopt Bylaws as necessary to fulfill the responsibilities and goals of the Council.

Section 2. Bylaws must be submitted in written form and may be submitted only by a Representative. A simple majority vote at a regular meeting is required to approve a Bylaw.

Section 3. Amendment or revocation of a Bylaw requires a simple majority vote at a regular meeting.

ARTICLE XI: RATIFICATION

Section 1. This constitution shall become effective immediately upon approval by the student body in a special referendum with a majority of those voting constituting approval.

Section 2. Upon ratification, this constitution shall supersede any other constitution previously in effect.

ARTICLE XII: DEFINITIONS

academic year: a time period beginning with the first day of class of a fall semester and ending with the last day of finals week of the immediately succeeding winter semester.

full semester: the period from the first Council meeting to the last Council meeting in the semester includes Housing Representatives, Organizational Representatives, Members-at-Large, and Associate Members; all members are representatives but not all members are voting representatives

minority: minority groups include those granted minority status by the U.S. government

off-campus student: any student not living in university-approved housing

regular Council meeting: all meetings established by the Recorder's calendar.

student body: a group consisting of all persons currently enrolled in classes for UMR credit at UMR or recognized by the UMR Registrar's office as actively pursuing a degree at UMR.

Student Activity Fees: the semesterly student fees that the university designates as Student Activity Fees.

Student Council funds: money that is deposited into the Council's university account.

[valid referendum: a referendum in which at least 25% of the student body returns a ballot.

intercampus: involving two or more campuses of the University of Missouri System.

extracampus: involving any activity that lies outside of the university of Missouri-Rolla campus.

Council members: consist of the Representatives, Officers, and Advisors of Student Council.]
MEMO TO: Academic Council

FROM: Curricula Committee

SUBJECT: Meeting of June 1, 1989

EC1's reviewed:

EC1 217, Nuclear Engineering 301, Radiation Protection Engineering. Approved for Fall 1989. Prerequisites: NE 205. 3 hours credit.

EC1 218, Philosophy 201ML, Studies in Philosophy: Great English Moral Philosophers. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit.

EC1 219, English 101ML, Shakespeare. Approved for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit.

EC1 220, Physics 101, Environmental Physics II. Approved for Winter 1990. 3 hours credit.

EC1 221, Computer Science 301, Parallel Processing: Architectures, Languages and Algorithms. Approved for Winter 1990. Prerequisites: CSc 284 and CSc 228 or CSc 260 3 hours credit.

EC1 222, Computer Science 401, Theory of Parallel & Distributed Computation. Approved for Winter 1990. Prerequisites: CSc 381 or CSc 385 and CSc 355. 3 hours credit.

CC1's reviewed:

CCI 3066, Engineering Management 282, Production Management. Approved for Winter 1990. Change of catalog description to: This course presents the techniques of production management at an introductory level; productivity improvement through automation, robotics, real-time control and other innovations for managing and organizing the factory of the future to meet quality and delivery requirements.

CCI 3114, Chemical Engineering 000. Approved for Fall 1989. New curriculum: EG 10 is being replaced with a Communications Elective so CBHE requirements for community colleges and transfer credit can be met. The Communications Elective can be satisfied by taking EG 10, Engl 60, Engl 160, Speech & Media 85.

CCI 3116, Chemical Engineering 234, Chemical Engineering Laboratory I (Lab I). Approved for 1989 Fall. Change in catalog description to: Experiments illustrate the unit operations of fluid flow and heat transfer. Experimental methods, such as design of experiments and uncertainty analysis are introduced.
Creativity and originality are stressed because data are used for design. Oral and written reports are important.

CCl 3117, Chemical Engineering 236, Chemical Engineering Laboratory II (Lab 2). Approved for Fall 1989. Change in description to: A continuation of ChE 234 with experiments illustrating the unit operations listed in ChE 235 and ChE 237. Experimental methods introduced in ChE 234 are extended to include principles of regression and model building. Improvement of communication skills is also stressed.

CCl 3118, Aerospace Engineering. Approved for Fall 1990. Proposed Aerospace minor consisting of five aerospace courses for a total of 16 hours.


CCl 3120, Mining Engineering 151, Introduction to Mining Safety. Approved for Winter 1990. Change in prerequisites from Accompanied or proceeded by Min. 001 to Accompanied or proceeded by Min. 003.

CCl 3121, Mining Engineering 110, Surveying for Mineral Engineers. Approved for Winter 1990. Change in prerequisites from Math 6, EG 10 accompanied or proceeded by Min. 001 to Math 6, EG 10 accompanied or proceeded by Min. 003. Change in description to: Principles of surface and underground survey practice utilizing mining transit, theodolite, EDM, Brunton compass, and engineer's level. Traversing and details, determination of meridian and transferring underground, note taking and computations, and map construction.

CCl 3122, Mining Engineering 221, Mining Exploration. Approved for Winter 1990. Change in prerequisites from Geol 112 and 220, Min. 110 to Geol. 113 and 220, Min. 110.

CCl 3123, Civil Engineering 423, Analysis and Design of Plates and Shells II. Approved new course for Fall 1989. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: CE 422. Description reads: Buckling of cylindrical shells and spherical and stiffened domes. Analysis of cylindrical barrel roofs and other shapes such as paraboloids and conoids. Finite difference and plastic analysis of plates with complex geometry. Thermal stress analysis in plates and shells.

CCl 3124, Civil Engineering 422, Analysis and Design of Plates and Shells I. Approved for Fall 1989. Change in course title from Analysis and Design of Plates and Shells.


CCl 3127, Basic Engineering 025, Mechanical Design. Approved for Winter 1990. Change in course title from Graphical Design.

David Oglesby, Chairman
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David Oglesby, Chairman
Academic Council Meeting, Thursday, June 15, 1989; 1:30 p.m.; G-5 H/SS.

I. Approval of minutes of April 20, 1989, (VOL. XVIII, NO. 6) meeting.

II. Reports and Responses
   A. President’s Report (5 min.) Orrin Crosser (4459)

   B. Referrals
      1. Admission Standards to Admissions and Academic Standards Committee
      2. Spring Break Schedule to Calendar/Public Occasions Committee
      3. Staff Benefits Planning Committee Report to Personnel Committee

   C. Administrative Reports
      1. Chancellor’s Report on 1989-90 Budget (15 min.) Martin Jischke (4114)
      *2. Teaching Evaluation (10 min.) Walter Johnson (4809)

   D. Administrative Response
      1. Salary Increase Distribution Policy (February 2, 1989; XVIII, 4; III.C.2)
      2. Academic Freedom and Outside Teaching Assignments (March 23, 1989; XVIII, 5; III.C)
      3. Smoking/Non-Smoking Policy (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; III.D)

III. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
   A. .0406.01 Academic Assessment (5 min.) Robert Laudon (4466)
      *1. Assessment Day Proposal

   B. .0406.03 Admissions and Academic Standards (10 min.) Thomas Herrick (4507)
      1. Revised Regulations for Removing a Student from Academic Probation (April 23, 1987; XVI, 8; IV.A.1)
      2. Excused Absence Procedure (May 5, 1988; XVII, 8; II.B.1)
      *3. Admission Standards (June 15, 1989; XVIII, 7; II.B.1)

   C. .0406.05 Budgetary Affairs (10 min.) Carol Ann Smith (4869)
      *1. Aerospace Ph.D.
      2. Response to Salary Distribution Policy

   D. .0406.09 Curricula (5 min.) David Oglesby (4598)
      1. CAPS and the Graduation Catalogue (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.1)
      2. Time Limitation of the Graduation Catalogue (June 25, 1987; XVI, 9; IV.A.2)
      3. Fee Structure Inequities (December 8, 1988; XVIII, 3; II.C.1)
      *5. Aerospace Ph.D. an equal opportunity institution
E. 0406.15 Personnel (10 min.) Vince Roach (4449)/Catherine Riordan (4812)
   *1. Sexual Harassment (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; II.C.2)

F. 0406.18 Rules, Procedure and Agenda (5 min.) Lance Williams (4816)
   *1. Meeting Dates, 1989-90

G. Intercampus Faculty Council (5 min.) Jim Pogue (4784)

H. Promotion and Tenure (5 min.) Walt Eversman (4670)
   *1. Qualifications for Professorial Ranks (April 20, 1989; XVIII, 6; II.C.1)

IV. Old Business

V. New Business

R, P & A Cmtt.
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Supplementary materials sent to Academic Council members and department chairmen.
SUMMARY of the reports, actions, referrals and announcements made at the meeting of the Academic Council held on June 15, 1989.

1. Approval of minutes of the April 20, 1989, Council meeting.

2. Reports and responses.
   
   A. President’s report - O. Crosser
   
   B. Referrals
   1. Admission standards to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee
   2. Spring break schedule to the Public Occasions Committee
   3. Staff Benefits Planning Committee report to the Personnel Committee and the Budgetary Affairs Committee
   4. Academic freedom and outside teaching assignment administrative response to the Academic Freedom Committee
   
   C. Administrative reports
   1. 1989-90 budget - M. Jischke
      (Attachment II.C.1)
   2. Teaching evaluation - W. Johnson
      (Attachment II.C.2)
   
   D. Administrative responses
   1. Salary increase distribution policy
      (Attachment II.D.1)
   2. Academic freedom and outside teaching assignments
      (Attachment II.D.2)
   3. Smoking/non-smoking policy (Attachment II.D.3)

3. Reports of standing and special committees.
   
   A. Academic Assessment - R. Laudon
   1. Assessment day proposal
      (Attachment III.A)
   
   B. Admission and Academic Standards - T. Herrick
   1. Admission standards
      (Attachment III.B)
   
   C. Budgetary affairs - C. A. Smith
   1. Aerospace Ph.D.
      (Attachment III.C.1)
   2. Response to salary distribution policy
D. Curricula - D. Oglesby
   a. Six experimental courses presented
   b. Twelve course/curriculum changes approved
   c. One new course approved
      (Attachment III.D.1)
2. Aerospace Ph.D.
   (Attachment III.D.2)

E. Personnel - V. Roach
1. Sexual harassment procedures
   (Attachment III.E)

F. Rules, Procedure and Agenda - O. Crosser
1. Meeting dates, 1989-90
   (Attachment III.F)

G. Intercampus Faculty Council (ICFC) - J. Pogue
H. Promotion and Tenure - W. Eversman
1. Revised procedures for promotion and tenure
2. Qualifications for professorial ranks
   (Attachment III.H.2)

Attachments: II.C.1
               II.C.2
               II.D.1
               II.D.2
               II.D.3
               III.A
               III.B
               III.C.1
               III.D.1
               III.D.2
               III.E
               III.F
               III.H.2
The June 15, 1989, meeting of the Academic Council was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Prof. Orrin K. Crosser, Academic Council President. The following were recognized as substitutions: Prof. Garnett Walters for Prof. John Prater; Maj. Julius Fraley for Lt. Col. Sam Dent; Prof. Bassem Armaly for Prof. Al Crosby; Prof. Nicholas Tsoulfanidis for Dean Don Warner; and Prof. Lawrence Christensen for Prof. Lance Williams. The motion to approve the April 20, 1989, minutes was made by Prof. Clyde Wade and seconded by Prof. Garnett Walters. The motion carried.

REPORTS AND RESPONSES.

A. PRESIDENT’S REPORT. A letter of condolence to Curator Carrie Franke’s parents following her death in a car accident was sent on behalf of the Academic Council by President Orrin Crosser.

An open letter was received from a student during assessment asking for reconsideration of the mathematics sequences and questioning the fairness of the supplemental fee for engineering courses. These concerns will be forwarded to the appropriate committee(s).

President Crosser asked that all faculty submit Council business to Prof. Donald Askeland, who will be taking office on July 1, 1989.

Council office hours during the Summer are 3:30 to 5:00 Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday.

B. REFERRALS.
1. ADMISSION STANDARDS to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee.
2. SPRING BREAK SCHEDULE to the Public Occasions Committee.
3. STAFF BENEFITS PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT to the Personnel Committee and the Budgetary Affairs Committee.
4. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND OUTSIDE TEACHING ASSIGNMENT ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE to the Academic Freedom Committee.
C. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS.

1. 1989-90 BUDGET. In light of Missouri’s expected tax refund of $152 million to federal pensioners, Chancellor Jischke outlined two possible budgets. If in the July 5th special session of the general assembly legislators are able to compensate for the lost revenue, UMR will receive additional operating funds of $2.5 million and will be able to increase salary and wages by 6 percent, increase E&E by 2 percent, and increase library acquisitions by $75,000. If funds to cover this unexpected indebtedness are not found, then UMR’s operating fund increase of $2.5 and capital appropriation of $1.5 million could be lost along with funds for library acquisitions, student support, faculty/staff compensation increases, instructional lab equipment, et cetera. (Attachment II.C.1)

2. TEACHING EVALUATION. As reported by Prof. Walt Johnson, the Blue Ribbon Committee on Teacher Evaluation has developed procedural guidelines and an evaluation instrument. The Committee’s report has been made available to the Committee of Department Chairs, the Chancellor’s Staff Group, to Vice-Chancellor John Park, and now to the Academic Council. With Council blessings, the intent is to conduct a pilot study of the proposed evaluation procedure in the coming year. During this first year, corrections will be performed where necessary, and results will not be used administratively. (Attachment II.C.2)

D. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES.
1. SALARY INCREASE DISTRIBUTION POLICY. (Attachment II.D.1)
2. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND OUTSIDE TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS. (Attachment II.D.2)
3. SMOKING/NON-SMOKING POLICY. (Attachment II.D.3)

XVIII, 7 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

A. ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT.
1. ASSESSMENT DAY PROPOSAL. Based upon the March 21 Student Council resolution and open letters requesting a day off in exchange for student
participation in assessment, the Academic Assessment Committee, as reported by Prof. Robert Laudon, in agreement with the Students, recommended that an "assessment day off" be granted late in the Spring semester. Prof. Nicholas Tsoulfandis moved for approval of the recommendation, and Prof. Clyde Wade seconded the motion. Prof. Glen Haddock questioned whether adding an additional day during the semester, as this recommendation provides, would satisfy the students. Vice-Chancellor John Park speaking for the motion indicated that the additional day would indeed help students accept the assessment process and would additionally address the Governor’s concern of "Time on Task." Prof. Haddock raised the question as to whether it was necessary for the Council to take action on the proposal. Prof. Laudon replied that the Calendar Committee (a sub-committee of the Public Occasions Committee, a faculty standing committee) would be required to consider and recommend action on an "assessment day off." Prof. Vincent Roach moved to table for consideration in August, allowing the students to voice opinion. Prof. Garnett Walters seconded the motion which carried.

(Attachment III.A)

B. ADMISSIONS AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS.

1. ADMISSION STANDARDS. In October, 1988, the UMR Academic Council forwarded its recommendation on academic performance standards to the administration. As related by Prof. Thomas Herrick, UMKC and UMSL have since then recommended that the currently existing standard be retained, while UMC proposed one which would only slightly increase the standard from the "Sum of 75." This latter recommendation has been accepted by UMSL and UMKC. Upon consideration of UMC’s proposal, the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee recommended the reaffirmation by this Council of the previously submitted standard. Prof. Herrick moved for approval of this position, stating that the most practical solution would be to set high standards and maintain a broad exceptions policy. Prof. D. Ray Edwards seconded his motion. The motion was subsequently approved.

(Attachment III.B)
C. BUDGETARY AFFAIRS.

1. AEROSPACE PH.D. Prof. Carol Ann Smith reported that, based upon the previously endorsed resolution stating that no new programs be established until the base is repaired, the Budgetary Affairs Committee proposed that the Aerospace Ph.D. program not be supported at this time. Prof. Glen Haddock moved for approval, and Prof. Garnett Walters seconded the motion. During discussion it was noted that the Curricula Committee supports the program on its technical merit only; that this program is already in existence under a different curriculum which does not support the necessary 400 level coursework for the Ph.D. degree; that qualified faculty recruitment is hampered by not having a Ph.D. program specifically entitled "Aerospace"; that a program commitment (funds, etc.) has been made to and by one of the largest employers in this State; that the timing to start a new program is poor; and that only Graduate Faculty approval is necessary for program implementation. The motion to support the recommendation to disapprove this program proposal was defeated 17 to 3. (Attachment III.C.1)

2. RESPONSE TO SALARY DISTRIBUTION POLICY. Prof. Smith reported that the policy memorandum, dated March 1, 1989, is "virtually the Budgetary Affairs Committee resolution which was passed by this body with some minor editorial changes and, as I see it, two substantive changes." Campus distribution of salary increase funds among the five categories (market, merit, cost-of-living, affirmative action, and equity) will be determined by the Chancellor after consulting with the Budget Review Committee instead of both the Budget Review Committee and the Academic Council; and the level of funding for each category shall be made known to the campus instead of announced annually. Cost of living increases shall be made if approved by the Board of Curators.

D. CURRICULA.

1. REPORT NO. 7, 1988-89. Prof. Donald Askeland, representing Prof. David Oglesby, who was called out-of-town, and the Curricula Committee, moved
for approval of this report with the following typo corrections: under CCI 3120, "Change in prerequisites from accompanied or preceded (not proceeded) by Min. 001 to accompanied or preceded (not proceeded) by Min. 003;" and under CCI 3121, "Change in prerequisites from Math 6, EG 10 accompanied or preceded (not proceeded) by Min. 001 to Math 6, EG 10 accompanied or preceded (not proceeded) by Min. 003." The motion was seconded by Prof. Clyde Wade and carried by Council. (Attachment III.D.1)

2. AEROSPACE PH.D. Prof. Glen Haddock moved to approved the Curricula Committees recommendation for adoption of this program. Prof. Donald Askeland seconded the motion, which carried. (Attachment III.D.2)

E. PERSONNEL.

1. SEXUAL HARASSMENT PROCEDURES. Prof. Vincent Roach moved for endorsement of the proposed informal procedures to handle sexual harassment with the substitution (under enumeration 3, last paragraph, line 2) of the phrase "as appropriate" for "2-4 weeks," thereby allowing flexibility regarding follow-up visits. Prof. Nicholas Tsoulfanidis seconded the motion, which was passed. These procedures, as indicated by Prof. Catherine Riordan, are to provide easy accessibility of information and procedure to people who think they have a problem and are required on each campus by university policy. (Attachment III.E)

F. RULES, PROCEDURE AND AGENDA.

1. MEETING DATES, 1989-90. President Orrin Crosser entertained a motion from Prof. Garnett Walters to approve these proposed dates. Prof. Thomas Herrick seconded the motion, which carried. (Attachment III.F)

G. INTERCAMPUS FACULTY COUNCIL (ICFC). Prof. Jim Poque stated, "For the last several months, almost every ICFC meeting has been consumed with discussion of the budget ... with very little substance in terms of any solution." It is hoped that the Legislature will raise the needed $152 million.
President Magrath and the Missourians for Higher Education are "hard at work again" on tax revision to support higher education. A faculty committee has been appointed to advise President Magrath on ways to increase university funding. UMR representation on this committee are our Academic Council President (Prof. Donald Askeland), one ICFC member (Prof. Robert Wolf), and one faculty member (Prof. Lance Williams).

A survey of 1988-89 Weldon Springs Fund recipients is in process to determine the adequacy of fund division and the value/merit of intercampus project funding.

Chancellor Jischke announced the establishment of two other committees by President Magrath. One (chaired by Chancellor George Russell) is charged with developing tax initiative strategy and the other (chaired by Chancellor Jischke) with studying "agenda for action" goals in the absence of support from a tax increase.

H. PROMOTION AND TENURE.
1. REVISED PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE. As requested by the memorandum dated April 27, 1989, Prof. Walt Eversman reported that his Committee has reviewed the Procedures for Promotion and Tenure revision. No changes were necessary.

2. QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROFESSORIAL RANKS. After reviewing the proposed revision of policy number II-10, Qualifications for Professorial Academic Ranks, the Committee comments, as stated by Prof. Eversman, leaned toward developing a more specific set of criteria in the decision process at all levels: were critical of eliminating the factor of service to department, college, campus, university and profession; pointed out irregularities regarding effective teaching and scholarly presentation or publication; stressed independence of extension activities; and emphasized a strongly justified guideline for exceptions. (Attachment III.H.2)
The meeting adjourned at 3:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Clyde G. Wade
Secretary
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*Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.*
June 8, 1989

NOTICE

All Faculty, Deans, Staff and Administrative Officers should please note that as of July 1, 1989 direct communication with the UMR Academic Council should be addressed to Donald R. Askeland, Metallurgical Engineering. (314) 341-4730.

Orrin K. Crosser
1988-89 President
MEMORANDUM TO: John Park  
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  

FROM: Walter D. Johnson, Chair  
Blue Ribbon Committee on Teacher Evaluation  

RE: Final Report  

April 25, 1989  

I am attaching the teacher evaluation instrument and the procedural guideline developed by the Blue Ribbon Committee on Teacher Evaluation as per your change on January 25, 1989. Having completed our task the Committee has no further meetings scheduled at this point. Should you wish to discuss either the instrument or the procedure with us prior to the end of this semester the Committee found Tuesday afternoons from 3:30 to 5:00 to be the most appropriate time.  

I have been asked by the Committee of Department Chairs to make the instrument and procedure statement available to them at their upcoming meeting on April 28th. Similarly, Lance Williams will make these documents available to the Academic Council at their next meeting. If you should wish to make adjustments prior to these presentations please call.  

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Committee members for their time and effort on this project. They have been meeting weekly for over two months and have worked very hard to fulfill your charge. I would also like to thank David Anderson and Dr. Ellen Leininger for their input and excellent staff support of the Committee. It was perhaps the best group that I have had the pleasure of working with in my academic career.  

WDJ:rg  

Attachments  

cc: Kathy Stone  
Ronald Kohser  
David Oglesby  
Norman Smith  
Lance Williams  
Walt Gajda  
David Anderson  
Ellen Leininger
PROCEDURE

The Registrar shall record and verify, in the SIS database, information about each course. Departments shall be responsible for working with the Registrar to verify the accuracy of this data. Departments shall determine which instructors in a given section will be evaluated however, instructors with 33% or more teaching responsibility in a section must be evaluated.

Administrative Data Processing shall print a survey instruction sheet for each selected instructor in each section. The survey instruction sheet will contain data about the course and the instructor as well as instructions to the survey administrator.

The Director of Institutional Assessment, with technical assistance provided by Computing Services, shall determine the methods and procedures for using Optical Mark Reader technology including choice or design of the OMR answer sheets.

The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will provide the printed questionnaires and the OMR answer sheets. A packet shall be prepared for each instructor/section being evaluated containing:

1. the survey instruction sheet for this instructor/section,
2. student evaluation questionnaires,
3. OMR answer sheets, and
4. a large envelope pre-addressed to the Registrar.

These packets shall be bundled by department and delivered to the department chair with a cover letter explaining the department’s options and responsibilities.

The department and/or the instructor shall have the option to supplement the campus questionnaire. It shall be the department’s responsibility to design and duplicate the supplemental questionnaire and to add it to the packets. Supplemental questions must either use the OMR five-answer format or be appended to the open-ended questions.

The department chair shall be responsible for designating independent persons to administer the surveys. This person shall not be the instructor or a student enrolled in the class. The instructor shall not be in the room when the survey is administered. The designated survey administrator shall on the day of the survey:

1. Make sure that the instructor is not in the room.
2. Administer the survey according to the survey instruction sheet.
3. Collect ALL of the survey materials, including unused OMR answer sheets.
4. Notify the instructor that the evaluation is completed and instruction can resume.
5. Hand deliver the survey materials to the Registrar in a single, sealed package.

The evaluation shall be administered after the twelfth week and at least one week prior to the end of the semester during the Fall and Winter terms.

The Registrar shall receive and process the survey materials:

1. Forward the OMR answer sheets to the Computer Center.
2. Return student responses to the open-ended questionnaires to department chairs after final grades are turned in.

The Computer Center shall have the OMR answer sheets processed. The OMR answer sheets shall be archived for one year and then discarded. Administrative Data Processing shall analyze the data collected by OMR and prepare summary reports for the instructor, department chairs and administration. These reports shall be distributed within two weeks after final grades are turned in.
STUDENT REACTIONS TO INSTRUCTION AND COURSES

Your thoughtful answers to these questions will provide helpful information to your instructor and his administrative supervisor(s).

Course # _______ Instructors Last Name ______

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements describing your perceptions of the course and the way it has been taught.

1 - Strongly Agree 2 - Agree 3 - Undecided 4 - Disagree 5 - Strongly Disagree NA - Not Applicable

The Instructor:

1. returns assignments, homework, & tests within a reasonable amount of time.

2. gives assignments which contribute to an understanding of the subject matter.

3. uses examination questions which reflect course content and material emphasized in class.

4. explained his/her grading policy and procedures.

5. adheres to his/her grading policy and procedures.

6. is accessible for help outside of class.

7. is receptive to student questions in class.

8. stimulates interest in the subject matter.

9. shows interest and enthusiasm for the subject.

10. shows concern for the students' understanding of the material.

11. clearly stated the objectives of the course.

12. effectively utilizes the text(s) and/or materials assigned for the course.

13. is prepared for class.

14. presents material in an organized manner.

15. speaks audibly and clearly.

16. uses helpful examples to explain concepts and principles.

17. How would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Effective</th>
<th>Moderately Effective</th>
<th>Not At All Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Would you recommend this instructor to another student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, Definitely</th>
<th>Yes, With Reservations</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Your overall evaluation of the instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:

20. Strengths and weaknesses of the instructor.

21. Suggestions for improving the quality of instruction.

22. Strengths and weaknesses of the course.

23. Suggestions for course improvement.
June 8, 1989

ASSESSMENT DAY RESOLUTION

The Academic Assessment Committee recommends to the Council that an "Assessment day off" be granted during the Spring semester on the Friday before preregistration for the Fall semester. To compensate for this day off, a day must be added to the semester, either at the beginning of the semester, at the end of the semester, or from one of the present holidays. It is understood that "Assessment day off" is not the same as "Assessment Day." Students who do not fulfill their assessment requirements on "Assessment Day" must do so on "Assessment day off."

Robert Laudon
Chair

RL/cmb
MEMO TO: The Academic Council  
FROM: The Admissions and Academic Standards Committee  
RE: Performance standards of the Admissions Requirements

The performance requirement to be accepted as a regular student of the University of Missouri is in the final stages of consideration. A quick review would be helpful to put the matter in perspective:

a) Many years ago, Vice President Mel George (198?) asked the campuses to study the admissions requirement principally to determine if revisions were needed, since the old standards were set in 1970.

b) The early effort of this study resulted in a change in high school course work requirements, which was a major improvement. However, the performance requirement was delayed so that data could be collected on how students who had been enrolled in the University for at least one year were performing with the new high-school course work requirement.

c) At the October 1988 meeting of the Academic Council, the Admission Performance Standards recommendation of the Committee was approved (Enclosure #1). Vice president Askeland forwarded the standards to Chancellor Jischke for consideration by the appropriate University authorities.

UMKC and UMSL forwarded their recommendations, which were to keep the performance standard at the old level of a sum of 75 (Sum of HSCRP and ACT Composite Percentile).

The UMC proposal (Enclosure #2) recommends a somewhat different approach using the HSCRP and the actual ACT composite score. The figures in pen have been added to help the Committee study the UMC proposal. The Sum column shows the proposal to be a slight increase in performance standards from a Sum of 75.

The Committee has been informed that both UMKC and UMSL have agreed to accept the UMC proposal. The Committee has been urged to study the UMC proposal with the possibility of adoption or to recommend minor modifications to the UMC proposal that could be accepted by the other campuses.

The Committee has met and considered the UMC proposal. It is the Committee's unanimous recommendation that the UMR Academic Council reaffirm the performance standard previously forwarded to the Chancellor by the Council. The justification is that no member of the Committee would advise a prospective student to enroll at UMR with a Sum less than 100. In fact, 120 is a more reasonable number for this campus.
A score of 120 gives a prospective student about a 50% chance of completing the first year without being put on probation. This was the original charge to the Committee. The lower limit of a Sum of 100 was selected to give the greatest possible accessibility to UMR.

Charges will be made that raising admission standards is elitist, or racist. These charges are offensive to the Committee. The admission standards of the campus should be an honest reflection of what the faculty believes is necessary to have a reasonable chance of success. This we have done.

If a student is interested in the Programs at UMR, that student should contact the Admissions Office and receive expert, professional guidance in developing the best overall plan to achieve the student's educational goal. For students with Sums in the low hundreds, the best overall plan frequently requires remediation or developmental coursework which is not available at UMR. Later entry to UMR through the Transfer Student Program has been the path of success for thousands of graduates.

TJH/bc
MEMORANDUM TO: Martin C. Jischke, Chancellor
FROM: Donald Askeland, Vice-President
SUBJECT: Admission Performance Standards

The Academic Council, at its October 13th meeting, approved the following Admission and Academic Standards Committee recommendation. We request that it be included under the requirements for admission of first-time college students in UMR's admission packet/application booklet after consideration by the proper University of Missouri authorities.

If the SUM of the high school class rank percentile and aptitude examination percentile is:

- **120 or greater**
  - the student is directly admissible. However, the University placement process may require remediation and reduced schedules for some students.

- **100 - 120**
  - students in this range are frequently at high risk in successfully completing University level work. Students in this category may be admitted, but will receive advising, recommendations for remediation, and reduced academic schedules.

- **less than 100**
  - students in this range are normally admissible only after additional academic development which is not available at UMR. Students in this category may later apply to UMR through the Transfer Student Program.

cc: John Park, Vice-Chancellor
    Academic Affairs
    Robert Lewis, Director
    Admissions
    Thomas Herrick, Chairman
    Admissions and Academic Standards Committee
ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS PROPOSAL FOR MU-COL.

(Effective Fall, 1990)

The following requirement has been established for general admission of first time college (entering freshmen) students.

At least 14 units of credit (1 unit = 1 year in class) as follows:

4 units of English, one of which may be in speech or debate. Two units emphasizing composition or writing skills are required.

3 units of mathematics (Algebra I and higher)

2 units of science (not including General Science), one of which must be a laboratory course.

2 units of social studies

3 additional units selected from foreign language, English, mathematics (Algebra I and higher), science, or social studies. Among these options, two units of foreign language are strongly recommended.

In addition it is proposed that each student be evaluated on the basis of High School Class Rank Percentile (HSCRP) and ACT Composite Score. The table shows the minimum combination of class rank percentile and test score which satisfy requirements for regular admission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSCRP</th>
<th>ACT Composite Score</th>
<th>( \frac{\text{Act Composite Percentile (%)}}{\text{ACT Composite Score}} )</th>
<th>( \text{HSCRP + ACT Composite Score} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>84 - 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>83 - 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82 - 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>82 - 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82 - 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83 - 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84 - 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>86 - 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>88 - 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91 - 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>93 - 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93 - 98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University seeks a heterogeneous student body reflecting diversity of race, ethnicity, age, geography, (including international students) and physical disability. Factors given prime consideration for admission to undergraduate study are an applicant's previous academic success and the quality of the record presented. When considering an individual for non-regular admission, other factors considered may be:

- Extensive extracurricular activity involving school, church, or community
- Outstanding talent and/or abilities
- Number and scope of college preparatory courses taken
- Evidence of marked improvement over time in high school academic record
- Significant work experience and/or family responsibilities
- Supporting evidence attesting to one or more of the above in student's own hand (in the form of an essay)
MEMO TO: Academic Council members

FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair, Budgetary Affairs Committee

RE: Aerospace Engineering PhD Proposal

Colleagues, given the Budgetary Affairs Committee's recent resolutions and your endorsement of those resolutions, the Committee reaffirms its commitment to no new programs until such time as repairing the base is accomplished.

Although no new dollars in the short run have been associated with the proposed degree, the Committee believes that any new proposal will eventually require additional funding.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee recommends that this proposal not be supported.
June 5, 1989

Memorandum To: Orrin Crosser
Chairman, Academic Council

From: David B. Oglesby
Curricula Committee

Re: Proposed PhD in Aerospace Engineering

The Campus Curricula Committee reviewed the PhD in Aerospace Engineering proposal and recommends the approval of the program.

It should be noted that the committee reviewed and discussed only the technical merit of the proposal and did not consider the budgetary aspects since they do not fall within our jurisdiction.
May 2, 1989

Memo To: Orrin Crosser, Chairman, Academic Council

From: Vince Roach, Chair, Personnel Committee

Re: Referral on "Informal Procedures to Handle Sexual Harassment Complaints"

The Personnel Committee has discussed with Catherine Riordan, Assistant to the Chancellor, the attached "Informal Procedures to Handle Sexual Harassment Complaints". After these discussions with Ms. Riordan and subsequent deliberations, the Committee feels the proposed procedures are reasonable and needed for effectively handling many sensitive problems involving actual or perceived sexual harassment. The Committee suggests changing the time frame for the follow-up visit (see 3., last paragraph, line 2), by substituting "as appropriate" instead of "2-4 weeks".

The Personnel Committee endorses the draft document "Informal Procedures to Handle Sexual harassment Complaints", modified as indicated above. The Committee further recommends that all council members convey to their respective departments the proposed procedure and solicit comments regarding the document. These comments should be sent directly to Ms. Riordan. Catherine plans to attend the June 15 meeting of the Council and has agreed to respond to questions regarding the document at that time.

DVR:dms

Attachment
Informal Procedures to Handle Sexual Harassment Complaints*

The following procedures supplement the University of Missouri's Procedures and should not in any way be interpreted as discouraging complainants from filing formal grievances as outlined in University of Missouri's Personal Policy Manual PE106 or Student Manual of Information.

1. The complainant may visit with one of the university's Equality Aides** to discuss the problem. The Equality Aid may suggest solution methods or send the complainant to visit with the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action.

   Equality Aides will notify the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action of each contact with a complainant.

2. Alternatively, the complainant may go directly to the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action to discuss the problem. Alternative solution methods will be suggested.

3. When deemed necessary the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action will decide, in consultation with the complainant, how to contact the accused (personally, through supervisor, and/or in writing) to attempt an informal resolution of the problem.

   - The complainant will be given feedback about the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action's contact with the accused.
   - The Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action will meet with the complainant for a follow-up visit 2-4 weeks after attempt at informal resolution is made to see if the behavior has stopped.

4. If the unwanted behavior is still occurring at the time of the follow-up visit, the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action will contact the supervisor of the accused and encourage the complainant to file a formal grievance.

*In the interests of both complainant and accused, all communications and discussions with Equality Aides and the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action will be held in strictest confidence except where specified in this policy.

**Equality Aides will be faculty, staff, and administrators designated as such by the Chancellor and trained in interview techniques and university policies by skilled personnel.
MEETING DATES FOR 1989-90

Rules, Procedure and Agenda:

Thursday, August 31, 1989
Thursday, October 5, 1989
Thursday, November 16, 1989
Thursday, January 11, 1990
Tuesday, March 13, 1990
Thursday, April 12, 1990
Thursday, May 31, 1990

Academic Council:

Thursday, September 14, 1989
Thursday, October 19, 1989
Thursday, November 30, 1989
Thursday, January 25, 1990
Thursday, March 29, 1990
Thursday, April 26, 1990
Thursday, June 14, 1990

General Faculty:

Tuesday, September 5, 1989
Tuesday, December 5, 1989
Tuesday, April 24, 1990
MEMORANDUM TO: Professor O. K. Crosser  
President to Academic Council  
FROM: W. Eversman  
Chairman, Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee  
DATE: June 5, 1989  
RE: Proposed Revision of Policy Memorandum II-10

The Promotion and Tenure Committee has carefully reviewed the proposed revision of Policy Memorandum II-10. The following comments reflect the consensus of the committee.

1. It has been the experience of the committee that the final administrative decision process regarding promotion and tenure systematically applies criteria other than those stated in Policy Memorandum II-10. Specifically, considerations of "worth to the department, college, or campus" and "marketability" have been used, even though they are intangible and generally undocumented. If the deliberations of the various departmental, college, and campus committees are to be based on consistent procedures, then the Policy Memorandum must specifically refer to all criteria which are important in the decision process at all levels. In particular, criteria such as "demonstrated worth" and "marketability" must be addressed.

2. The committee notes the elimination of service to the department, college, campus, university, and profession as a factor in promotion and tenure. This contradicts the commonly accepted profile of the complete academic as one who excels in the three areas of teaching/research/service. Paradoxically, the new draft retains section (V), which defines the service activity.

3. Addendum III.B.2 has anomalies in regard to demonstration of effective teaching. Scholarly presentations or publications may be irrelevant unless specifically related to teaching methods and course and curriculum development.

4. Addendum III.B.3 suggests that extension activities are important in the assessment of research and scholarship. The committee does not support this view. Extension activities should be independently identified and their role clarified.

5. In relation to observation (1) above, the following is recommended as an addition to "Exceptions":

Recommendations with strong justification for exceptions to any of the above guidelines for candidates displaying unusual worth to the institution may qualify for consideration.
NORMALLY AT THIS TIME OF THE YEAR THE NEW BUDGET IS WELL UNDERSTOOD AND I WOULD BE REPORTING TO YOU, WITH CONSIDERABLE CERTAINTY, THE OUTLINES OF OUR FINANCIAL PICTURE FOR THE COMING YEAR.

HOWEVER, BECAUSE OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION IN DAVIS VS. MICHIGAN AND THE SUBSEQUENT DECISION OF THE MISSOURI SUPREME COURT, THE STATE OF MISSOURI MUST NOW REFUND APPROXIMATELY $152 MILLION TO FEDERAL PENSIONERS IN MISSOURI. THIS IS A REFUND OF TAXES THAT WERE LEVIED ON FEDERAL PENSIONS THAT THESE COURT DECISIONS HAVE HELD TO BE DISCRIMINATORY. THE NECESSITY TO REFUND $152 MILLION HAS CREATED AN EFFECTIVE LOSS OF REVENUE FOR THE STATE OF MISSOURI FOR FY 90 THAT NOW CAUSES CONSIDERABLE UNCERTAINTY IN THAT BUDGET. IN THE ABSENCE OF ACTION TO REPLACE THE LOST REVENUES BY THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, WHICH THE GOVERNOR HAS CALLED FOR JULY 5TH, THE $45 MILLION INCREASE APPROVED BY THE GOVERNOR AND THE GENERAL
ASSEMBLY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION'S OPERATING BUDGET WOULD BE LOST AS WOULD THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS APPROVED BY THE GOVERNOR AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. FOR UMR, THERE IS A GREAT DEAL AT STAKE. MORE THAN $2.5 MILLION IN OPERATING FUNDS PLUS NEARLY $1.5 MILLION IN CAPITAL APPROPRIATIONS COULD BE LOST.

Thus, there are two possible budgets depending on the outcome of the special session. If the special session succeeds, as I hope it will, in replacing the revenues lost by the Davis vs. Michigan decision, the resulting budget would allow for some rather modest progress as I will describe shortly. If, however, the efforts in the special session do not result in a replacement of the revenue lost by Davis vs. Michigan, then the campus would have a budget that I would characterize as representing a terrible setback for UMR. There would be no funds for instructional laboratory equipment, the library collection would continue to erode, support for students would be diminished, faculty and staff compensation would become even less competitive, leaky roofs would go unrepaired,
AND OUR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS WOULD SUFFER A SETBACK THAT, I BELIEVE, WOULD TAKE MANY YEARS TO REMEDY. THIS IS A VERY SERIOUS MATTER IN MY VIEW AND THE STAKES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION ARE VERY HIGH. I URGE EACH OF YOU TO ENCOURAGE THE LEGISLATURE AND THOSE WHO CAN INFLUENCE THE LEGISLATURE TO SOLVE THIS REVENUE PROBLEM AND KEEP THIS STATE ON TRACK. TO DO OTHERWISE WOULD DERAIL US. THE RESULTING DAMAGE TO HIGHER EDUCATION AND TO THIS CAMPUS, IN PARTICULAR, WOULD BE SUBSTANTIAL. WE AND, MORE IMPORTANTLY, OUR STUDENTS CANNOT STAND THE CONSEQUENCES OF A $4 MILLION LOSS IN SUPPORT THIS NEXT YEAR. THIS IS RATHER LIKE LEGISLATIVE OVERTIME IN WHICH WE AND OUR STUDENTS WILL EITHER WIN OR LOSE--THERE CAN BE NO DRAW IN THIS CASE.

THUS LET ME FIRST DESCRIBE THE BUDGET THAT WOULD RESULT IN THE EVENT THAT THE REVENUES LOST DUE TO DAVIS VS, MICHIGAN WERE REPLACED AND THAT THE BUDGET ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND APPROVED BY THE GOVERNOR WOULD BE FUNDED. THIS BUDGET ALSO ASSUMES THAT 3% OF THE STATE APPROPRIATIONS WOULD BE WITHHELD AS HAS BEEN THE CASE IN THE PAST THREE YEARS.
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The alternative budget is based on the more disturbing and depressing assumption that the special session is unable to find revenue sources to replace the funds lost in Davis vs. Michigan. As you can see from this revised budget, our net operating income is reduced by $2.5 million which would mean no increase in salaries and wages, no E&E increases, no additional support for students, no increase in the Library acquisitions, no funds to recruit minorities to our faculty, no funds to expand the public relations activities of the campus. In short, it would be a tremendous setback.

Thus we are in a very uncertain time. I have been encouraged recently by the leadership that the Governor, the President Pro Tem of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House have shown in calling a special session to remedy this revenue shortfall problem. The lost revenue must be replaced. Each of us must do everything we can to encourage such a solution. I, for one, plan to devote as much time and attention to this as I can. We must not let this one slip by. UMR, and all of higher education for that matter, will suffer a setback that will take years and years and years to remedy. Missouri deserves better.
TENTATIVE FY 90 BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

This budget is subject to approval by the Board of Curators and is based upon the budget adopted by the General Assembly and approved by the Governor. It assumes that 3% of the state appropriations would be withheld.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
<td>$2,540,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withholding</td>
<td>(561,205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstate revenue</td>
<td>727,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocation</td>
<td>338,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,045,375</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Staff benefits program</td>
<td>$327,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% salary &amp; wage increase (incl.s.b.)</td>
<td>1,920,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position upgrades for market</td>
<td>129,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Compensation</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,376,290</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship accounts</td>
<td>$87,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer</td>
<td>24,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>61,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curators professor</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Mandatory Items</strong></td>
<td><strong>$258,783</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% E&amp;E increase</td>
<td>$119,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's fellowships</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate research</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library acquisitions</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Priority Items</strong></td>
<td><strong>$294,641</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty position</td>
<td>$47,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>29,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>38,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>$115,661</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $3,045,375
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TENTATIVE FY 90 BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

This budget is subject to approval by the Board of Curators and is based upon the budget adopted by the General Assembly and approved by the Governor. It assumes that 9.6% of the state appropriations would be withheld.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
<td>$2,340,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withholding</td>
<td>(561,205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstate revenue</td>
<td>727,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocation</td>
<td>338,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,045,370</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Staff benefits program</td>
<td>$327,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% salary &amp; wage increase (incl.s.b.)</td>
<td>1,920,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position upgrades for market</td>
<td>189,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,376,290</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory Items</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship accounts</td>
<td>$ 87,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer</td>
<td>24,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>61,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curators professor</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 258,783</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Items</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2% E&amp;E increase</td>
<td>$ 119,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's fellowships</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate research</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library acquisitions</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 244,641</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority faculty position</td>
<td>$ 47,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>38,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 115,661</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $5,045,370 504,853
April 25, 1989

MEMORANDUM TO: John Park
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

FROM: Walter D. Johnson, Chair
Blue Ribbon Committee on Teacher Evaluation

RE: Final Report

I am attaching the teacher evaluation instrument and the procedural guideline developed by the Blue Ribbon Committee on Teacher Evaluation as per your change on January 25, 1989. Having completed our task the Committee has no further meetings scheduled at this point. Should you wish to discuss either the instrument or the procedure with us prior to the end of this semester the Committee found Tuesday afternoons from 3:30 to 5:00 to be the most appropriate time.

I have been asked by the Committee of Department Chairs to make the instrument and procedure statement available to them at their upcoming meeting on April 28th. Similarly, Lance Williams will make these documents available to the Academic Council at their next meeting. If you should wish to make adjustments prior to these presentations please call.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Committee members for their time and effort on this project. They have been meeting weekly for over two months and have worked very hard to fulfill your charge. I would also like to thank David Anderson and Dr. Ellen Leininger for their input and excellent staff support of the Committee. It was perhaps the best group that I have had the pleasure of working with in my academic career.

WDJ:rg

Attachments

cc: Kathy Stone
Ronald Kohser
David Oglesby
Norman Smith
Lance Williams
Walt Gajda
David Anderson
Ellen Leininger
Your thoughtful answers to these questions will provide helpful information to your instructor and his administrative supervisor(s).

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements describing your perceptions of the course and the way it has been taught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Instructor:</th>
<th>1 - Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 - Agree</th>
<th>3 - Undecided</th>
<th>4 - Disagree</th>
<th>5 - Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>NA - Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. returns assignments, homework, &amp; tests within a reasonable amount of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. gives assignments which contribute to an understanding of the subject matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. uses examination questions which reflect course content and material emphasized in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. explained his/her grading policy and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. adheres to his/her grading policy and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. is accessible for help outside of class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. is receptive to student questions in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. stimulates interest in the subject matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. shows interest and enthusiasm for the subject.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. shows concern for the students' understanding of the material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. clearly stated the objectives of the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. effectively utilizes the text(s) and/or materials assigned for the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. is prepared for class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. presents material in an organized manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. speaks audibly and clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. uses helpful examples to explain concepts and principles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Effective</td>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
<td>Not At All Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Would you recommend this instructor to another student?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Definitely</td>
<td>Yes, With Reservations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Your overall evaluation of the instructor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:

20. Strengths and weaknesses of the instructor.

21. Suggestions for improving the quality of instruction.

22. Strengths and weaknesses of the course.

23. Suggestions for course improvement.
PROCEDURE

The Registrar shall record and verify, in the SIS database, information about each course. Departments shall be responsible for working with the Registrar to verify the accuracy of this data. Departments shall determine which instructors in a given section will be evaluated however, instructors with 33% or more teaching responsibility in a section must be evaluated.

Administrative Data Processing shall print a survey instruction sheet for each selected instructor in each section. The survey instruction sheet will contain data about the course and the instructor as well as instructions to the survey administrator.

The Director of Institutional Assessment, with technical assistance provided by Computing Services, shall determine the methods and procedures for using Optical Mark Reader technology including choice or design of the OMR answer sheets.

The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will provide the printed questionnaires and the OMR answer sheets. A packet shall be prepared for each instructor/section being evaluated containing:

1. the survey instruction sheet for this instructor/section,  
2. student evaluation questionnaires,  
3. OMR answer sheets, and  
4. a large envelope pre-addressed to the Registrar.

These packets shall be bundled by department and delivered to the department chair with a cover letter explaining the department’s options and responsibilities.

The department and/or the instructor shall have the option to supplement the campus questionnaire. It shall be the department’s responsibility to design and duplicate the supplemental questionnaire and to add it to the packets. Supplemental questions must either use the OMR five-answer format or be appended to the open-ended questions.

The department chair shall be responsible for designating independent persons to administer the surveys. This person shall not be the instructor or a student enrolled in the class. The instructor shall not be in the room when the survey is administered. The designated survey administrator shall on the day of the survey:

1. Make sure that the instructor is not in the room.  
2. Administer the survey according to the survey instruction sheet.  
3. Collect ALL of the survey materials, including unused OMR answer sheets.  
4. Notify the instructor that the evaluation is completed and instruction can resume.  
5. Hand deliver the survey materials to the Registrar in a single, sealed package.

The evaluation shall be administered after the twelfth week and at least one week prior to the end of the semester during the Fall and Winter terms.

The Registrar shall receive and process the survey materials:

1. Forward the OMR answer sheets to the Computer Center.  
2. Return student responses to the open-ended questionnaires to department chairs after final grades are turned in.

The Computer Center shall have the OMR answer sheets processed. The OMR answer sheets shall be archived for one year and then discarded. Administrative Data Processing shall analyze the data collected by OMR and prepare summary reports for the instructor, department chairs and administration. These reports shall be distributed within two weeks after final grades are turned in.
March 1, 1989

POLICY MEMORANDUM

UMR SALARY INCREASE DISTRIBUTION POLICY

I. GENERAL GUIDELINES

It is the purpose of this policy to describe the principles that guide campus decisions regarding the distribution of salary increase funds. Such decisions, of course, must adhere to and be consistent with the guidelines adopted by the Board of Curators for the University system. In general, salary increase decisions can be based on five considerations: merit, market conditions, cost-of-living adjustments, equity, and nondiscrimination/Affirmative Action principles.

It has been the goal of the University system and the campus to achieve competitive salaries for faculty and staff. Faculty salaries at the Big 8/Big 10 universities have been used, by rank and discipline, as the basis for assessing the competitiveness of campus faculty salaries. The University has employed appropriate national, regional, and local markets to assess the competitiveness of staff salaries. These various assessments are conducted annually by the office of Vice President for Administrative Affairs and are used to quantify the market position of faculty and the various categories of staff. It is the goal of the campus to achieve competitive salaries for the various categories of employees and to eliminate differences in market competitiveness.

II. UMR SALARY POLICY FOR SALARY INCREASES

To the extent that funds are available to the campus for salary and wage adjustments for faculty and staff, these funds will be distributed in accordance with the guidelines adopted annually by the Board of Curators.

1. The need for salary adjustments for nondiscrimination/Affirmative Action principles will be determined by an internal annual review and comparison of compensation for the various Department of Labor categories of employees. This review will be done at the campus level by the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action in consultation with the Chancellor.

2. Market salary adjustments will be considered annually based on comparisons of faculty salaries by rank and discipline with the Big 8/Big 10 institutions and staff compensation with appropriate comparator groups.
3. Merit salary increases are to be awarded based on individual performance as evaluated within each unit and reviewed at the divisional and campus level. Each division and each unit shall have written procedures describing how such merit evaluations will be made. The unit procedures will be reviewed and approved by the appropriate Vice Chancellor or Dean and, together with the divisional policy, will be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor.

4. Cost-of-living increases, if approved by the Board of Curators, shall be made across-the-board at one equal percentage of salary to all faculty and staff.

5. Other equity issues such as salary compression shall be handled on an ad hoc basis with input from appropriate groups.

III. UMR PROCEDURES FOR SALARY INCREASES

1. The campus distribution of salary increase funds among the five categories in Section II will be determined by the Chancellor after consultation with the Budget Review Committee. The level of funding for each category shall be made known to the campus.

2. Prior to the distribution of funds to the divisions, a pool of funds will be set aside by the Chancellor to address nondiscrimination/Affirmative Action principles, if there has been established a need to make such adjustments.

3. If approved by the Board of Curators, each unit will receive an identical percentage of the base budget for cost-of-living increases.

4. Funds for market adjustments will be distributed to divisions based on their relative market position with respect to comparable units. Funds for other equity issues will be distributed to divisions after analyses have been made at the Chancellor's level.

5. Each division will receive a similar percentage increase in the salary and wage pool for merit to be distributed in accordance with the written policies adopted by the division and the various units within the division.

6. Employees represented by collective bargaining units will have their compensation adjusted centrally and will not be reviewed individually for merit and market adjustments.
7. It is expected that each division will establish appropriate procedures for distributing salary increase funds among the units of the division. The assessment of the relative market position and merit of individual faculty and staff, however, is most likely to be done accurately and fairly within the unit and thus the bulk of the funds available to the division will be allocated by unit heads.

8. It is the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor or Dean of each division to ensure that the campus' goals are met by the division. The resulting salary increase recommendations from the division will be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 1, 1989
RESPONSIBILITY: Chancellor, Vice Chancellors and Academic Deans
BASIS: Chancellor

[Signature]
Martin C. Jischke
Chancellor
June 2, 1989

MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Orrin Crosse

FROM: John T. Park
        Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Policy Guidelines for Interdepartmental Teaching Assignments

Attached is a copy of the draft policy guidelines for interdepartmental teaching assignments. This draft addresses the reward structure and provides guidelines under which a faculty member may be asked to teach in disciplines outside his/her home department.

Please feel free to give me a call if you have any additional questions. If this draft meets with the approval of the Academic Council, I will submit it to the Chancellor for his consideration as a campus policy memorandum.

JTP/bjc
POLICY GUIDELINES FOR INTERDEPARTMENTAL TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

It is the policy of the University of Missouri-Rolla to encourage faculty members to teach courses in their areas of expertise even if this involves teaching outside of their home departments. Such a policy permits the efficient use of the broad talents of the faculty, aids in the equalization of teaching loads between departments, and assists the campus in meeting short-term changes in student demand.

Whenever possible, department chairs should make outside teaching assignments using the most qualified faculty member within the department to fulfill the assignment. The faculty member's interest in and desire to teach a course outside the department should be considered in making the assignment. However, it is recognized that needs may arise which will require faculty members to teach courses they consider less desirable than courses within the department. If at all possible, such assignments should be temporary. Because the faculty members involved are assisting the campus in resolving a campus-wide problem, such assignments should be recognized and rewarded by both the department receiving the service and the faculty member's home department. In addition, appropriate time should be made available for preparation and for accommodation of the procedures as well as the requirements of the receiving department.

To ease the transition of teaching a course outside the home department, efforts to team-teach courses and to provide an experienced mentor are strongly encouraged.

II. GUIDELINES

1. Department chairs may request that faculty members teach courses outside their disciplines for which the faculty members have clearly defined expertise as evidenced by:
   a. Prior teaching experience;
   b. Formal academic training;
   c. Self-proclaimed competency.

2. Courses taught outside the home department will be given consideration as a part of the faculty member's teaching load and will be rewarded within the faculty member's home department on the same basis as a similar course within the discipline.

3. If the course is being taught for the first time, faculty members will be given the same considerations in work load, release time, and support as would be given for teaching a new course for the first time in their home department.

4. Teaching assignments outside the home department are to be given the same consideration relative to tenure, promotion, and salary increases as would be given to equivalent courses taught within the department.

Revised 5/16/89
To: Orrin Crosser  
President, Academic Council

From: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor

Date: June 6, 1989

Subject: UMR Smoking Policy

I am responding to the resolution passed by the Academic Council on April 20, 1989 recommending a campus smoking policy. This policy has been reviewed by the vice chancellors and academic deans. The attached Policy Memorandum establishing the UMR Smoking/Nonsmoking Policy has been prepared and will be distributed to the vice chancellors, deans, and unit heads for implementation. Notices will also be in the Digest.

MCJ/mlc
Attachment
POLICY MEMORANDUM

UMR Smoking/Nonsmoking Policy

PURPOSE AND PHILOSOPHY:

A comfortable environment at the University of Missouri - Rolla is dependent upon the thoughtfulness and cooperation of both smokers and nonsmokers. Because smoking is a health and potential fire hazard, it shall be restricted in order to create and maintain an environment that is in the best interest of the health, safety and well-being of all concerned.

POLICY:

Smoking is prohibited in all buildings owned, operated, or leased by the University of Missouri - Rolla except in designated smoking areas. Designated smoking areas will be established for each building by the person(s) responsible for the administration of the building, see attached list.

Areas which may be designed as smoking areas include public areas provided there is adequate ventilation so as not to cause health or safety problems for building users. Smoking is permitted in private and semi-private offices provided all occupants agree.

Disagreements regarding the application of this policy shall be referred to the Office of Human Resource Services.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Immediately

RESPONSIBILITY: Academic Council, Chancellor, Vice Chancellors and Deans, Human Resource Services, and all members of the University community.

BASIS: Chancellor, upon the recommendation of the Academic Council and Personnel Committee.

Martin C. Jischke
Chancellor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altman Hall</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Storage</td>
<td>Prof. Billy Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler-Carlton Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Dean Robert L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buehler Building</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building B</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullman Multi-Purpose</td>
<td>Prof. Billy Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's Garage</td>
<td>Dr. Martin C. Jischke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's Residence</td>
<td>Dr. Martin C. Jischke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressible Flow Lab</td>
<td>Dr. Robert L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Trailer T-39</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing Facilities</td>
<td>Prof. Billy Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Dr. Robert L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Management Building</td>
<td>Dr. Robert L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Engineering</td>
<td>Dr. Robert L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Research Lab</td>
<td>Dr. Robert L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explosive Center</td>
<td>Dr. Don L. Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrar Hall</td>
<td>Dr. Marvin W. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton Hall</td>
<td>Dr. Don L. Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Service Building</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Service Storage</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Shop</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Storage</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.I.S. Building</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Hall</td>
<td>Dr. Marvin W. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Name</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Chemical Storage</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtman Hall</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities-Social Sciences</td>
<td>Dr. Marvin W. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackling Restroom</td>
<td>Prof. Billy Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Hall</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUMR Transmitter</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math-Computer Science Building</td>
<td>Dr. Marvin W. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAnerney Hall</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Dr. Robert L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Compressor House</td>
<td>Dr. Don L. Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Dry House</td>
<td>Dr. Don L. Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Ventilation Lab</td>
<td>Dr. Don L. Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner Recreation Center</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Engineering Building (McNutt)</td>
<td>Dr. Don L. Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Engineering</td>
<td>Dr. Robert L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagogami Terrace Married Student Apts.</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Hall</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Reactor</td>
<td>Dr. Don L. Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Cafeteria</td>
<td>Dr. Marvin W. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Hall</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Dr. Marvin W. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics Observatory</td>
<td>Dr. Marvin W. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Plant</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Box</td>
<td>Prof. Billy Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayl Cafeteria</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Mechanics Center</td>
<td>Dr. Don L. Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolla Building</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Name</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schrenk Hall</td>
<td>Dr. Robert L. Davis and Dr. Marvin W. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismographic Station</td>
<td>Dr. Don L. Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straumanis Hall MRC</td>
<td>Dr. Don L. Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Apartments</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jefferson</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jefferson Addition</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-11 OPI/Centralized Printing</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-2 Military Science</td>
<td>Dr. Marvin W. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-21 208 West 16th</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-32 Grow</td>
<td>Dr. Robert L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-35 Grow</td>
<td>Dr. Robert L. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-36 1606 Rolla</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-6 Area Shop/KMNR Radio Station</td>
<td>Mr. Neil K. Smith and Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Research Facility</td>
<td>Dr. Don L. Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Center East</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Center West</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell R. Ogrosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Library</td>
<td>Dr. John T. Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 8, 1989

ASSESSMENT DAY RESOLUTION

The Academic Assessment Committee recommends to the Council that an "Assessment day off" be granted during the Spring semester on the Friday before preregistration for the Fall semester. To compensate for this day off, a day must be added to the semester, either at the beginning of the semester, at the end of the semester, or from one of the present holidays. It is understood that "Assessment day off" is not the same as "Assessment Day." Students who do not fulfill their assessment requirements on "Assessment Day" must do so on "Assessment day off."

Robert Laudon
Chair
RL/cmb
MEMO TO: The Academic Council  
FROM: The Admissions and Academic Standards Committee  
RE: Performance standards of the Admissions Requirements

The performance requirement to be accepted as a regular student of the University of Missouri is in the final states of consideration. A quick review would be helpful to put the matter in perspective:

a) Many years ago, Vice President Mel George (198?) asked the campuses to study the admissions requirement principally to determine if revisions were needed, since the old standards were set in 1970.

b) The early effort of this study resulted in a change in high school course work requirements, which was a major improvement. However, the performance requirement was delayed so that data could be collected on how students who had been enrolled in the University for at least one year were performing with the new high-school course work requirement.

c) At the October 1988 meeting of the Academic Council, the Admission Performance Standards recommendation of the Committee was approved (Enclosure #1). Vice president Askeland forwarded the standards to Chancellor Jischke for consideration by the appropriate University authorities.

UMKC and UMSL forwarded their recommendations, which were to keep the performance standard at the old level of a sum of 75 (Sum of HSCRP and ACT Composite Percentile).

The UMC proposal (Enclosure #2) recommends a somewhat different approach using the HSCRP and the actual ACT composite score. The figures in pen have been added to help the Committee study the UMC proposal. The Sum column shows the proposal to be a slight increase in performance standards from a Sum of 75.

The Committee has been informed that both UMKC and UMSL have agreed to accept the UMC proposal. The Committee has been urged to study the UMC proposal with the possibility of adoption or to recommend minor modifications to the UMC proposal that could be accepted by the other campuses.

The Committee has met and considered the UMC proposal. It is the Committee's unanimous recommendation that the UMR Academic Council reaffirm the performance standard previously forwarded to the Chancellor by the Council. The justification is that no member of the Committee would advise a prospective student to enroll at UMR with a Sum less than 100. In fact, 120 is a more reasonable number for this campus.

an equal opportunity institution
A score of 120 gives a prospective student about a 50% chance of completing the first year without being put on probation. This was the original charge to the Committee. The lower limit of a Sum of 100 was selected to give the greatest possible accessibility to UMR.

Charges will be made that raising admission standards is elitist, or racist. These charges are offensive to the Committee. The admission standards of the campus should be an honest reflection of what the faculty believes is necessary to have a reasonable chance of success. This we have done.

If a student is interested in the Programs at UMR, that student should contact the Admissions Office and receive expert, professional guidance in developing the best overall plan to achieve the student's educational goal. For students with Sums in the low hundreds, the best overall plan frequently requires remediation or developmental coursework which is not available at UMR. Later entry to UMR through the Transfer Student Program has been the path of success for thousands of graduates.

TJH/bc
MEMORANDUM TO: Martin C. Jischke, Chancellor
FROM: Donald Askeland, Vice-President
SUBJECT: Admission Performance Standards

The Academic Council, at its October 13th meeting, approved the following Admission and Academic Standards Committee recommendation. We request that it be included under the requirements for admission of first-time college students in UMR’s admission packet/application booklet after consideration by the proper University of Missouri authorities.

If the SUM of the high school class rank percentile and aptitude examination percentile is:

120 or greater the student is directly admissible. However, the University placement process may require remediation and reduced schedules for some students.

100 - 120 students in this range are frequently at high risk in successfully completing University level work. Students in this category may be admitted, but will receive advising, recommendations for remediation, and reduced academic schedules.

less than 100 students in this range are normally admissible only after additional academic development which is not available at UMR. Students in this category may later apply to UMR through the Transfer Student Program.

cc: John Park, Vice- Chancellor
    Academic Affairs
Robert Lewis, Director
    Admissions
Thomas Herrick, Chairman
    Admissions and Academic Standards Committee
ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS PROPOSAL FOR MU - CoL

(Effective Fall, 1990)

The following requirement has been established for general admission of first time college (entering freshmen) students.

At least 14 units of credit (1 unit = 1 year in class) as follows:

4 units of English, one of which may be in speech or debate. Two units emphasizing composition or writing skills are required.

3 units of mathematics (Algebra I and higher)

2 units of science (not including General Science), one of which must be a laboratory course.

2 units of social studies

3 additional units selected from foreign language, English, mathematics (Algebra I and higher), science, or social studies. Among these options, two units of foreign language are strongly recommended.

In addition it is proposed that each student be evaluated on the basis of High School Class Rank Percentile (HSCRCP) and ACT Composite Score. The table shows the minimum combination of class rank percentile and test score which satisfy requirements for regular admission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSCRCP</th>
<th>ACT Composite Score</th>
<th>ACT Composite Percentile (2%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75-</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University seeks a heterogeneous student body reflecting diversity of race, ethnicity, age, geography, (including international students) and physical disability. Factors given prime consideration for admission to undergraduate study are an applicant's previous academic success and the quality of the record presented. When considering an individual for non-regular admission, other factors considered may be:

- Extensive extracurricular activity involving school, church, or community
- Outstanding talent and/or abilities
- Number and scope of college preparatory courses taken
- Evidence of marked improvement over time in high school academic record
- Significant work experience and/or family responsibilities
- Supporting evidence attesting to one or more of the above in student's own hand (in the form of an essay)
MEMO TO: Academic Council members

FROM: Carol Ann Smith, Chair,
      Budgetary Affairs Committee

RE: Aerospace Engineering PhD Proposal

Colleagues, given the Budgetary Affairs Committee's recent resolutions
and your endorsement of those resolutions, the Committee reaffirms its commitment
to no new programs until such time as repairing the base is accomplished.

Although no new dollars in the short run have been associated with the
proposed degree, the Committee believes that any new proposal will eventually
require additional funding.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee recommends that this proposal not be
supported.
June 5, 1989

Memorandum To: Orrin Crosser  
Chairman, Academic Council

From: David B. Oglesby  
Curricula Committee

Re: Proposed PhD in Aerospace Engineering

The Campus Curricula Committee reviewed the PhD in Aerospace Engineering proposal and recommends the approval of the program.

It should be noted that the committee reviewed and discussed only the technical merit of the proposal and did not consider the budgetary aspects since they do not fall within our jurisdiction.
May 2, 1989

Memo To: Orrin Crosser, Chairman, Academic Council

From: Vince Roach, Chair, Personnel Committee

Re: Referral on "Informal Procedures to Handle Sexual Harassment Complaints"

The Personnel Committee has discussed with Catherine Riordan, Assistant to the Chancellor, the attached "Informal Procedures to Handle Sexual Harassment Complaints". After these discussions with Ms. Riordan and subsequent deliberations, the Committee feels the proposed procedures are reasonable and needed for effectively handling many sensitive problems involving actual or perceived sexual harassment. The Committee suggests changing the time frame for the follow-up visit (see 3., last paragraph, line 2), by substituting "as appropriate" instead of "2-4 weeks".

The Personnel Committee endorses the draft document "Informal Procedures to Handle Sexual Harassment Complaints", modified as indicated above. The Committee further recommends that all council members convey to their respective departments the proposed procedure and solicit comments regarding the document. These comments should be sent directly to Ms. Riordan. Catherine plans to attend the June 15 meeting of the Council and has agreed to respond to questions regarding the document at that time.

DVR:dms

Attachment
Informal Procedures to Handle Sexual Harassment Complaints*

The following procedures supplement the University of Missouri's Procedures and should not in any way be interpreted as discouraging complainants from filing formal grievances as outlined in University of Missouri's Personal Policy Manual PE106 or Student Manual of Information.

1. The complainant may visit with one of the university's Equality Aides** to discuss the problem. The Equality Aid may suggest solution methods or send the complainant to visit with the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action.

   Equality Aides will notify the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action of each contact with a complainant.

2. Alternatively, the complainant may go directly to the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action to discuss the problem. Alternative solution methods will be suggested.

3. When deemed necessary the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action will decide, in consultation with the complainant, how to contact the accused (personally, through supervisor, and/or in writing) to attempt an informal resolution of the problem.

   * The complainant will be given feedback about the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action's contact with the accused.

   * The Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action will meet with the complainant for a follow-up visit 2-4 weeks after attempt at informal resolution is made to see if the behavior has stopped.

4. If the unwanted behavior is still occurring at the time of the follow-up visit, the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action will contact the supervisor of the accused and encourage the complainant to file a formal grievance.

*In the interests of both complainant and accused, all communications and discussions with Equality Aides and the Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action will be held in strictest confidence except where specified in this policy.

**Equality Aides will be faculty, staff, and administrators designated as such by the Chancellor and trained in interview techniques and university policies by skilled personnel.
MEETING DATES FOR 1989-90

Rules, Procedure and Agenda:
- Thursday, August 31, 1989
- Thursday, October 5, 1989
- Thursday, November 16, 1989
- Thursday, January 11, 1990
- Tuesday, March 13, 1990
- Thursday, April 12, 1990
- Thursday, May 31, 1990

Academic Council:
- Thursday, September 14, 1989
- Thursday, October 19, 1989
- Thursday, November 30, 1989
- Thursday, January 25, 1990
- Thursday, March 29, 1990
- Thursday, April 26, 1990
- Thursday, June 14, 1990

General Faculty:
- Tuesday, September 5, 1989
- Tuesday, December 5, 1989
- Tuesday, April 24, 1990
MEMORANDUM TO: Professor O. K. Crosser  
President to Academic Council

FROM: W. Eversman  
Chairman, Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee

DATE: June 5, 1989

RE: Proposed Revision of Policy Memorandum II-10

The Promotion and Tenure Committee has carefully reviewed the proposed revision of Policy Memorandum II-10. The following comments reflect the consensus of the committee.

1. It has been the experience of the committee that the final administrative decision process regarding promotion and tenure systematically applies criteria other than those stated in Policy Memorandum II-10. Specifically, considerations of "worth to the department, college, or campus" and "marketability" have been used, even though they are intangible and generally undocumented. If the deliberations of the various departmental, college, and campus committees are to be based on consistent procedures, then the Policy Memorandum must specifically refer to all criteria which are important in the decision process at all levels. In particular, criteria such as "demonstrated worth" and "marketability" must be addressed.

2. The committee notes the elimination of service to the department, college, campus, university, and profession as a factor in promotion and tenure. This contradicts the commonly accepted profile of the complete academic as one who excels in the three areas of teaching/research/service. Paradoxically, the new draft retains section (V), which defines the service activity.

3. Addendum III.B.2 has anomalies in regard to demonstration of effective teaching. Scholarly presentations or publications may be irrelevant unless specifically related to teaching methods and course and curriculum development.

4. Addendum III.B.3 suggests that extension activities are important in the assessment of research and scholarship. The committee does not support this view. Extension activities should be independently identified and their role clarified.

5. In relation to observation (1) above, the following is recommended as an addition to "Exceptions":

    Recommendations with strong justification for exceptions to any of the above guidelines for candidates displaying unusual worth to the institution may qualify for consideration.

an equal opportunity institution
March 22, 1989

MEMO TO: Orrin K. Crosser  
President, Academic Council

FROM: Martin C. Jischke  
Chancellor

SUBJECT: Policy Proposal

Attached is a proposed revision of Policy Memorandum No. II-10 dealing with Qualifications for Professorial Academic Ranks. I would appreciate receiving the comments of the Academic Council regarding this proposed revision. Dean Barker played a leadership role in the development of this proposal and I would encourage you to visit with him if you have questions regarding the proposal.

MCJ/cal
attachment

cc: Dean Marvin Barker
POLICY MEMORANDUM

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 automatically qualify one for either promotion or tenure.

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 demonstrable promise of excellent teaching ability and research/scholarship abilities.

B. Associate Professor (AP): ap qualifications and a superior record in at least two of the following three areas: teaching and research/scholarship.

1. Teaching

2. Research: Demonstrated by publication of significant research results, and/or publication of textbooks, and/or securing of research support, and/or other scholarly or creative attainments recognized in the field.

3. Professional Activities: Demonstrated by participation in departmental and University functions, or professional organizations, or professional service in the community.

C. Professor (P): (See Addendum I.C.)

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 with acceptable justification for exceptions to any of the above guidelines may be proposed by the department chair and concurred in by the Dean of the School/College.
IV. Definitions:

A. Experience: Full-time professional activities that would enhance the faculty member's performance in one or more of the areas listed under B. 

B. Professional Activities: Performance 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).

III. V. Guidelines for Promotion: These guidelines are intended to convey in general terms the expectations in faculty development and the requirements for promotion. It is intended that these criteria be interpreted as general guidelines and not as rigid rules. Promotions are based on productivity and excellence of performance in the areas (teaching/research/extension) of the faculty member's agreed-upon assignment. Contributions to departmental excellence should also be recognized in promotion decisions.

A. Assistant Professor. Promotion or appointment to an assistant professorship is usually based upon potential. However, promotion from the rank of instructor to that of assistant professor is based partly upon performance.

The following are considerations for promotion to assistant professor:

1. Possess the degree of education usually considered to be the terminal degree for his or her discipline.

2. Have the personal qualities, intellectual interests, and the academic competence required for effective teaching and effective research/scholarship.

3. Possess the enthusiasm and the capacity to motivate students.

4. Have demonstrated the capacity for independent creative thinking.

5. Have demonstrated a willingness and determination to maintain currency in his or her academic field, and to grow professionally.

B. Associate Professor. Promotion to the associate professor rank is based upon demonstrated performance and future potential. A critical evaluation of teaching effectiveness and professional growth should be made at this point. If the individual has research responsibilities, evidence of accomplishment must be clearly present. Such evidence might include publication in refereed journals, grants, contracts, renewal of grants/contracts and invited presentations.
The following are considerations for promotion to associate professor:

1. Satisfy the criteria for promotion to assistant professor.

2. Be recognized as an effective teacher, as demonstrated by ...(See Addendum III.B.2.)

3. Demonstrate continuing professional growth and a contribution toward the definition of and achievement of departmental goals.

4. Be recognized by colleagues and peers as having the stature associated with the associate professor rank to departmental goals.

The length of service on the faculty before promotion will vary with the individual's productivity, qualifications, and rate of development. As a point of reference, promotion to the rank of associate professor for a new Ph.D. with less than three years on the faculty ought to be unusual and as such should be considered to recognize exemplary performance, will normally be considered in the sixth year of service.

C. Professor: Promotion to the rank of professor is intended to recognize status as a mature, excellent, and thoroughly productive scholar with and teacher. A developing national reputation. Promotion to this rank requires that the individual be of such stature as to be recognized by professional peers as an authority in his or her field of specialization. It is also expected that important and recognized contributions will have been made in at least two of the three areas of teaching, research, and professional or public service. Contributions must have been such that the candidate has a university reputation as a leader and an effective teacher and is recognized nationally for important contributions through research or professional service. The quality of the individual's work be recognized by professional peers.

The following are considerations for promotion to professor:

1. Satisfy criteria for promotion to associate professor.

(See Addendum III.C.2.)

2. Have made significant contributions in his or her field of specialization and be qualified to participate effectively in the academic programs of his or her department.

3. Have earned the respect of peers in his or her home department, of the faculty of the University as a whole, and of colleagues in his or her discipline nationwide.

4. Evince the ability to continue to grow professionally and to maintain a national reputation.

While no minimum time in rank is required, under normal circumstances achievement of the stature, maturity, and record of accomplishment required for promotion to the rank of professor with less than three years of service as an associate professor will be unusual.
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IV. **Exceptions**: Recommendations with acceptable justification for exceptions to any of the above guidelines may be proposed by the department chair and by the Dean of the School/College.

V. **Definitions**:

**Service/Professional Activities**: Service is defined as committee assignments and similar activities required in order that the University and professional associations may function. These activities are required of all faculty members and marginal or poor performance could negatively affect a promotion decision. However, excellence in service and/or professional activities alone is not a sufficient reason for promotion.
ADDENDUM

I.C.  **Professor (P):** AP qualifications and a developing national reputation in teaching or research/scholarship.

III.B.2.  Student and peer evaluation, awards and honors, course and curriculum development activities, scholarly presentations or publications, continuing education leadership and teaching, and/or publication of textbooks.

III.B.3.  Be recognized as an effective researcher/scholar as demonstrated by publication of significant research results, securing of research support, transfer of new technology through such activities as extension, and/or other scholarly creative attainments recognized in the field.

III.C.2.  Have a developing national reputation in teaching or research as demonstrated by external evaluation by professional peers. (External evaluators should not include only former colleagues or mentors.)
POLICY MEMORANDUM

NUMBER II-10

September 1, 1989

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 automatically qualify one for promotion.

I. Minimum Professional Qualifications as indicated for appropriate rank:

A. Assistant Professor (ap): Appropriate doctorate from a reputable institution and demonstrable promise of excellent teaching and research/scholarship abilities.

B. Associate Professor (AP): ap qualifications and a superior record in teaching and research/scholarship.

C. Professor (P): AP qualifications and a developing national reputation in teaching or research/scholarship.

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. Guidelines for Promotion: These guidelines are intended to convey in general terms the expectations in faculty development and the requirements for promotion. It is intended that these criteria be interpreted as general guidelines and not as rigid rules.

A. Assistant Professor. Promotion or appointment to an assistant professorship is usually based upon potential. However, promotion from the rank of instructor to that of assistant professor is based partly upon performance.
The following are considerations for promotion to assistant professor:

1. Possess the degree of education considered to be the terminal degree of the discipline.

2. Have the personal qualities, intellectual interests, and the academic competence required for effective teaching and effective research/scholarship.

3. Possess the enthusiasm and the capacity to motivate students.

4. Have demonstrated the capacity for independent creative thinking.

5. Have indicated the willingness and capability to participate as a respected colleague in deliberations concerning the department, the School/College, and the University.

B. Associate Professor. Promotion to the associate professor rank is based upon demonstrated performance and potential: a critical evaluation of teaching effectiveness and professional growth should be made at this point.

The following are considerations for promotion to associate professor:

1. Satisfy the criteria for promotion to assistant professor.

2. Be recognized as an effective teacher as demonstrated by student and peer evaluation, awards and honors, course and curriculum development activities, scholarly presentations or publications, continuing education leadership and teaching, and/or publication of textbooks.

3. Be recognized as an effective research/scholar as demonstrated by publication of significant research results, securing of research support, transfer of new technology through such activities as extension, and/or other scholarly creative attainments recognized in the field.

4. Be recognized by colleagues and peers as making significant contributions to departmental goals.

The length of service on the faculty before promotion will vary with the individual's productivity, qualifications, and rate of development. As a point of reference, promotion to the rank of associate professor for a new Ph.D. will normally be considered in the sixth year of service.
C. Professor. Promotion to the rank of professor is intended to recognize status as a mature, excellent, and thoroughly productive scholar and teacher. Promotion to this rank requires that the quality of the individual's work be recognized by professional peers.

The following are considerations for promotion to professor:

1. Satisfy criteria for promotion to associate professor.

2. Have a developing national reputation in teaching or research as demonstrated by external evaluation by professional peers. (External evaluators should not include only former colleagues or mentors.)

IV. Exceptions: Recommendations with acceptable justification for exceptions to any of the above guidelines may be proposed by the department chairman and by the Dean of the School/College.

V. Definitions:

Service/Professional Activities: Service is defined as committee assignments and similar activities required in order that the University and professional associations may function. These activities are required of all faculty members and marginal or poor performance could negatively affect a promotion decision. However, excellence in service and/or professional activities alone is not a sufficient reason for promotion.
President's Report  On behalf of himself and the Academic Council, President Crosser has sent a letter of condolence to the parents of Curator Carrie Francke who recently died in a traffic accident. In his letter President Crosser emphasized Curator Francke’s vigorous and intelligent dedication to the University of Missouri.

Chancellor's Report on the FY 1990 Budget  Chancellor Jischke presented a tale of two budgets. If the special legislative session commencing July 5 is successful in passing tax bills for funds to repay $152 million to federal pensioners and if, by such legislative action, the University does not lose its $45 million budget increase, UMR will receive $2 1/2 million in additional operating funds and $1 1/2 million in capital appropriations. These increases will allow such things as a 6% increase in S & W (6.6% counting concomitant increases in staff benefits), a 2% increase in E & E, and a $75,000 increase in library acquisitions. If the special legislative session fails to raise the money to refund the federal pensioners, the campus will receive approximately 1/2 million dollars in new money, 60% of which will be required to cover increased staff benefits costs. Chancellor Jischke believes that the Legislature understands the University's needs and is optimistic that it will act positively to meet them.

Administrative Reports: Teacher Evaluation

Professor Walter D. Johnson, Chairman of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Teacher Evaluation, reported on the "teacher evaluation instrument and the procedural guideline" developed by his committee. He will send his report to Dr. John Park, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and requests that suggestions about the instrument and the guidelines be sent to the Vice Chancellor. Vice Chancellor Park indicated that he wants a one-year trial basis before instituting an evaluation process.

Reports of Standing and Special Committees

Committee on Academic Assessment  Professor Robert Laudon presented an "Assessment Day Resolution" that "an assessment day off be established on the Friday before preregistration for the fall semester." After discussion, the resolution was tabled.

Admissions and Academic Standards  Professor Tom Herrick reported on the progress toward admission standards at the other campuses of the University and moved that the Council accept the admission standards developed for UMR by his committee. These standards combine a student's score on the ACT test with his high school rank percentile to establish a minimum standard of 100 and, based upon actual performances at UMR, a preferred standard
The motion to adopt and forward these recommended standards to system authorities was seconded and approved.

Budgetary Affairs Committee On the basis of a resolution previously adopted by the Council that no new programs be implemented until the financial base of the University is restored, the Budgetary Affairs Committee proposed that the Council withhold approval of the new Ph.D degree in Aerospace engineering. The motion to disapprove was defeated. Later the Council voted to approve the new degree program. The chair of the Committee, Professor Smith, then reported on the Administration response to the proposed salary distribution policy.

Curricula Committee. After correcting two typos, the Council voted to approve report No. 7, 1988-89.

Personnel Professor Roach moved approval of the "Informal Procedures to Handle Sexual Harrassment Complaints" as amended (slightly) by the Committee. The motion passed.

R P & A The R P & A, Academic Council, and General Faculty meeting dates for the academic year 1989-90 were presented and approved.

IFC Professor Pogue reports an IFC "hope" that with sufficient urging the Legislature will include, with its efforts to raise the $152 million, an additional amount of money so as to make unnecessary any withholding of 3%. President Magrath continues to work for increased tax support for higher education with the assistance of Missourians for Higher Education and a newly appointed faculty committee. A survey is being taken of individual faculty who have received monies from the Weldon Spring Fund to see how they are paying off. Results from the survey are very positive. Following the IFC report, Chancellor Jischke informed the Council that two other committees have been established by President Magrath to help promote the better financial health of the University. One is chaired by Chancellor George Russell of UMKC; it will develop a strategy for pursuing a tax initiative. The other committee is chaired by Chancellor Jischke; it will study how the University may attain the goals of the Agenda for Action without a tax increase.

Promotion and Tenure Committee Chairman Eversman reported on the review his committee has made of "the proposed revision of Policy Memorandum II-10." The committee notes the following inconsistencies: (1) Criteria such as "worth to the department," etc., and "marketability" are used but not documented; they should be. (2) Exceptions to any guidelines should be strongly justified. (3) Elimination of service as a consideration "contradicts the commonly accepted profile of the complete academic as one who excels" in service as well as teaching and research. Moreover, Section V of the new draft "defines the service activity." The committee also called attention to (4) anomalies in the document relative to effective teaching and (5) the committee's decision not to support the view that "extension activities are important"; these activities should be assessed independently. (Interested faculty are referred to Professor Eversman's June 5 memo to President Crosser.)
The board president and the University System president recapped last weekend's special board meeting in Kansas City. Edwin S. Turner, president of the board, emphasized the importance of the session. "I can flatly say that the depth and seriousness of the discussions in Kansas City were unparalleled," Turner said. "Let there be no doubt, question or mistake that the board is committed to do the best possible job in applying the best education, to fairly compensate staff and faculty and be a resource to the state through research, service and instruction. Wake up Missouri. Education needs your help. It is indeed time for the state to wake up. We, as a board, plan to open some eyes." President C. Peter Magrath said of the meeting: "I left that meeting with renewed affirmation in my heart and mind about the commitment of the board, faculty, students. It is not a time for doubts. It is a time for candor and not to be afraid to move ahead."

In discussing the special board meeting, the board reinforced its resolve to work toward gaining additional state support to improve the University. A resolution passed by the curators reinforces the board's policy to "ensure the most efficient and effective utilization of the University's resources through a continuing process of planning and educational improvement, including evaluation of programs and procedures of the University" regardless of state funding levels. The University report Magrath has recommended be presented to the board in October will include, according to the resolution, past and present actions by the University to more efficiently allocate and utilize System resources; recommendations regarding overall educational and program improvement, including elimination, reduction and consolidation of programs, reallocation of program resources and other restructuring of programs; and recommendations for ongoing and further initiatives and procedures throughout the University that will provide for more efficient administration and effective utilization of resources.

A board committee formed in November to hire a consultant to conduct an independent review of the University's organization and administration has been dissolved. The committee's responsibilities will be carried out by the board's Resources and Planning Committee.

The University's two urban campuses may meet the needs for improved access to engineering education by joining forces with the University's two campuses that have existing engineering programs. President C. Peter Magrath recommended to the board that UMKC and UMSL meet the engineering needs of part-time students and industry by building on the System's engineering programs at UMC and UMR. Contingent upon available funding, existing UMC and UMKC cooperative engineering programs will be combined with UMKC computer science and telecommunications programs to form an Institute for Science and Technology, and UMSL will offer undergraduate engineering programs in cooperation with UMR, which now offers graduate programs in St. Louis.

Awards and honors: Three faculty members received $4,000 Burlington Northern Faculty Achievement Awards for outstanding teaching in 1988: Richard J. Hardy, UMC associate professor of political science; Lori S. Spatz, UMKC professor of English; and Paul D. Travers, UMSL professor of educational studies.

Next meeting: June 22-23, St. Joseph