I. Approval of minutes of the June 15, 2000 meeting

II. Reports and Responses

A. President's Report (20 min.) Don Myers

B. Chancellor's Report (10 min.) Gary Thomas
   (10 minutes for Questions and Answers)

III. Reports of Standing and Special Committees

A. Curricula (5 min.) Charles Morris
   1.*Reports No. 1 & 2

B. Rules, Procedure and Agenda (5 min.) Jeff Cawfield
   1. Election of Academic Council Officers

C. Student Affairs (5 min.) Mark Potrafka
   1.*Constitution of the Advanced Aero-Vehicle Group

IV. Old Business

A. *Action Items

V. New Business and Announcements

A. Staff Council
B. Student Council
C. Discussion of Resolution on Academic Free Time

*Information distributed with agenda
Memo To: Academic Council
From: UMR Campus Curricula Committee
Re: August 16, 2000, Meeting
Date: August 24, 2000

For the information of the Academic Council, the following ECIs have been submitted by the University departments for an experimental course that will be offered in the near future. No action is needed by the Academic Council for these experimental courses.

EC1 1105, History 301, Modern East Asia. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: History 175 or 176.

EC1 1106, Electrical Engineering 301, Introduction to Power Quality. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: EI Eng 153 with a grade of "C" or better, passing grade on the EI Eng Adv. Exam II.

EC1 1111, Education 301, Using Multimedia in the Classroom. Approved for FS2000. 1 hour credit. The prerequisite was changed from "graduate standing" after a suggestion was made by the committee to change it to "Post Bac/practicing teacher." This change in prerequisite will help insure that only teachers are able to take the class.

EC1 1113, Civil Engineering 301, Infrastructure. Approved for WS2001. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: Cv Eng 223.

EC1 1114, Electrical Engineering 301, Advanced Programmable Logic Controllers. Approved for WS2001. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: EI Eng 235.

EC1 1115, Mechanical Engineering 401, Laser Aided Manufacturing and Materials Processing. Approved for FS2000. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Mc Eng 325.

EC1 1116, Geological Engineering 401, Advanced Concepts of Environmental Geological Engineering. Approved for FS2000. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Graduate level course in environmental geologic studies.

EC1 1117, History 301, History of Baseball. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: History 175 or 176.
EC1 1119, English 201, Genre Studies in Literature and Film. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: English 20 & a semester of college literature, or English 177.


The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends to the Academic Council that the curricula changes on the following CC1s be approved.

CC1 4887, Mechanical Engineering 000, curriculum change. Approved for FS2000. In the degree requirements for the Manufacturing Processes emphasis area, Mc Eng 323 was replaced with MC Eng 221.

CC1 4888, Basic Engineering 220, Engineering Design Methodology. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Junior standing in engineering and at least 12 hours major field credit. Description: this course examines structured engineering design theory and methodologies for conceptual design and redesign of products. Topical coverage includes customer needs gathering, functional modeling, engineering specifications creation (QFD), concept generation, selection and design embodiment. Team work/hands-on projects emphasized.

CC1 4889, Nuclear Engineering 000, curriculum change. Approved for FS2000. In the second semester of sophomore year, EI Eng 281 is replaced by EI Eng 282. In the first semester of senior year, the course Nu Eng 345 is replaced by Nu Eng 307.

CC1 4890, Engineering Management 000, curriculum change. Approved for FS2000. Eng Mg 211 replaces Eng Mg 209 in the second semester of sophomore year.

CC1 4907, Education 345, Introducing Educators to Computers. Approved for FS2000. 1 hour credit. Prerequisite: Post Bac/practicing teacher. Description: A basic introduction to computers for K-12 educators. Includes identification and use of hardware components, as well as the fundamentals of using the operating system and basic computer software. Actual software taught will reflect current usage.
Memo To: Academic Council
From: UMR Campus Curricula Committee
Re: September 11, 2000, Meeting

For the information of the Academic Council, the following EC1s have been submitted by the University departments for an experimental course that will be offered in the near future. No action is needed by the Academic Council for these experimental courses.

EC1 1120, Electrical Engineering 401, Advanced Topics of Electromagnetics, WS2001. Removed from tabled. Approved for WS2001, with amendment. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: EI Eng 371. Amendment deleted last sentence of catalog description: “Repeatable for additional credit toward degree each time a different subtitle offered.”

EC1 1121, English 301, Advanced Writing for Science and Engineering, WS2001. Removed from tabled. Approved for WS2001. 2 hours credit. No prerequisites. Editorial change: The word “skills” was added to the description to read as “communication skills”.

EC1 1123, Geology 401, Adv Mineralogy and Petrology. Approved for FS2000. 3 hours credit. Editorial changes: Prerequisite was changed to: Admittance into the USAES-UMR Cooperative Degree Program. This sentence was added to the catalog description: This course is structured for students in the USAES-UMR Cooperative Degree Program. The instructor for this course has been replaced by Bill Little.

EC1 1124, Engineering Management 301, Electronic Commerce. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior Standing.

EC1 1125, Chemistry 401, Solid-State NMR Spectroscopy. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Undergraduate physical chemistry.

EC1 1126, Chemistry 401, Environmental Aerosol Characterization. Approved for WS2001. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: Chem 375.

EC1 1127, Geophysics 401, Adv Engineering and Environmental Geophysics. Approved for FS2000. 3 hours credit. Editorial changes: Prerequisites changed to: Admittance into the USAES-UMR Cooperative Degree Program. Editorial change: This sentence was added to the catalog description: This course is structured for students in the USAES-UMR Cooperative Degree Program.

EC1 1129, Geology 301, Advanced Physical Geology. Approved for FS2000. 3 hours credit. This course was approved by the committee through e-mail with amendment. Amendment replaced the prerequisite with: Admittance into the USAES-UMR Cooperative Degree Program. Amendment added this sentence to the description: This course is structured for students in the USAES-UMR Cooperative Degree Program.

EC1 1130, Computer Engineering 301, Dynamic Programming & Markov Decision Processes. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Prior course in probability or statistics. Editorial change: The prerequisite had a change in words from “background” to “course.”

EC1 1131, Computer Engineering 301, Adaptive Critic Designs. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Background in Markov processes.

The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends to the Academic Council that the curricula changes on the following CC1s be approved.

CC1 4886, Engineering Management 468, Systems Engineering Analysis II, WS2001. Removed from tabled. Approved new course for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Graduate standing. Description: Advanced concepts of Systems Engineering is covered. The objective is to provide the advanced knowledge and tools of transforming an operational need into a defined system configuration through the iterative process of analysis, system integration, synthesis, optimization and design. These tools and concepts are reinforced with projects and case studies.

CC1 4891, Geology 381, X-ray Analysis. Approved deletion of course for FS2000.

CC1 4892, Geology 376, Aqueous Geochemistry. Approved for WS2001. Change in prerequisites from Chem 1, 3 or 5, Geol 275 or Geol 375 "TO" Geol 275. Editorial change in prerequisite: “or permission of instructor” was deleted. Change in catalog description to: Studies of the interaction of water with minerals and organic materials at low temperatures; including processes affecting the migration of elements (alteration, precipitation, and adsorption), the influence of geochemical processes on water composition, weathering, soil formation, and pollution. Field trip fee required.

CC1 4893, Geology 440, Advanced Geochemistry. Approved for WS2002. Title changed from “Geochemistry.” Prerequisites changed from Chem 243 and Geol 234 "TO" Geol 275. Editorial change in prerequisite: “or permission of instructor” was deleted. Description changed to: A study of the absolute and relative abundance of elements and isotopes in the Earth, principals of element transport, formation of the Earth’s crust, mineral deposits, and soils. Field trip fee required.
CC1 4894, Geology 220, Structural Geology. Approved for FS2000. Change in description to: A study of the architecture of the Earth. Geologic structures, criteria for recognition, solution of structural problems, and properties and behavior of rocks under different geologic conditions are emphasized. Field trip fee required.


CC1 4897, Geophysics 381, Global Tectonics. Approved for FS2000. Change in course number from 281. Change in prerequisites from Geo 51 or Ge Eng 50 and math 21 "TO" Physics 23 and 24, Geo 220.

CC1 4898, Geophysics 286, Introduction to Geophysical Data Analysis. Approved for FS2000. Change in prerequisites from Cmp Sc 73 and 77, Physics 25, accompanied or preceded by Math 204 "TO" Cmp Sc 73 and 77, Physics 25 and Math 22. Change in catalog description to: The application of time series and spatial series analysis techniques to geophysical data. Topics covered include digitization and aliasing of geophysical signals, frequency and wavenumber spectra, digital filtering and linear systems theory.

CC1 4899, Geology 413, Clay Mineralogy. Approved for WS2001. Change in prerequisites from graduate standing "TO" Geo 113 and 275, or Chem 237, or Cv Eng 315 or Ge Eng 372. Change in description to: Mineral structure, geochemical properties, occurrence, environment, and uses of clays. Determination of physical properties, optics, x-ray diffraction, and thermal features of clays. Field trip fee required. Editorial change: "Permission of instructor" was deleted from the prerequisites.

CC1 4900, Geology 375, Applied Geochemistry 375, Applied Geochemistry. Approved for WS2002. Change in prerequisites from Geo 113 and Geo 275 "TO" Geo 113 and Geo 275. Change in description to: Application of the principles of geochemistry and techniques of geochemical analysis in a student research project investigating geochemical processes (mineral deposits, environmental geochemistry, trace element migration, or water-rock interaction). Field trip fee required. Editorial change: "Permission of instructor" was deleted from the prerequisites.


CC1 4902, Ceramic Engineering 418, Optical Properties of Materials. Approved new course for WS2001. 3 hours credit. No prerequisites. Description: The objective of this course is to give the student a fundamental understanding of the structure-optical property relationships exhibited by isotropic and anisotropic materials. Topics will include the wave/particle nature of light, how light interacts with materials, color, and applications such as lasers, fiber optic communication systems, electro-optics, and integrated optics.
CC1 4903, Biological Sciences 328, Nutritional and Medicinal Properties of Plants. Approved for WS2001. Change in prerequisites from Bio Sc 110 and Bio Sc 242 "TO" Bio Sc 110 and Bio Sc 211. Editorial change: "or with instructors consent" deleted from the proposed prerequisites.

CC1 4904, Geology 345, Radioactive Waste Management and Remediation. Approved new course for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Math 204. Description: Sources and classes of radioactive waste, long-term decay, spent fuel storage, transport, disposal options, regulatory control, materials issues, site selection and geologic characterization, containment, design and monitoring requirements, domestic and foreign waste disposal programs, economic and environmental issues; history of disposal actions, and conduct of remedial actions and cleanup. (Co-listed with Nu Eng 345.)


CC1 4906, Geological Engineering 371, Rock Engineering. Approved for FS2000. Change in credit hours from 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab "TO" 3 hours lecture.

CC1 4907, Education 345, Introducing Educators to Computers. Approved new course for FS2000. (See 8/16/00 minutes)

CC1 4908, Computer Engineering 000, change in curriculum. Approved for FS2000. Footnote #12 changed to: The six hours of science electives to be selected from an approved list which includes Bas Eng 140, Mc Eng 227, Mc Eng 219, Physics 107, Chem 221, Bio Sc 110, 112, 211, 231, 234, 251. Justification reads: Proposed change deletes Bio Sc 121, 122 which are no longer taught, and adds to Bio Sc 231, 235, and 251 which are appropriate for Cp Eng students pursuing a career in Bio Medical Engineering or a related field.

CC1 4909, Political Science 226, International Relations. Approved new course for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Pol Sc 90 or History 175 or 176. Description reads: A general introduction to theoretical framework, pattern and personalities of international relations with special emphasis upon American foreign policy making. Problems of international economic development, resources, and armaments will also be examined.

J. Keith Nisbett, Chair
Constitution of the Advanced Aero-Vehicle Group

University of Missouri - Rolla

Latest Revision May, 2000

ARTICLE I: NAME

The name of this organization shall be "University of Missouri – Rolla Advanced Aero-Vehicle Group" which hereafter shall be referred to as the "Group."

ARTICLE II: PURPOSE

The purpose of this organization shall be to:

1. promote technological advancement and knowledge of the aerospace sciences
2. expand Group members' knowledge of classroom concepts regarding group dynamics, aerospace engineering, and real engineering problems
3. promote the name and reputation of the University of Missouri – Rolla on an international level through participation in intercollegiate aerospace design competitions
4. encourage support of the Group by the University of Missouri - Rolla
5. familiarize members with product development, marketing, and business skills through self-administration of business duties necessary to run the Group
6. provide technical and interpersonal skills that will prepare members for leadership roles in industry
7. provide interdisciplinary cooperation in advancing quality designs of competitive aerospace vehicles

It shall be the duty of the Group to ensure the following:

1. participation in various aero-vehicle design competitions, including (but not limited to) the following:
   1. SAE Aero-Design Heavy-Lift Competition
   2. AOPA Design It, Build It, Fly It!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Passage</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>REFERRED TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January, 2000</td>
<td>Resolution on Video/Distance Learning</td>
<td>Dr. Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2000</td>
<td>Faculty Performance Shares Plan</td>
<td>Dr. Thomas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because Council President Jerry Tien was out of the country, the meeting was opened by President Elect Donald Myers at 1:35 P.M. Roll call was taken by the office secretary. Members absent were: Martin Bohner, Matt Insall, Patrick Guinta, Richard Hall, S.N. Balakrishnan (who had sent a substitute), Wayne Huebner, Ralph Wilkerson, Mark Mullin, Walt Gajda, Wendell Ogrosky, and Dean Saperstein (who had notified in advance that he could not attend).

There was a motion by Professor Lenn Koederitz to approve the minutes of the June 15, 2000 meeting as distributed. Professor Dan White seconded, and motion carried.

There was a motion by Professor Lance Haynes to move the Rules, Procedure and Agenda Committee election of officers to this point in the meeting. There was a second, and motion carried.

.2 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

A. RULES, PROCEDURE AND AGENDA

1. Chair Jeff Cawlfied presented the slate of officers for Academic Council 2000-01 as follows: President-Donald Myers; President Elect-Ralph Wilkerson; Secretary-Lenn Koederitz; and Parliamentarian-Todd Hubing. Professor Cawlfield moved to approve the slate by acclamation. There was a second and motion carried.

.1 REPORTS AND RESPONSES

A. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. Newly elected President Myers presented a report on the Academic Council Web Page using an overhead. He showed the description of the Academic Council from the UMR Bylaws, and listed some ways this Council is
different from other Faculty Senates, such as more collaboration with the Faculty and Administration.

2. Professor Myers announced that Dr. Teresa Thiel of the Committee on Post Tenure Review will be at the October 19 Academic Council meeting to address questions on this subject.

3. President Myers said that Professor Todd Hubing has agreed to take charge of the Council’s Web Site—adding to it in order to better inform the Faculty on issues of interest, and possibly creating a method for Faculty input.

4. Professor Myers said there had been a discussion with Chancellor Thomas about the need to develop a list of agenda items for the year that would cover the issues of greater interest.

5. President Myers mentioned IFC (InterCampus Faculty Council). There were some questions as to what that group does. Professor Myers explained that there are three representatives from each campus (UMR’s being Don Myers, Ralph Wilkerson, and Jeff Cawlfield this year). This Council talks with President Pacheco about items of interest to the four campuses. President Myers asked Professor Cawlfield to give a report from the last IFC meeting.

   a. Professor Cawlfield said Post Tenure Review is still one of the main topics of discussion. A preliminary presentation from that committee is on the Web, and they are soliciting input from Faculty. (See attached)

   b. There was some discussion by Council members as to whether the charge the Post Tenure Review Committee was to decide if a new process is needed, or to definitely set up a new one. Professor Myers is on the committee (also from UMR—Jack Ridley and Don Askeland), and he said President Pacheco has asked for a new one—that each campus has some sort of Post Tenure Review, but needed a consistent one among all four campuses.

   c. Also discussed at IFC was the English Language Proficiency issue. Each campus reported on their efforts, and Steve Lemkuhle made a presentation to the Board of Curators. Professor Cawlfield said results from a survey
showed that native English speakers were having more communication problems than professors from other countries.

d. Professor Cawlfield said there had been quite a bit of concern about the implementation of PeopleSoft, and he assured the Council that it will run parallel with existing programs for quite some time.

e. Professor Cawlfield said IFC had a list of issues needing discussion, including: ownership of web-based courses and Intellectual Property Rights; grievance procedures; and the Resource Planning Document.

f. Professor Greg Gelles voiced questions and concerns about Post Tenure Review, saying he felt the new policy might enforce causes for dismissal more than the old one. President Myers said the opportunity for voicing comments, questions, and concerns would be at the next Council meeting.

B. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT-Dr. Thomas said he wanted to endorse the comments about collaborative decision-making. He further stated that he needs input BEFORE time to make the decision on an issue.

1. The Chancellor said he had received a memo from Academic Council concerning Academic Free Time. He said he had met with the Retention Committee, and the feeling was that there is a need to improve the campus climate between students and staff. He said there was an obvious need to create time in the day when everyone would have—within reason—time to participate in activities—clubs, etc. for students and seminars and such for Faculty. Dr. Thomas said he and the Faculty and students need to think collectively about this and the reasons for it before next fall.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Professor Lance Haynes asked if Faculty input to the Chancellor could be made by email. Chancellor Thomas said that was definitely a positive use of email. He gave his email address: thomas@umr.edu.
2. Professor Don Myers asked for a brief overview of the Chancellor’s presentation to the Board of Curators on UMR’s survey on English Language Proficiency.

3. Dr. Thomas said the survey was done with a comparison by language group to which they belonged, then by how big classes were—also why some professors had communication difficulties in one class, but not in another. The largest number of problems occurred in classes of about twenty to thirty students. Where individuals had different levels of communication problems in different classes, it was the larger classes where the worst problems were. The Chancellor went on to say that it is an explicit part of a Chair’s responsibility to speak with Faculty to see if there is a communication difficulty. The Chair should then talk to the professor in question and the Dean to help overcome the problem.

4. UMR student Joe Maul commented on the issue, stating, “this issue is not dead”.

Professor Myers officially welcomed the new Chancellor, Dr. Gary Thomas.

.2 STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES (continued)

B. CURRICULA—Professor Charles Morris presented this report, from August and September. He first mentioned the EC1’s for information only. He then moved to approve the CC1’s as distributed. Professor Lenn Koederitz seconded, and motion carried.

C. STUDENT AFFAIRS—Mr. Mark Potrafka presented the Constitution of the Advanced Aero Vehicle Group. Professor Lance Haynes moved to approve it. Professor Hal Nystrom seconded, and motion carried.

.3 No old business was presented; however, President Myers mentioned that Faculty Performances Shares Plan was mistakenly listed as an Action Item. This issue has been referred to the Personnel Committee.
.4 NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. No one was present to represent the Staff Council.

B. STUDENT COUNCIL-Mr. Joe Maul, Vice President For External Affairs introduced himself and stated that he would be attending Academic Council meetings, RP&A meetings, etc. He listed as some topics of interest to Student Council: the proposed new University Center, English Language Proficiency, and FERPA.

C. REFERRALS-Professor Myers referred the issue of Academic Free Time for the year 2001-02 to the Student Affairs Committee.

There was a motion and a second to adjourn. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Lenn Koederitz
Secretary

*Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
September 18, 2000

To: Members of the IFC

Lawrence Barton   Mark Burkholder   Jeff Cawlfield
Judith Goodman   Joseph Martinich   Ed Mills
Donald Myers   Mary Ellen Sievert   Max Skidmore
Jakob Waterborg   Ralph Wilkerson   Russ Zguta

Dear Colleagues:

At the last IFC meeting, you asked about the charge to the Post-Tenure Review Committee, and specifically if the Post-Tenure Review Committee was to consider the feasibility of implementing post-tenure review or instructed to develop a post-tenure review policy for the University. I believe the excerpt below taken from the charge issued to the Post-Tenure Review Committee answers your question.

Currently, the University of Missouri System does not have a specific post-tenure review system. However, in order to take a proactive stance in this regard, President Pacheco has requested that a post-tenure review process be designed and adopted for the University of Missouri System.

Hopefully, this is the information that you requested. If you need additional information about the post-tenure review process and other aspects about the charge, please contact Vice-President Lehmkuhle.

Yours sincerely,

Manuel T. Pacheco
President

SWL:kav
ANNUAL REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

Executive Guideline No. 27, 2-2-93.

310.015 ANNUAL REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

A. Even though the great majority of the University's tenured faculty take great pride in meeting their responsibilities to the institution, their students, and their disciplines, there may be instances where a tenured faculty member's performance leads to actions eventuating in dismissal for cause in accord with the University's tenure regulations. Even though such instances are rare, it is essential that the University identify and deal effectively with these cases, not only to maintain and improve its reputation and to avoid harm to the morale and effectiveness of other faculty, but also because the system of tenure, which is essential to academic freedom, is best preserved by preventing its abuse.

B. The preferred course of action is to deal with such individual problems before dismissal for cause is necessary. Deans and department chairs have primary responsibility for dealing with such instances both before and after they develop.

C. The performances of all faculty members, including tenured faculty, are to be reviewed annually. In most instances, a discussion involving the department chair (or dean) with the tenured faculty member as to her or his performance for the past year and plans for the coming year will be sufficient, although written evaluations should be provided to those faculty members where there are concerns about substantial shortcomings in performance. Written annual evaluations of untenured faculty members are expected.

D. As part of the annual evaluation process, each campus shall develop procedures whereby each dean will report to the Chancellor, through established administrative channels, whether there are any tenured faculty members in the division whose performances are such that there are grounds for termination for cause. If there are such situations, the report will also include the steps being taken to deal with the situation. Such steps may include reaching an agreement as to specific performance requirements, seeking treatment for particular problems, assignment of new duties, support of opportunities to develop new skills, and dismissal for cause.

E. Annually, each Chancellor will report to the President, who will report to the Board of Curators in Executive Session, as to any instances of tenured faculty as to whom there are grounds for dismissal for cause.

Return to Table of Contents

http://www.system.missouri.edu/uminfo/rules/bylaws/310015.htm 9/8/00
The following is a draft of the post-tenure review plan, developed by the University of Missouri Post-Tenure Review Committee. We would appreciate any comments or suggestions. If you have comments or suggestions, please respond to: UM-Post Tenure Review**.

** If this link does not work for you, please e-mail your comments to UM-POSTTENUREREVIEWcommittee@umsystem.edu.

Post-Tenure Review Plan

DRAFT - May 5, 2000

Introduction

Tenured faculty have proven their ability to contribute significantly in their discipline and to work independently and productively in their field. Tenure is designed to foster creativity and to provide academic freedom by protecting faculty from unfair dismissal based on arbitrary or discriminatory practices. However, tenure does not protect faculty from the consequences of not performing satisfactorily their duties to the university. It is in the best interest of the faculty as a whole to ensure that each faculty member contributes fully to the institution throughout that individual's career. Consequently, the performance of each faculty member is reviewed annually in the areas of teaching, research, and service. In addition, since periodic broader reviews provide a better measure of long-term performance, a cumulative review of each tenured faculty member will be employed for each five-year period subsequent to receipt of tenure. As appropriate, this five-year review can result in a plan for professional development or initiate a process that may lead to dismissal for cause.

The recommendation of dismissal for cause for failure to meet academic responsibilities shall not be used as a means to discriminate unfairly or capriciously against any faculty member. All parties involved in the post-tenure review process have a special obligation to ensure that this process is applied fairly and is not used in a discriminatory manner.

Summary of the Process

http://www.system.missouri.edu/vpacad/faculty/ptr/review_plan.htm 9/26/00
The post-tenure review process will evaluate the performance of tenured faculty members in the areas of research, teaching and service. The process will provide faculty, on an annual basis, with information that may help them to maintain or improve the quality of their performance. Every five years the overall performance of each faculty member will be evaluated for that time period. Those faculty who have demonstrated satisfactory performance will continue to be evaluated annually and on a five-year cycle. Any faculty member whose performance is judged unsatisfactory as a result of the five-year evaluation will, with the help of the chair and other appropriate faculty, formulate a professional development plan for improvement of performance over the next three years. In the event that a faculty member fails to perform satisfactorily for the original five-year evaluation period and for the three-year development plan period, the campus committee on Tenure and Promotion and the Provost or Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will review the case. They may recommend an extension of the professional development plan or may recommend dismissal for cause.

Post-Tenure Review Process

1. Every tenured faculty member (including those with an administrative appointment) will submit a signed annual report describing her/his activities in research, teaching and service. This annual report will be reviewed by the chair or unit administrator according to normal unit practices. The activities of the faculty member will be rated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory in research, teaching and service, and an overall evaluation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory will be provided. The faculty member will receive this information in a written evaluation. If the overall evaluation is unsatisfactory there must be a face-to-face discussion of the evaluation between the faculty member and the unit administrator. The faculty member will sign the written evaluation to acknowledge its receipt and may provide a written response to the evaluation. A copy of this signed evaluation will be provided to the faculty member by the chair within a month after the faculty member has signed the evaluation.

2. At five-year intervals a tenured faculty member will resubmit the annual reports and evaluation statements for the past five years, with a concise summary statement of research, teaching, and service activities for the five-year period, and a current curriculum vita to the chair or unit administrator. The first five-year review will be done five years after the last formal review of the faculty member for promotion to associate professor or five years after the evaluation for those hired at or promoted to the full professor level.

3. Based on the five-year report, the chair will evaluate the faculty member’s performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The five-year evaluation process will be complete with a satisfactory evaluation. If the evaluation is unsatisfactory, then the five-year report will be sent to the appropriate established committee of the department/unit, typically the one that reviews faculty for tenure and promotion. The five-year evaluation process will be complete if the departmental committee judges the performance of the faculty member to be satisfactory.

4. If a majority (alternatively: two-thirds majority) of the members of the committee of the department/unit considers the performance of the faculty member to be unsatisfactory, a plan for professional development will be written. This plan will be developed by the faculty member, the department/unit committee or a designated subcommittee, a mutually agreed upon mediator from outside the department (selected from the campus faculty grievance panel), and the chair of the department/unit. This development plan will have clear and attainable objectives for the faculty member and may include a reallocation of the faculty member’s effort and a commitment of institutional resources to the plan. This plan will be signed by the faculty member, the chair or unit administrator, and the mediator. The development plan and any associated resource commitments will be reviewed and approved by the Dean.

5. A faculty member with a plan for professional development will submit an annual progress report to the other signatories (see paragraph 4) of the development plan for three successive years after the plan has been agreed upon. The other signatories will provide an annual written evaluation on the progress of the faculty member toward the objectives stated in the development plan. If both of the other signatories find satisfactory progress for any two of the next three years, then this process will cease.
and the faculty member will begin a new five-year cycle of review.

6. If both of the other signatories (see paragraph 4) do not find satisfactory progress after three years, then the five-year evaluations plus the three years of progress reports on the development plan will be forwarded to the campus committee on Tenure and Promotion and to the Provost or Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Each of them will review the reports and will recommend separately to the chancellor either: 1) that an additional two-year development plan be written and implemented in consultation with the faculty member and the originating departmental committee, or 2) that the faculty member be dismissed for cause, the cause being sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities. In the case of the latter, the procedures for dismissal for cause will be invoked according to CR 310.060.

7. At every level of review, the faculty member will be provided with a copy of any written report that is part of these proceedings and will have the right of appeal of any evaluations, decisions, or recommendations to the next level of the process, as described above in items 4-6. However, a faculty member who has been found by the chair, the departmental committee, and the mediator to have unsatisfactory performance for the past five years may not appeal the process of developing a professional plan. If the faculty member is not satisfied with the plan that has been developed, he/she may appeal to the next level (usually a Dean) to help in the formulation of an acceptable development plan.

8. Administrators who are also tenured faculty will be subject to the post-tenure review process; however, the criteria for evaluation of performance will depend on their particular job description. Evaluation of administrators will include review by the administrator to whom that faculty member reports and the department in which the administrator is tenured. The evaluation must include a satisfactory/unsatisfactory evaluation of their ability to return to effective performance of their academic position within a two-year period upon leaving administrative office.

9. Faculty may be dismissed for cause independent of the process described above under the conditions outlined in CR 310.020.C.1.

Administrative Appendix

At the time the post tenure review process is initiated on each campus, tenured faculty will begin the first five-year review cycle based on the date of their last review for promotion to associate or full professor. Those faculty who are at that time 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30 years from the date of their last review will have their first post-tenure review in 5 years. Those faculty who are 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31 years from the date of their last review will have their first post-tenure review in 6 years. The staggered terms will continue in this pattern such that all faculty will have completed their first 5 year review by the end of year nine.

DRAFT

This is a draft of the post-tenure review plan, developed by the University of Missouri Post-Tenure Review Committee. We would appreciate any comments or suggestions. If you have comments or suggestions, please respond to: UM-Post Tenure Review**.

** If this link does not work for you, please e-mail your comments to UM-POSTTENUREVIEWcommittee@umsystem.edu.
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
UMR FACULTY
Academic Council Meeting
Thursday, October 19, 2000; 1:30 P.M.; 204 McNutt

I. Chair of Post Tenure Review
   Dr. Teresa Thiel

II. Approval of minutes of the September 21, 2000 meeting

III. Reports and Responses
   A. President’s Report-to include IFC (5 min.)
      Don Myers
   B. Chancellor’s Report (15 min.)
      Keith Stanek
      (10 minutes for Questions and Answers)

IV. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
   A. Curricula (5 min.)
      Charles Morris
      1.*Report No. 3
   B. Personnel (5 min.)
      Don Myers
      1. Faculty Performances Shares Plan (September, 2000)
      2.*Resolution on Faculty Performances Shares Plan
   C. Student Affairs (10 min.)
      Mark Potrafka
      1. Academic Free Time (September, 2000)
      2. Graduate Student Council

V. Old Business
   A.*Action Items

VI. New Business and Announcements
   A. Staff Council
   B. Student Council
   C. Referrals

*Information distributed with agenda
The meeting was opened at 1:30 P.M. by President Don Myers. Roll call was taken by the office secretary. Members absent at the time of roll call were: James Stone, Martin Bohner, Matt Insall, Paul Worsey, Patrick Giunta, H.L. Tsai, Wayne Huebner, Michael Hilgers, Mark Mullin, Ronald Bieniek, Dr. Gajda, Dr. Thomas, Dr. Ogrosky, and Dean Saperstein.

There was a motion by Professor Hal Nystrom to approve the minutes of the September 21, 2000 meeting as distributed. After a second, motion carried.

President Myers mentioned that the Board of Curators meeting was on this date also, so Chancellor Thomas and Vice Chancellor Gajda were not able to attend the Council Meeting. Professor Myers then introduced Dr. Teresa Thiel, Chair of the system wide Post Tenure Review Committee.

Dr. Thiel gave a brief history of how and why this committee originated. She stated that this was not mandated by the Legislature or the Board of Curators. She said President Pacheco felt that this would happen soon, and decided to ask the Faculties to develop a Post Tenure Review document. Although this idea has been the subject of much criticism, Dr. Pacheco said it’s not realistic to say we don’t have or need it.

Dr. Thiel said that Executive Order 27 (already in existence) covers this area to some degree, but the committee did not like it for Post Tenure Review. She said it provides virtually no protection for Faculty. UMKC has a 1989 Chancellor’s Memorandum on Post Tenure Review, but it also offers no protection for Faculty.
President Pacheco asked the four campuses to provide three members each to serve on this committee, as Post Tenure Review should be Faculty-driven. The committee members felt this was an opportunity to draft a document that would protect Faculty. Their primary design is to help Faculty, not to punish a developmental plan.

Dr. Thiel briefly went over the high points of the draft document, and then invited questions and comments. Professor Myers said the three representatives from UMR (Jack Ridley, Don Myers, and Don Askeland) are looking for input. Dr. Thiel also said at the system website, faculty members can email their suggestions to the committee.

.2 REPORTS AND RESPONSES

A. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. President Myers briefly mentioned six items that were discussed at the October 6 IFC meeting.
   a. The movement to change guidelines on the Thomas Jefferson Award and to increase the stipend.
   b. A request to look at the UM System Committees (members not rotating often enough).
   c. A tuition waiver policy for Faculty and Dependents. IFC asked President Pacheco to take this under advisement.
   d. Post Tenure Review
   e. Administrator Review process
   f. Rules, policies, and procedures in selecting endowed chairs.

B. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT. Due to Dr. Thomas being away at the Board of Curators' Meeting, Professor Keith Stanek presented this report. The Rules, Procedures, and Agenda Committee asked Professor Stanek to report on Mentoring to Improve Retention, as he is the co-chair (with Carl Burns) of the Retention Committee.
1. Professor Stanek gave an overhead presentation of past enrollment losses and gains, graduation statistics, and comparisons to similar schools.

2. Professor Stanek said retention is a factor that outside people use to rate UMR and its peers.

Questions and Answers

1. Mr. Joe Maul from STUCO asked what percent of the lost students were from out of state. The answer was that the comparison with instate students is very close.

2. Professor Hal Nystrom asked if UMR is coming up with priorities as to what can be done about it. Professor Stanek said Chancellor Thomas is looking at courses with high failure and drop rates.

3. Professor Don Myers asked if anyone could doubt the importance of improving these numbers. He said the RP&A Committee is looking at ways Faculty can input that. He said he has asked Professor Arlan DeKock to chair an ad hoc committee on Mentoring with about six members.

4. Professor Stanek stated that the ExCel Program had much to do with retention.

5. There was a question as to why students are leaving, and how the problem can be addressed if you don’t know what it is. One answer was that they leave Engineering. Professor Myers said there are things Faculty can do about this—not just administration. He asked that any suggestions be given to Professor DeKock.

3 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

A. CURRICULA-Professor Charles Morris presented this Report.

1. Professor Morris said the committee recommended approval of a new Degree Program-Bachelor of Science in Architectural Engineering. He said UMR has the expertise on campus to offer this—Dr. Tony Nanni and Dr. John Myers and only one new faculty member would be needed.
a. Professor Lenn Koederitz asked how many freshman registered for the program would not come without it. Professor Morris said 90% of Kansas University’s Enrollment in this program come from Missouri.
b. Professor Hal Nystrom asked when this program could start, if approved. Professor Morris said they hope to start it next fall for incoming freshman.
c. Professor Morris then moved to approve this program. Professor Dan White seconded, and motion carried.

2. Professor Morris then moved to approve the CC1’s as distributed. Professor Dan White seconded, and motion carried.

3. Professor Morris presented the EC1’s for information only.

B. PERSONNEL-Professor Don Myers presented this report.

1. Professor Myers called the members’ attention to the Resolution on the Faculty Performance Shares Plan, which was distributed with the agenda. He then read the resolution.
2. Professor Lance Haynes moved to approve the resolution. Following a second, motion carried.

C. STUDENT AFFAIRS-Mr. Mark Potrafka presented this report on the referral to his committee concerning Academic Free Time.

1. Mr. Potrafka said that his committee and STUCO both support this. He said the committee would recommend their information and suggestions be put on the Academic Council Website for comments.
2. After a lengthy discussion, Professor Todd Hubing moved that the Student Affairs Committee work with the Registrar on a specific proposal to be put on the web site within a week. Professor Lance Haynes seconded, and motion carried.
3. Mr. Potrafka presented information concerning the Graduate Students’ Council, saying it was now inactive.
.4 No old business was presented.

.5 NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. No one was present to represent the Staff Council.

B. STUDENT COUNCIL—Mr. Joe Maul mentioned that the Parking, Security, and Traffic Committee had removed the bans on skateboards and rollerblades on campus, as long as they were not in buildings.

Professor Charles Morris moved to adjourn. There was a second and motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Lenn Koederitz
Secretary

*Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
MEMO TO: Academic Council
From: UMR Campus Curricula Committee
RE: October 2, 2000, Meeting

The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends to the Academic Council that the new degree program on the following CC1 be approved.

CC1 4912, Civil Engineering, Proposal of new Bachelor's of Science Degree in Architectural Engineering. Approved for the Fall 2001 semester.

The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends to the Academic Council that the curricula changes on the following CC1s be approved.

CC1 4896, Geology 489, Ore Deposition. Approved for FS2000. Change of prerequisites from Geo 292 "TO" Geo 294. Description changed to: An advanced study of mineral deposits, time and space in deposition, theories of deposition and their effect on exploration. Discussions based on maps, logs, and samples from the world's typical mineral deposits. Two all day field trips at student expense required.

CC1 4910, Computer Science 342, Java GUI & Visualization. Approved new course for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Cmp Sc 253 or equivalent. Description: Fundamentals of Java swing foundation classes, Java system language specifics, graphical user interfaces, images, audio, animation, networking and threading. Visualization of algorithms. GUI elements include event driven programming, interaction with mouse and keyboard, window managers, frames, panels, dialog boxes, borders.

CC1 4911, Computer Science 000. Approved changes in curriculum for FS2000. Freshman year, second semester, Bio 110 & 112 replaced with lab science course(s). Senior year, second semester, Cmp Sc 298 replaced with Free elective. Footnote one added: These course(s) maybe selected from: Chem 1, 2 & 4; Bio Sc 110 and 112; Physics 9, 11 and 10; and Geology 51.
For the information of the Academic Council, the following EC1s have been submitted by the University departments for an experimental course that will be offered in the near future. No action is needed by the Academic Council for these experimental courses.

EC1 1132, Geological Engineering 401, Discontinuous Rock. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Introductory course in geology.

EC1 1133, History 301, 20th Century Americans in Combat. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: History 175 or 176.

EC1 1134, Geological Engineering 301, Aggregates & Quarrying. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Introductory course in geology. This statement was added to the description: Credit cannot be received for both this course and Ge Eng 401, Aggregates & Quarrying.

EC1 1135, Geological Engineering 401, Aggregates & Quarrying. Approved for WS2001. Prerequisites: Introductory course in geology. This statement was added to the description: Credit cannot be received for both this course and Ge Eng 301, Aggregates & Quarrying.

EC1 1136, Computer Science 401, Web Data management and XML. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Cmp Sc 304. Consent of instructor removed from the prerequisite.

EC1 1137, Electrical Engineering 301, Electrical Systems for Industrial & Commercial Buildings. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: EI Eng 281 or EI Eng 152 and 153 or equivalent.

EC1 1138, Physics 101, College Physics. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Math 6 or equivalent with a grade of "C" or better.

J. Keith Nisbett, Chair
PROPOSED RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the University has developed a Faculty Performance Shares Plan for 2000-2001, and

WHEREAS, this Campus developed criteria and a selection process for selecting awardees for 2000-2001 with some input from the Personnel Committee of the Academic Council with the understanding that the criteria and selection process would be reviewed again upon completion of the process for this first year;

IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED:

That the Academic Council be provided a list of award recipients and the justifications presented for each awardee and that the Academic Council be included in the review of the criteria and selection process for 2001-2002 that will permit timely input for consideration.
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

ACTION ITEMS

Date of Passage

January, 2000

Subject

Resolution on Video/Distance Learning

REFERRED TO

Dr. Thomas
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

To: UMR FACULTY
Academic Council Meeting
Thursday, November 16, 2000; 1:30 P.M.; 204 McNutt

I. Approval of minutes of the October 19, 2000 meeting

II. Reports and Responses
   A. President’s Report-to include IFC (10 min.) Don Myers
   B. Chancellor’s Report (10 min.) Gary Thomas
      (10 minutes for Questions and Answers)

III. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
   A. Curricula (5 min.) Charles Morris
      1. *Report No. 4
   B. Student Affairs (5 min.) Mark Potrafka
      1. *Constitution of Omicron Delta Kappa

IV. Old Business
   A. *Action Items

V. New Business and Announcements
   A. Staff Council
   B. Student Council
   C. Referrals

*Information distributed with agenda
The UMR Campus Curricula Committee forwards without recommendation the Bachelor of Science degree in Information Science and Technology to the Academic Council.

CC1 4925, BS in Information Science and Technology.
The UMR Campus Curricula Committee expressed an opinion that in general the program is sound and should be moved forward in a timely manner, but that it needs to address the concerns expressed by Management Systems before final campus approval. Dr. Rao agreed to pursue discussions with appropriate students and faculty of Management Systems immediately. This committee agreed to reconsider its recommendation to Academic Council before its Nov. 16 meeting, based on the results of the discussions with Management Systems. The following documentation improvements were also specified: 1) Discussion of duplication of programs within the state, 2) Discussion of the administrative organization of the interdisciplinary program, 3) Correction of statements about Program Accreditation, 4) Clarification of which courses in the program are new, existing, or co-listed with existing courses.

The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends to the Academic Council that the new degree program on the following CC1 be approved.

CC1 4926, MS in Information Science and Technology.
Approved for FS 2001, with instructions to add the following to the documentation: 1) Discussion of duplication of programs within the state, 2) Discussion of the administrative organization of the interdisciplinary program, 3) Further definition of specific courses to be used in Core Courses and Specialty Modules.
The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends to the Academic Council that the curricula changes on the following CC1s be approved.

CCl 4913, Geology 260, Methods of Karst Hydrogeology. Approved new course for WS2001. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisite: Geol 51 or Ge Eng 50 and Geol 223. Description: This course is designed to familiarize geologists and geological engineers with karst hydrogeology. It will include the formation of karst, aquatic geochemistry in karst areas, identifying karst features and understanding their hydrologic significance. The techniques for investigating groundwater in karst areas will be emphasized, and will include groundwater tracing using fluorescent dyes. Several field trips at student expense will be required.

CCl 4914, History 325, History of Renaissance Thought. Approved new course for FS2001. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisites: History 111 or History 112. Description: Concentrates on the political, religious, and social thought of the Renaissance. Particular emphasis on the revival of the classics, the spread of humanistic values, and reform efforts during the period with relationship to the material basis of society.

CCl 4915, Political Science 237, Contemporary Political Thought. Approved new course for FS2001. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisites: History 175 or History 176 or Pol Sc 090. Description: A survey of Western ideas that have contributed to our contemporary understanding of the world: liberalism, conservatism, Marxism-Leninism, democratic socialism and fascism. This course shall explore the impact of ideas on American politics, including the relationship between public policy and political philosophy; this will be accomplished through the study of American political institutions using an elite model of politics. Co-listed with History 237.

CCl 4916, Civil Engineering 361, Remediation of Contaminated Groundwater and Soil. Approved new course for WS2001. Co-listed with Env Eng 361. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: Cv Eng 265, Ge Eng 337 or Graduate Standing. Description: Course covers current in-site and ex-site remediation technologies. Current literature and case studies are utilized to provide the focus for class discussions and projects.

CCl 4917, Environmental Engineering 361, Remediation of Contaminated Groundwater and Soil. Approved new course for WS2001. Co-listed with Cv Eng 361. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: Cv Eng 265, Ge Eng 337 or Graduate Standing. Description: Course covers current in-site and ex-site remediation technologies. Current literature and case studies are utilized to provide the focus for class discussions and projects.

CCl 4918, Basic Engineering 342, Introduction to Solar Car Design. Approved new course for FS2001. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisites: Math 204 or 229. Description: the course provides an introduction to designing and building a solar car for participating in national and international competitions. Topics include power management, race rules, solar array, batteries, electric motors, chassis structure, suspension, drive train, steering, brakes, signals, displays and controls, management structure, and race logistics.
CC1 4919, Electrical Engineering 357, Communications Circuits. Approved new course for FS2001. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisites: EI Eng 254, preceded or accompanied by EI Eng 243. Description: Analysis and design of circuits used in communication systems. Topics include RF semiconductor devices, low-noise amplifiers, mixers, modulators, crystal oscillators, AGC circuits, high-power RF amplifiers, phase-locked loops, impedance matching, and frequency-selective networks and transformers.

CC1 4920, Electrical Engineering 337, Neural Networks for Control. Approved for FS2001. Change in credit hours from 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab “TO” 3 hours lecture. Change in description to: Introduction to artificial neural networks and various supervised and unsupervised learning techniques. Detailed analysis of some of the neural networks that are used in control and identification of dynamical systems. Applications of neural networks in the area of Control. Case studies and a term project.

CC1 4921, History 237, Contemporary Political Thought. Approved new course for FS2001. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisites: History 175 or History 176 or Pol Sc 090. Description: A survey of Western ideas that have contributed to our contemporary understanding of the world: liberalism, conservatism, Marxism-Leninism, democratic socialism and fascism. This course shall explore the impact of ideas on American politics, including the relationship between public policy and political philosophy; this will be accomplished through the study of American political institutions using an elite model of politics. Co-list with Pol Sc 237.

CC1 4922, Physics, 000. Approved change in curriculum for WS2001. Justification reads: This is a correction to the total number of hours for a B.S. degree. Hours changed from 132 total to 130 total hours.

For the information of the Academic Council, the following EC1s have been submitted by the University departments for an experimental course that will be offered in the near future. No action is needed by the Academic Council for these experimental courses.


EC1 1140, Ceramic Engineering 301, Chemical Processes in Refractories. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisites: Cr Eng 259. (The committee requested a prerequisite be added to this 300 level course.)

EC1 1141, Geology 301, Petroleum Exploration Simulation. Approved for WS2001. 1 hour lab. Prerequisite: Geol 340.

EC1 1142, Mathematics 401, Set Theory III-Advanced Topics. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisites: A previous graduate level set theory course.
EC1 1143, Civil Engineering 401, Environmental Aquatic Chemistry. Approved for WS2001. Co-listed with Env Eng 401, Environmental Aquatic Chemistry. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisite: Chem 1, Chem 2 or equivalent.

EC1 1144, Environmental Engineering 401, Environmental Aquatic Chemistry. Approved for WS2001. Co-listed with Civil Eng 401, Environmental Aquatic Chemistry. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisite: Chem 1, Chem 2 or equivalent.

EC1 1145, Education 301, Balanced Literacy Series. Approved for WS2001. 1 hour lecture. Prerequisite: Post Bac-practicing teacher.

The committee was asked to extend the period in which both Bas Eng 50 and Bas Eng 51 may be offered to students. At the January 10, 2000, meeting the committee had approved the experimental offering of both Bas Eng 50 and Bas Eng 51 for the FS2000 and WS2001 semesters, with the understanding that one of the courses would then be deleted. Dr. Ron Fannin requested an extension since deadlines for FS2001 Schedule of Classes will occur before the first trial semester is completed. The committee approved an extension through WS 2002, at which time a decision is to be made as to the long term disposition of the two courses.

J. Keith Nisbett
Chair, UMR Campus Curricula Committee
Constitution of the Omicron Delta Kappa Society, Inc.

ARTICLE I -- Name

The name of this organization shall be Excelsior Circle of Omicron Delta Kappa at the University of Missouri - Rolla.

ARTICLE II -- Purpose

The Omicron Delta Kappa Society is a leadership honor society with a threefold purpose:

A. To recognize individuals who have attained a high standard of leadership in collegiate and/or community activities and to encourage them to aspire to higher achievements.

B. To bring together the most representative individuals in all phases of collegiate life and thus to create an organization which will help to mold the sentiment of the institution on questions of local and intercollegiate interest.

C. To bring together members of the faculty and student body of the institution, as well as other Omicron Delta Kappa members, on a basis of mutual interest, understanding, and helpfulness.

ARTICLE III -- Emblem and Seal

A. The emblem of the Society shall be a circular key crossed by two bars between which shall appear the Greek letters OΔK. The upper bar shall contain five stars and the lower bar the date 1914.

B. The circular portion of the same design shall constitute the basis for the official seal of the Society, provided that the seal shall contain, in addition, the full name of the Society around the circular portion.

ARTICLE IV -- Membership

A. There shall be four classes of members:

1. Student Members shall be those duly selected and initiated into membership as students by a circle of the Society and they shall be so designated during the remaining period of their collegiate enrollment.

2. Faculty Members shall be those members of the faculty or the administrative staff selected and initiated into membership by the circle as faculty members or members formerly initiated who may subsequently serve on the faculty or staff of such an institution.

3. Alumni Members shall be former Student members after their graduation or the termination of their collegiate enrollment, or those selected and initiated by a collegiate circle after graduation.

4. Honorary Members shall be those selected and initiated honoris causa by a circle of the Society. Honors causa members should have demonstrated outstanding achievements in the local, state, national or international community.

B. Membership in Omicron Delta Kappa entitles the person selected to the rights and privileges of membership for the remainder of the member's life, except that only voting members may vote and hold office in a local circle.
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

ACTION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Passage</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Referred To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January, 2000</td>
<td>Resolution on Video/Distance Learning</td>
<td>Dr. Thomas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XXX,3. The meeting was opened at 1:35 P.M. by President Don Myers. Roll call was taken by the office secretary. Members absent at the time of roll call were: James Stone, Kristine Swenson, Shubhender Kapila, Kurt Kosbar, Roger Brown, Wayne Huebner, Mark Mullin, Dr. Gajda, and Dr. Ogrosky.

There was a motion by Professor Lenn Koederitz to add the Public Occasions Committee to the agenda. There was a second and motion carried. There was a motion and a second to approve the minutes of the October 19, 2000 meeting as distributed. Motion carried.

1 REPORTS AND RESPONSES

A. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

1. Professor Myers began this report with a Thought for the Day: “Education is the ability to listen to almost anything without losing your temper”.

2. President Myers mentioned the Post Tenure Review Process.
   a. He said the U-wide committee solicited comments, and made modifications. This revised version is being submitted to President Pacheco, with the comments included.
   b. Professor Myers said this proposed document will be on the Academic Council web site, along with frequently asked questions. He said they would like a UMR Faculty vote as to their feelings on this proposed policy, which has been renamed, “The Post Tenure Development Policy”.
c. Professor Lenn Koederitz moved to poll all Faculty on this, and submit the results to President Pacheco. Professor Greg Gelles seconded. Motion carried.

3. President Myers said that many of the Academic Council Committees had not yet organized this fall, or elected chairs. He stated that he was going to request that each committee do so right away. This is necessary in order for the Council to get a response for requests for input.

4. Professor Myers asked Professor Ralph Wilkerson to report on the last IFC Meeting. Professor Wilkerson listed the subjects that were discussed: Administrator Review Process; Post Tenure Review Policy; Problems Foreseen with Faculty Recruitment; and Copyright Ownership of Web-based Materials.

B. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

1. Dr. Thomas said that it was natural the copyright ownership is a “hot topic”. He said there is a need to compare web-based courses and telecommunications with residential education.

2. The Chancellor referred to a handout that was distributed, dealing with new positions in Administration, which are: Provost; Dean of Enrollment Management; Vice Provost for Research; and Vice Chancellor of Information Technology.
   a. Dr. Thomas said a search committee for the Provost position has been formed, and includes Tony Nanni(Chair), Laura Stoll, Marvin Patton, David Summers, John Watson, Paula Lutz, Neil Smith, Wayne Bledsoe, and a student.
   b. The Chancellor elaborated on the need for these changes, which would aid recruitment and retention.

3. On the subject of Intellectual Properties, the Chancellor said there is a need to come to a quick agreement on protecting Intellectual Property, and then move on to the effective use of it.
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Professor Lance Haynes said he understood the Chancellor was encouraging Faculty to take more interest in Budgetary Affairs; and, in that vein, he would like to ask how the new administrative positions would be funded.
   a. Dr. Thomas said a consensus is needed to face the new problems next year.
   b. He said that he would be making a presentation to the Chancellor's Staff and Department Chairs on options for next year.
   c. He further stated that he feels UMR must have a Dean of Enrollment Management Planning to reverse the trend of falling enrollment.

2. There was a question as to whether the Chancellor was implying that schools that outrank UMR in enrollment do so because they have a Dean of Enrollment, and also what offices would be combined for this position.
   a. Dr. Thomas said Financial Aid and Administrative Records would be combined.

3. A council member asked if the position of Dean of Enrollment Management replaces another position, and when did the Chancellor hope to have this person in place.
   a. The Chancellor said “no” in answer to the first question, and “March, 2001” to the second one.

4. Professor Matt Insall asked who really knows the reasons Students leave UMR. Dr. Thomas said the best way to keep them here is just to teach the courses well.

5. There was a question as to whether the Dean of Enrollment Management would also work with the recruitment of graduate students, and the Chancellor answered in the affirmative.

.2 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES
A. CURRICULA-Professor Charles Morris presented this report.

1. Professor Morris moved to approve the BS degree in Information Science and Technology.
   a. There was a second, followed by comments and discussion, including recommendations from Professors Stanek and St. Clair that this be approved.
   b. Vote was taken, and motion carried.
2. Professor Morris moved to approve the CC1’s. Professor Lance Haynes seconded, and motion carried.
3. Professor Morris presented the EC1’s for information only.

B. STUDENT AFFAIRS-Mr. Mark Potrafka presented this Report.

1. Mr. Potrafka presented the Constitution of Omicron Delta Kappa, and recommended that it be approved. Professor Lance Haynes moved to approve. Professor Dan White seconded, and motion carried.

C. PUBLIC OCCASIONS-This report was presented by Professor Jerry Bayless.

1. Professor Bayless distributed copies of the recommended Academic Calendar for 2002-2003. He noted that the name of the second semester has been changed to Spring Semester. Professor Lenn Koederitz moved to approve the calendar. After a second, motion carried. (See attached)
2. Professor Bayless then presented the Public Event Dates for 2001-2002. Professor Lance Haynes moved to approve. There was a second, and motion carried. (See attached)

4 OLD BUSINESS
A. Professor Hal Nystrom moved to approve the resolution on Academic Free Time that was read at the October meeting. After a second, Professor Jerry Cohen read from a handout he had distributed. (See attached)

1. Professor Lance Haynes moved to postpone consideration of the motion on the floor. There was a second, and motion carried, with two opposed.

2. Professor Lance Haynes moved that Professor Cohen’s proposal be approved. Professor Greg Gelles seconded.
   a. Chancellor Thomas said a delay would be bad, as this free time is needed by the students.
   b. A vote was taken and motion failed with 4 in favor, and 12 opposed.

3. A vote was then taken on Professor Nystrom’s motion. Motion carried.

B. A discussion ensued concerning the search for a Provost. A Proposed resolution was read by Professor Lance Haynes (See attached), who moved to approve. Professor Ralph Wilkerson seconded, and motion carried.

.5 NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. There were no reports from Staff and Student Councils.

B. President Myers made a referral to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, and also to the ad hoc Mentoring Committee to review the issues associated with “sticking points”.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lenn Koederitz, Secretary

*Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
FALL SEMESTER 2003

International Student Orientation
Fall Semester opens 7:30 a.m.
Freshman Orientation Begins
Transfer Student Orientation
Student Registration 8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Classwork begins 7:30 a.m.
Labor Day Holiday
Mid-Semester
Thanksgiving vacation begins 7:30 a.m.
Thanksgiving vacation ends 7:30 a.m.
Last Class Day
Reading Day
Final Examinations begin 8:00 a.m.
Final Examinations end 6:00 p.m.
Fall Semester closes 6:00 p.m.
December Commencement

August 13, Tuesday
August 18, Sunday
August 18, Sunday
August 21, Wednesday
August 22, Thursday
August 26, Monday
September 2, Monday
October 19, Saturday
November 27, Wednesday
December 2, Monday
December 13, Friday
December 14, Saturday
December 16, Monday
December 20, Friday
December 20, Friday
December 21, Saturday

SPRING SEMESTER 2003

International Student Orientation
Spring Semester opens 7:30 a.m.
Student Registration 8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Classwork begins 7:30 a.m.
Martin Luther King, Jr. Recognition Holiday
Mid-Semester
Spring Recess begins 7:30 a.m.
Spring Recess ends 7:30 a.m.
Spring Break begins 7:30 a.m.
Spring Break ends 7:30 a.m.
Last Class Day
Reading Day
Final Examinations begin 8:00 a.m.
Final Examinations end 6:00 p.m.
Spring Semester closes 6:00 p.m.
May Commencement

January 6, Monday
January 9, Thursday
January 9, Thursday
January 13, Monday
January 20, Monday
March 8, Saturday
March 13, Thursday
March 17, Monday
March 30, Sunday
April 7, Monday
May 9, Friday
May 10, Saturday
May 12, Monday
May 16, Friday
May 16, Friday
May 17, Saturday

*SUMMER SESSION 2003

Summer Session opens 7:30 a.m.
Student Registration 8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Classwork begins 7:30 a.m.
Independence Day Holiday
Summer Sessions closes 12:30 p.m.

June 9, Monday
June 9, Monday
June 10, Monday
July 4, Friday
August 2, Saturday

*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>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Semester</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faculty is reminded of the religious and other holidays that a substantial number of students may wish to observe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Career Fair</td>
<td>Thursday, September 27, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homecoming</td>
<td>Friday &amp; Saturday, September 28, 29, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolla Night at the Engineers's Club of St. Louis</td>
<td>Thursday, October 4, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Council Free Day</td>
<td>Friday, October 5, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Day, UM-Rolla Day</td>
<td>Saturday, October 20, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement*</td>
<td>Saturday, December 15, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Career Fair</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 13, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering Fair</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 27, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Open House**</td>
<td>Saturday, April 13, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement*</td>
<td>Saturday, May 18, 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Previously established as part of 2001-02 calendar
**Consideration is being given to holding this event on a weekday.
Meeting, Nov. 16, 2000
Academic Council

Dear Colleagues:

I am writing to express doubts about the plan to remove 12:30 classes from the schedule next fall:

(1) In order for the plan to retain at-risk students, those students have to come to the meetings. But many of them are precisely the ones who often skip class (That's why they're at risk.) How therefore can they be relied upon to come to extra-curricular meetings?

(2) Students taking a 12:30 class (e.g., German 70) might not be able to sign up for this class due to a conflict if the class is shifted to 11:30 or 1:30. In other words, classes like my German 70 will LOSE students because some of them will need to take a required course at another hour. The advantage of 12:30 classes is that there aren't too many of them; this permits students to take a 12:30 class and also leave the very important hours of 11:30 and 1:30 free for required courses in their major.

(3) Merely eliminating all 12:30 classes does not free up this hour for all faculty and students. Someone with classes at 10:30 and 11:30 will want to eat at 12:30. The same goes for someone with classes at 11:30 and 1:30. And there will be a lot of both.

(4) It is one thing to ask faculty members to come to an occasional additional meeting or seminar. It is quite another to have several additional meetings a week at this hour. We faculty are all strapped for time. Students are all strapped for time. To expect everyone to start showing up for several meetings a week seems unrealistic.

In any case, I still don't see just what will be accomplished by all the meetings and seminars. How precisely will they retain students?

(5) The proposal to eliminate the 12:30 teaching hour seems to have been advanced without anyone soliciting input from the faculty. It is important that this oversight now be corrected. The elimination of 12:30 classes should be put on hold until the pros and cons of this step are examined. In particular, the faculty as a whole should be given the opportunity to set forth the anticipated drawbacks to the plan.
Our first task at UMR is to teach well, and access to the 12:30 hour is helpful in realizing this goal. If we as faculty give up that benefit, we should really be sure that the trade-off is justified. And presently that is not the case.

***

I would therefore be grateful if the following motion were considered:

Resolved: The Academic Council will ask one of its committees (ad hoc, if necessary) to review the proposal to eliminate the 12:30 hour from the teaching schedule. Before making its recommendation the committee will seek input from the faculty as a whole concerning the pros and cons of the elimination of that teaching hour.

Sincerely,

Jerry Cohen
Professor of German and Russian

P.S. The Chemistry Department offers three sets of labs (7:30-10:30, 10:30-1:30, and 1:30-4:30). Elimination of the 12:30 teaching hour would require the Chemistry Department to transfer the 10:30-1:30 labs to the evening. The holding of labs requires safety personnel to be available, who normally go home at 4:30. Holding the labs in the evening would seem to require the additional expense of hiring safety personnel for those later hours. And the holding of Chemistry labs in the evening might conflict with the labs of other departments which until now have not had competition with Chemistry in the evening hours. In other words, a pause to look at the whole situation might be in order before the Academic Council as a whole gives its approval to the change.
Proposed Resolution concerning Search Committees for Senior Administrators
WHEREAS the Academic Council is responsible for carrying out the functions and responsibilities of the General Faculty; and
WHEREAS the Chancellor from time to time ask for representatives of the General Faculty to serve on Search Committees; and
WHEREAS By-law 0402.0102 (ref. Policy Memorandum Number 2-70, "Academic Dean Search Procedure") states that the position of Dean of a school or college will be nominated by the Chancellor after consultation with a committee elected by and from the faculty of the school or college;
The Academic Council resolves that, by extension, the campus Provost, Vice Chancellors, and such other senior academic positions as may be created in the future, will also be nominated by the Chancellor after consultation with a committee that includes representatives elected by and from the General Faculty.
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

To: UMR FACULTY
Academic Council Meeting
Thursday, January 18, 2001; 1:30 P.M.; 204 McNutt

I. Approval of minutes of the November 16, 2000 meeting

II. Reports and Responses
   A. President’s Report-to include IFC (10 min.) Don Myers
   B. Chancellor’s Report (10 min.) Gary Thomas
      (10 minutes for Questions and Answers)

III. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
   A. Admissions and Academic Standards (5 min.) Mariesa Crow
   B. Ad Hoc Mentoring Committee (5 min.) Arlan DeKock
   C. Curricula (5 min.) Charles Morris
      1.*Reports No. 5 and 6
   D. Rules, Procedure and Agenda (5 min.) Jeff Cawlfield

IV. Old Business
   A. *Action Items

V. New Business and Announcements
   A. Staff Council
   B. Student Council
   C. Referrals

*Information distributed with agenda
Memo To: Academic Council  
From: UMR Campus Curricula Committee  
RE: December 4, 2000, Meeting

The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends to the Academic Council that the curricula changes on the following CC1s be approved.

CC1s:
4923, Mining Engineering 383, Tunneling & Underground Construction Techniques, approved for WS2001. Change in prerequisites from Mi Eng 231, and Mi Eng 325, or Cv Eng 211 preceded or accompanied by Cv Eng 245 or Ge Eng 341 “TO” Mi Eng 231, Mi Eng 325 or Cv Eng 215, Cv Eng 216 or Ge Eng 371.

4924, Chemical Engineering 000, Curriculum change, Biochemical Engineering Emphasis Program, approved for FS2001. Justification reads: The proposed new curriculum provides a more in-depth knowledge and education in the analysis and design of stage operations and also removes the repetition of similar topics among the courses of Bio Sc and Bio Chem.

4927, Ceramic Engineering 090, The Ceramic Experience, approved for WS2001. Justification reads: Introductory experience for students (specifically freshmen) who have an interest in the field of ceramic engineering. This course is being change from a required course to an elective.

4928, Ceramic Engineering 000, curriculum change, approved for WS2001. Justification reads: changes in curriculum due to changes in credit hours and dropping a required course.

4929, Ceramic Engineering 315, Organic Additives in Ceramic Processing, approved for WS2001. Change in credit hours from 3 hours “TO” 2 hours.

4932, Nuclear Engineering 423, Nuclear Reactor Safety, approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Changed from Nu Eng 305 and 321 “TO” Nu Eng 303 and 321.

4933, Mechanical Engineering 304, Compliant Mechanism Design, approved new course for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Mc Eng 213, Bas En 110. Description: Introduction to compliant mechanisms; review of rigid-body mechanism analysis and synthesis methods; synthesis of planar
mechanisms with force/energy constraints using graphical and analytical
methods; pseudo-rigid-body models; force-deflection relationships; compliant
mechanism synthesis methods; and special topics, e.g. bistable mechanisms,
constant-force mechanisms, parallel mechanisms, and chain algorithm in
design. Emphasis will be on applying the assimilated knowledge through a
project on compliant mechanisms design.

4934, Mechanical Engineering 453, Advanced Computer Numerical Control of
Manufacturing Processes and Engineering Metrology, approved new course
WS2001. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisite: Mc Eng 353.
Description: Advanced treatment of Computer Numerical Control (CNC) part
programming and machine tool metrology. Topics include mathematical
modeling and characterization of machine tools and Coordinate Measuring
Machines (CMMs); Measurement and analysis of dimensional accuracy,
surface finish, precision, and uncertainty; Machine tool error modeling and
compensation; Virtual Numerical Control (VNC) Machine Tool Modeling,
programming, simulation and process verification/optimization. Projects
include advanced CNC programming and simulation.

4935, Electrical Engineering 225, Electronic & Photonic Devices, approved for
WS2001. Change in prerequisites from Physics 24, Math 22, and preceded or
accompanied by El Eng 275 “TO” Physics 24, Math 22, and preceded or
accompanied by El Eng 271.

Change in prerequisite from El Eng 262 “TO” El Eng 267.

4937, Electrical Engineering 243, Communications Systems, approved for

4938, Electrical Engineering 303, Electrical Distribution System Design &
Protection, approved for WS2001. Change in prerequisite from El Eng 206
“TO” El Eng 207.

4939, Electrical Engineering 305, Electric Drive Systems, approved for
WS2001. Change in prerequisite from El Eng 204 and El Eng 231 “TO” El Eng
205 and El Eng 231.

4940 Electrical Engineering 307, Power Systems Engineering, approved for

4941, Electrical Engineering 324, Fourier Optics, approved for WS2001. Co-
list with Physics 324. Change in prerequisites from El Eng 261 * 275 or
Physics 208 & 321 “TO” El Eng 265 and 271 or Physics 208 and 321.

Change in prerequisites from Cp Eng 111 & El Eng 275 or equivalent “TO” Cp
Eng 111 and El Eng 271 or equivalent.

4943, Electrical Engineering 326, Fiber and Integrated Optics, approved for
or Physics 321 “TO” El Eng 271 or Physics 321.
4944, Electrical Engineering 327, Fiber Optic Communication Systems, approved for WS2001. Change in prerequisites from EI Eng 265 or EI Eng 261, EI Eng 253 or EI Eng 251, preceded or accompanied by EI Eng 243 and EI Eng 225 “TO” EI Eng 265 and EI Eng 253, preceded or accompanied by EI Eng 243 and EI Eng 225.


4959, Electrical Engineering 391, Electrical Engineering Senior Project I, approved for WS2001. Change in prerequisites from Stat, Cp Eng 111, Econ 121 or 122, Sp&MS 85, English 160, at least 3 of the following: El Eng 204, El Eng 206, El Eng 261, El Eng 262, El Eng 275, El Eng 252 “TO” Stat 217, Cp Eng 111, Econ 121 or 122, Sp&MS 85, English 160, at least 3 of the following: elk Eng 205, El Eng 207, El Eng 265, El Eng 267, El Eng 271, El Eng 254.


4961, Electrical Engineering 406, Power System Stability, approved for WS2001. Change in prerequisite from El Eng 207 or El Eng 206 or similar course “TO” El Eng 207 or similar course.

4962, Electrical Engineering 408, Computer Methods in Power System Analysis, approved for WS2001. Change in prerequisites from El Eng 207, El Eng 206 or similar course “TO” El Eng 207 or similar course.


For the information of the Academic Council, the following EC1s have been submitted by the University departments for an experimental course that will be offered in the near future. No action is needed by the Academic Council for these experimental courses.

EC1s:
1146, English 301, History of King Arthur, approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: English 020.

1147, Mathematics 401, Number Theory, approved for SS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Math 305 or equivalent.

1148, Mining Engineering 301, Environmental Controls for Blasting, approved for WS2001. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisite: Mi Eng 307. Added to the course description: Credit can only be given for either Mi Eng
301, Environmental Controls for Blasting or Mi Eng 402, Environmental Controls for Blasting.

1149, Education 301, Professional Development, approved for WS2001. 1 hour credit. Prerequisite: Graduate Standing.

1150, Education 301, Reading in the Content Fields, approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Graduate Standing.

J. Keith Nisbett, Chair
MEMO TO:  Academic Council  
FROM:  UMR Campus Curricula Committee  
RE:  January 8, 2001, Meeting  

The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends approval of the proposed Masters of Engineering Degree in Materials Engineering.


The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends to the Academic Council that the curricula changes on the following CCls be approved.

Approved CCls:
CCl 4968, Civil Engineering 211, Transportation Engineering. Approved for FS2001. Change in credit hours from 3 hours lecture "TO" 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Change in prerequisites from Cv Eng 001, Cv Eng 241, Bas En 50, all with a grade of "C" or better "TO" Cv Eng 001, Cv Eng 241, Bas En 50, Stat 213, all with a grade of "C" or better.

CCl 4969, Civil Engineering 311, Highway Engineering. Approved for FS2001. Change in course title from Highway Engineering "TO" Geometric Design of Highways. Change in catalog description to: Development and applications of concepts of geometric design for rural and urban highways. Design controls and criteria; elements of design, including sight distance, horizontal and vertical alignment; cross-section; highway types; intersection design elements; types of interchanges and interchange design elements; grade separations and clearance; development of visual elements.

CCl 4971, Electrical Engineering 329, Smart Materials and Sensors. Approved new course FS2001. (Co-listed with Cv Eng, Ae Eng, and Mc Eng 329.) 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: Senior standing and math 204. Description: Smart structures with fiber reinforced polymer (FRP) composites and advanced sensors. Multidisciplinary topics include characterization, performance, and fabrication of composite structures; fiber optic, resistance, and piezoelectric systems for strain sensing; and applications of smart composite structures. Laboratory and team activities involve manufacturing, measurement systems, instrumented structures, and performance tests on a large-scale smart composite bridge.
CC1 4972, Electrical Engineering 338, Fuzzy Logic Control. Approved new course FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: El Eng 231. Description: A mathematical introduction to the analysis, synthesis, and design of control systems using fuzzy sets and fuzzy logic. A study of the fundamentals of fuzzy sets, operations on these sets, and their geometrical interpretations. Methodologies to design fuzzy models and feedback controllers for dynamical systems. Various applications and case studies.

For the information of the Academic Council, the following EC1s have been submitted by the University departments for an experimental course that will be offered in the near future.

**Approved EC1s:**

EC1 1131, Computer Engineering 401, Adaptive Critic Designs. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Background in Markov processes. (This EC1 was approved on September 11, 2000, as a “301” for FS2001. The department requests that this EC1 be circulated again to show the change in course number from “301” changed to “401”.)

EC1 1151, Education 301, Evaluating Professional Development. Approved for WS2001. 1 hour credit. Prerequisite: Practicing educator.

EC1 1152, Education 301, Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice. Approved for WS2001. 1 hour credit. Prerequisite: Practicing educator.


EC1 1154, Geology 301, Carbonate Sedimentology. Approved for FS2001. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: Geo 130, Geo 275 and Geo 223.

EC1 1155, English 301, Medieval and Renaissance Drama. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: English 20.

EC1 1156, Civil Engineering 301, Teaching Engineering. Approved for SS2001. (Co-listed with Env Eng, Cp Eng, Eng Mg, and El Eng) 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Graduate standing and consent of instructor. (Note: This course was originally circulated as a 401 course.)

EC1 1157, Environmental Engineering 301, Teaching Engineering. Approved for SS2001. (Co-listed with Cv Eng, Cp Eng, Eng Mg, and El Eng). 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Graduate standing and consent of instructor. (Note: This course was originally circulated as a 401 course.)

EC1 1158, Computer Engineering 301, Teaching Engineering. Approved for SS2001. (Co-listed with Cv Eng, Env Eng, Eng Mg, and El Eng). 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Graduate standing and consent of instructor. (Note: This course was originally circulated as a 401 course.)
EC1 1159, Electrical Engineering 301, Teaching Engineering. Approved for SS2001. (Co-listed with Cv Eng, Env Eng, Eng Mg, and Cp Eng). 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Graduate standing and consent of instructor. (Note: This course was originally circulated as a 401 course.)

EC1 1160, Engineering Management 301, Teaching Engineering. Approved for SS2001. (Co-listed with Cv Eng, Env Eng, El Eng, and Cp Eng). 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Graduate standing and consent of instructor. (Note: This course was originally circulated as a 401 course.)

EC1 1161, Computer Science 401, Trustworthy Survivable Computer Networks. Approved for FS2001. (Co-listed with Cp Eng 401.) 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Cp Eng 319 or Cmp Sc 385.


EC1 1164, Computer Engineering 401, Systems & Software. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Cp Eng 313 or Cp Eng 315 or Cp Eng 317 or Cp Eng 319 or graduate standing.

EC1 1165, Computer Engineering 401, Trustworthy, Survivable Computer Networks. Approved for FS2001. (Co-listed with Cmp Sc 401.) 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Cp Eng 319 or Cmp Sc 385.

EC1 1166, Electrical Engineering 301, Power Electronics Laboratory. Approved for FS2001. 1 hour lab. Prerequisite: co-requisite El Eng 353.

EC1 1181, Education 301, Current Issues in Education: Performance Based Assessment, Advanced, WS2001. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisite: Practicing educator.

EC1 1182, Education 301, Current Issues in Education: Performance Based Assessment, Beginning, WS2001. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisite: Practicing educator.

J. Keith Nisbett, Chair
Date of Passage  
January, 2000

Subject  
Resolution on Video/Distance Learning

REferred TO  
Dr. Thomas
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

LATE ADDITIONS TO AGENDA
ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
JANUARY 18, 2001

III. Reports of Standing and Special Committees

E. PUBLIC OCCASIONS (5 min.) Jerry Bayless

IV. Old Business

B. Report from vote on Post Tenure Review Document Jeff Cawlfield
XXX,4. The meeting was called to order at 1:35 P.M. by President Don Myers. Roll Call was taken by the office secretary. Members absent were: James Stone, Matt Insall, Patrick Guinta, Richard Hall, Shubhender Kapila, S.N. Balakrishnan, H.L. Tsai, Lance Haynes, Ronald Bieniek, and Wendell Ogrosky. There was a motion to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2000 meeting as distributed. There was a second, and the vote was taken. Motion carried.

1 REPORTS AND RESPONSES

A. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

1. President Myers called on Jeff Cawlfield to give a report from IFC meetings. Professor Cawlfield mentioned items of discussion at the most recent meeting.
   a. Faculty evaluation of Administrators
   b. Post Tenure Review Document—It was reported that the survey here concerning this document resulted in 45 yes votes and 5 no votes. At the other campuses—UMKC voted nearly unanimously in support of the document. UMSL voted about 2-1 in favor. UMC had 60% of their 437 votes against supporting the new document.
   c. Discussion and clarification about the Engineering department at UMKC
   d. Intellectual Property Rights
   e. Launching the new K-16 initiative

2. President Myers reported additional items from the December IFC meeting.
   a. Discussion of encouraging administrators to look at dependent tuition assistance
   b. Vice President Lemkuhle voice his concerns about recruitment and retention of Faculty and what the UM System can do to assist in this.

B. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

1. Dr. Thomas gave a slide presentation on enrollment figures. He said the “tide has turned”, but we need to work together to keep that trend going.
2. The Chancellor then showed slides of Ds, Fs, and Ws by section (See attached). Each of the sections listed had approximately 25% or more of the registered students receiving Ds, Fs or Ws. These sections represent less than 1% of all the sections offered by UMR. Further, the Ws were not recorded until after the 6th week of class. Dr. Thomas pointed out that many of these courses with a high percentage of low grades or withdrawals have the same instructors. He referred to a report distributed at the meeting from the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. (See attached)

3. The Chancellor said he will be speaking to the Deans and Department Chairs to encourage them to ACT NOW to correct this Problem. Dr. Thomas said it would do less harm to change an uncaring faculty member currently teaching an undergraduate section now than it would to let this go on.

4. Dr. Thomas mentioned ways to assure turning applications into Admissions. He said he will be sending out a request to all departments to identify people who work well with young people to make calls to students who have applied. They would set up a time to answer any questions the applicants might have. (See attached).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS-There were no questions from the floor.

.2 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

A. ADMISSIONS AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS-Professor Keith Stanek gave this report with an overhead presentation (See attached).

1. President Don Myers mentioned the referral he had made on "sticking points" to this committee and the AD HOC Mentoring Committee. He said there had been no report from the latter as yet.
2. There was a question from the floor about input for the conclusions on the committee report. No one from the committee was present to answer.
3. Professor Jerry Bayless asked about ways to check the grades these students had made in prerequisite courses.
4. Registrar Laura Stoll said PeopleSoft would have the capability to check prerequisite grades.
5. Professor Ralph Wilkerson inquired as to when this would be available. The Registrar said it might be two or three semesters away.
6. Professor Michael Hilgers asked if there were a target goal to improve the D, F, W rate. The Chancellor said the target was soon, and there is a need for motivation.
7. Professor Neil Book said students sometimes take a W to transfer to another department when they realize they are not really in their chosen discipline.
8. The Registrar stated that the Early Warning System the Retention
Committee is working on will start in about two weeks.
9. The Chancellor said he urges the Department Chairs to look at these Situations; they should know which courses have good reasons for the D,F,W rate, and which do not.

B. CURRICULA-Professor Charles Morris gave this report from their December and January meetings.

1. Professor Morris first moved to approve the Masters of Engineering Degree in Materials Engineering. There was a second and the motion carried.
2. Professor Morris then moved to approve the CC1’s from both meetings. There was a second and the motion carried.
3. The EC1’s were presented for information only.

C. RULES, PROCEDURE, AND AGENDA-This report was presented by Professor Jeff Cawlfield.

1. Professor Cawlfield said the Chancellor had requested that they look at the possibility of redundancy in the committees—both in the Academic Council committees and Chancellor’s committees.
2. He said it is within this committee’s charge to keep check on the committee setup, and it will be doing this over the next few weeks. They will then bring a report back to the Council.
3. Professor Cawlfield said some committees might need to be eliminated or combined, and possibly new committees formed that do not now exist.

D. PUBLIC OCCASIONS-Professor Jerry Bayless presented this report.

1. Professor Bayless passed out copies of the calendar for 2002-2003 that was approved by the Academic Council at the November meeting.
2. At the time the calendar was set up for UMR, Spring Break was set for the first week in April to allow more time between it and the St. Pat’s Break. However, the Coordinated Calendar has Spring Break as the last week in March.
3. Professor Bayless said the question before the Council was whether we should change our dates to comply with the Coordinated Calendar.
4. Professor Paul Worsey said this would be a hardship on Faculty who have children in the Rolla Public Schools by putting them out of sync with their calendar. Professor Lenn Koederitz said the Rolla Schools set their calendar one year after we do, and they try to coordinate with UMR.
5. Professor Bayless called for a motion to modify our calendar changing the break to the last week in March. Professor Greg Gelles moved to do this. Professor Charles Morris seconded, and motion carried with one opposed.

.3 No old business was presented.
A. STAFF COUNCIL-President Greg Harris gave this report.

1. Mr. Harris said this group had their organizational meeting on September 14. He said their members serve two year terms, causing a 50% turnover.
2. The group’s purpose is to support the mission of the campus, and also to represent the approximately 750 staff members. Mr. Harris said they want to try to do their best to make this a place where students want to be.
3. Mr. Harris announced that on February 15, Dr. Dale Henry will speak to staff on Customer Service issues-how to interact and encourage students. On February 22, the Wellness Bash will be held. Staff Day will be on May 23, and Mr. Harris urged departments to allow staff the freedom to participate.

B. There was no representative present from Student Council.

C. REFERRALS

1. The Administrator Review Issue was referred to Personnel.
2. The Committee Review was referred to Rules, Procedure, and Agenda.

There was a motion and a second to adjourn. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

Lenn Koederitz
Secretary

*Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.*
Summary of Final Grade Report  
Fall 2000  
Percentage of D, F, and Ws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE 161</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic 050</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic 050</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic 051</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic 110</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic 110</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic 110</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic 110</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic 110</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio 110</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio 110</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio 112</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio 112</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem 001</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem 003</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem 223</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem 251</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChEng 027</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChEng 027</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChEng 027</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChEng 027</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChEng 141</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChEng 143</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChEng 143</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChEng 261</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil 230</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil 230</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CmpS 053</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CmpS 053</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CmpS 053</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CmpS 053</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CmpS 077</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CmpS 078</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CmpS 078</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CmpS 078</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CmpS 158</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CmpS 234</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CmpS 253</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CmpS 303</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ 122</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 151</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 151</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 153</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 153</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 253</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 282</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EngMech 160</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hist 111</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist 175</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist 176</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist 348</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 002</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 002</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 002</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 004</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 006</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 008</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 021</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 021</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 021</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 021</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 022</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 022</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 022</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 022</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 204</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 204</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 204</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 208</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 208</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 229</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Math &amp; Stat</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 219</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 219</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 219</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 219</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 221</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 225</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 225</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 279</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys 023</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys 023</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys 023</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys 025</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych 050</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span 001</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stat 215</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stat 215</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stat 215</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stat 217</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report of the  
December 8, 2000 Meeting  
of the  
Admissions and Academic Standards Committee

Members in Attendance: Ron Bieniek, Steven Cardimona, Mariesa Crow (chair), Ilene Morgan, Susan Murray

Purpose of Meeting: To discuss those courses that have a pattern of more than 25% of D's, W's, and F's and to make recommendations to the Academic Council

Discussion:

The committee discussed and identified several possible reasons for students obtaining grades below C in courses. These reasons may be (but are not necessarily limited to):

1. Insufficient preparation for course – non-adherence to prerequisite structure or prerequisite material not sufficient to prepare student for course
2. Poor study habits and motivation on part of student
3. Poor instructional style and motivation on part of instructor

The committee felt strongly that instructors must not lower the course standards for the purposes of assigning higher grades, but acknowledged that there are several areas that have potential for improvement.

Recommendations:

**Insufficient preparation**
The committee felt that the quality of advice that students received from freshman advising and in their home departments is very good. However, some students disregard the advice of their advisors and take courses for which they are not prepared (either by pre-requisite structure or by level of incoming test scores) or they take too heavy of a course load. Advisors should be empowered to have their recommendations binding. This must be supported by the administrative infrastructure.

In the case of prerequisite courses not preparing students for subsequent courses, the burden should be placed upon the department chairs to ensure the level of instruction of lower level and prerequisite courses. One suggestion is to require comprehensive competency exams over prerequisite material before students can proceed to the next level.

**Poor study habits and motivation on part of student**
It was noted by the committee that the UM-Rolla community does a good job of stressing the importance of study habits to incoming students and providing numerous resources for students for improving study habits (workshops, instructor-led study sessions, etc.). However, there is no hard incentive for students to participate in these activities.
Students often over-estimate their level of mastery of a subject and frequently realize too late (or never) in a semester that they are doing poorly. Thus the committee recommends that the faculty take greater responsibility for helping students assess their level of subject matter competency (pop quizzes, blackboard problems, etc.) and motivating students to participate in study habit improvement activities. Students should be (in some cases) coerced into taking personal responsibility for learning. One potentially successful program that could be used as a framework is the Physics “LEAD” program (see attached description).

Poor instructional style and motivation on part of instructor
The committee felt that instructional style and outcomes are the responsibility of the department chairs. While there are real and substantive awards for excellent teaching, there is little real and substantive penalty for poor teaching. In addition, there is little real incentive to motivate the “average” teacher. It was noted that poor teachers are frequently assigned to the undesirable classes: the “service” courses or fundamental required courses, while assigning the best teachers for elective and graduate classes. The Deans should hold the Chairs accountable for the quality of instruction in their department.
Calling Nights for Departments

Process:
- Contact Teresa who will confirm available chairs for your department.
- On the evening of your arrival, lists of prospective students (sorted by status -- admit, applicant, inquiry) will be provided for your area.
- Phone and desk space will be provided for your contacts.
- An admissions representative and a currently enrolled student will be on hand to assist with any questions.
- All calls will be logged into PeopleSoft by admissions staff or students for tracking purposes and to generate future calling lists.
- Email texts will be available to callers allowing for an immediate response following up on the phone call or indicating that the call was not completed. (Letters with similar text will also be available and will be generated that evening from the office for the faculty member's signature.)

Please contact Teresa Moore at x6085 (mooretm@umr.edu) to arrange space in the office of admission and student financial assistance for calling your prospective students. Calling nights begin Monday, January 22 and are normally scheduled between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m.
Possible Reasons for Low Grades

- Insufficient preparation for course – non-adherence to prerequisite structure or prerequisite material not sufficient
- Poor study habits and motivation on part of student
- Poor instructional style and motivation on part of instructor
Recommendations - preparedness

- Advisors should be empowered to have prerequisite recommendations binding
- Burden placed on department chairs to ensure level of material in prerequisite courses – i.e. comprehensive competency exams

Admissions and Academic Standards
January 18, 2001
Recommendations – poor study habits

- Faculty take greater responsibility for helping students assess their level of competency (pop quizzes, blackboard problems, etc.)
- Students should be encouraged to take personal responsibility for learning
Recommendations – poor instruction

- Instructional style and outcomes are responsibility of chair
- Little real and substantive penalty for poor teaching
- Little incentive for improvement for “average” teacher
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

To: UMR FACULTY
Academic Council Meeting
Thursday, February 15, 2001; 1:30 P.M.; 204 McNutt

I. Approval of minutes of the January 18, 2001 meeting

II. Reports and Responses
   A. President’s Report— to include IFC  (5 min.)  Don Myers
   B. Chancellor’s Report  (10 min.)  Gary Thomas
      (10 minutes for Questions and Answers)

III. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
   A. Curricula  (5 min.)  Charles Morris
      1. *Report No. 7
   B. Retention Committee  (10 min.)  Laura Stoll
      1. *Changes in Policy on Incomplete Grades, etc.
   C. Rules, Procedure and Agenda  (5 min.)  Jeff Cawlfield
      1. *Resolution on Developing minimum standards for 5 year review.
   D. Student Affairs  (5 min.)  Mark Potrafka
      1. *Constitutions

IV. Old Business
   A. *Action Items

V. New Business and Announcements
   A. Staff Council—Greg Harris
   B. Student Council—Joe Maul
   C. Referrals
      1. “Sticking Points” to Academic Freedom

*Information distributed with agenda
MEMO TO:  Academic Council
FROM:  UMR Campus Curricula Committee
RE:  February 4, 2001, Meeting

The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends to the Academic Council that the curricula changes on the following CC1s be approved.

CC1 4973, History 380, 20th Century Americans in Combat. Approved new course for SS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: History 175 or 176 or 112. Description: Through lectures, films, readings, exams, film reviews and discussions, this course examines the American military and combat experience throughout much of the twentieth century. The ultimate goal of the course is for students to understand the realities of warfare and its effect on ordinary Americans as well as American society.

CC1 4974, Math/Stat 410, Graduate Seminar. Approved new course for FS2001. Variable hours 1-3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Graduate standing. Description: Discussion of topics of current interest.


CC1 4976, Civil Engineering 319, Applied Mechanics in Structural Engineering 325. Approved new course for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Cv Eng 218. Description: A study of the basic relationships involved in the mechanics of structures. Topics include basic elasticity, failure criteria, fundamental theories of bending and buckling of plates and cylindrical shells for practical application in analysis and design of bridge, building floors, and shell roots.

CC1 4977, Civil Engineering 318, Smart Materials and Sensors. Approved new course for FS2001. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisite: Senior Standing and Math 204. Description: Smart structures with fiber reinforced polymer (FRP) composites and advanced sensors. Multidisciplinary topics include characterization, performance, and fabrication of composite structures; fiber optic, resistance, and piezoelectric systems for strain sensing; and applications of smart composite structures. Laboratory and team activities involve manufacturing, measurement systems, instrumented structures, and performance tests on a large-scale smart composite bridge. (Co-listed with El Eng/Mc Eng/Ae Eng 329).
CC1 4978, Civil Engineering 373, Air Transportation. Approved changes for WS2002. Change in course title from "Airport Planning and Design." Change in credit hours from 1 hour lecture and 1 hour lab "TO" 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Change in description to: Runway configuration, airfield capacity, geometrics and terminal layout and design. Aircraft performance; navigation and air traffic control; airport planning and design; airline operations; aviation systems planning.

CC1 4979, Civil Engineering 411, Transportation Systems Analysis. Approved for FS2001. Change in course title from "Advanced Highway Engineering." Change in prerequisites from Cv Eng 311 "TO" Cv Eng 353. Description changed to: Concepts and principles fundamental to the planning, design, operation, and management of transportation systems using a systems perspective to transportation problems. Concepts from economics, engineering, operations research, management, psychology, and public policy analysis are used throughout. Topics include linear and non-linear programming, dynamic programming, supply-demand microeconomic framework, analysis of transportation demand, system performance, network equilibrium, simulation and associated case studies.

CC1 4980, English 001, IEP Basic ESL Skills. Approved new course for FS2001. 0 hours credit. Prerequisite: Accepted student at UMR; by placement examinations in ALI. Description: Focuses on basic reading comprehension with basic vocabulary development, and on listening comprehension. The primary focus of this course is on the development of functional proficiency. For non-native speakers of English. The IEP Program will assess fees for this course.

CC1 4981, English 002, IEP Grammar through Writing. Approved new course for FS2001. 0 hours credit. Prerequisite: Accepted student at UMR; by placement examinations in ALI. Description: Presents basic English grammar to promote a beginning-level understanding of the structure and workings of the English language. Introduces basic writing applications. For non-native speakers of English. The IEP Program will assess fees for this course.

CC1 4982, English 003, IEP Core ESL Skills. Approved new course for FS2001. 0 hours credit. Prerequisite: Accepted student at UMR; by placement examinations in ALI. Description: Focuses on reading comprehension including vocabulary development, and on listening comprehension through basic academic applications. For non-native speakers of English. The IEP Program will assess fees for this course.

CC1 4983, English 004, IEP Writing & Grammar. Approved new course for FS2001. 0 credit hours. Prerequisite: Accepted student at UMR; by placement examinations in ALI. Description: Introduces more complex writing applications, focusing on basic academic requirements. Focuses on more complex aspects of English grammar. For non-native speakers of English. The IEP Program will assess fees for this course.

CC1 4984, English 005, IEP Academic ESL Skills, Approved new course for FS2001. 0 hours credit. Prerequisite: Accepted student at UMR; by placement examinations in ALI. Focuses on reading comprehension using academic reading materials, on development of academic vocabulary and on listening comprehension using academic-level lectures. For non-native speakers of English. The IEP Program will assess fees for this course.
CC1 4985, English 006, IEP ESL Writing Workshop. Approved new course for FS2001. 0 hours credit. Prerequisite: Accepted student at UMR; by placement examinations in ALI. Description: Focuses on developing academic writing applications. For non-native speakers of English. The IEP Program will assess fees for this course.

CC1 4986, English 007, IEP American English Articulation. Approved new course for FS2001. 0 hours credit. Prerequisite: Accepted student at UMR; by placement examinations in ALI. Description: Students who need specific instruction and practice in pronunciation receive heavy drills and activities to improve their articulation of American English. For non-native speakers of English. The IEP Program will assess fees for this course.

CC1 4987, English 008, IEP ESL Conversation, Discussion, Presentation. Approved new course for FS2001. 0 hours credit. Prerequisite: Accepted student at UMR; by approval. Description: Students who need intense practice in verbal activities participate in numerous varied activities to further develop their verbal skills. For non-native speakers of English. The IEP Program will assess fees for this course.

CC1 4988, Computer Science 328, Object-Oriented Numerical Modeling I. Approved for FS2001. Change in course title from “Numerical Approximations and Differential Equations.” Change in prerequisites from Cmp Sc 228 or Advanced Calculus “TO” Cmp Sc 228 and Cmp Sc 153. Description changed to: A study of object-oriented modeling of the scientific domain. Techniques and methodologies will be developed enabling the student to build a class library of reusable software appropriate for scientific application. Applications will be drawn from mechanics, finance, and engineering.

CC1 4989, Computer Science 487, New Trends in Massively Parallel Computing. Approved for FS2001. Change in course title from “Advanced Parallel Computation.” Change in description to: The study of exploiting the potential parallelism of massively parallel computers, state-of-the-art parallel architectures and computing models. Systolic architectures. Topics from current research include reconfigurable computing, cellular computing and revolutionary computing methods such as DNA computing and quantum computing.

CC1 4990, Computer Science 329, Object-Oriented Numerical Modeling II. Approved for WS2002. Change in course title from “Numerical Linear Algebra.” Change in prerequisites from Cmp Sc 228 or Advanced Calculus “TO” Cmp Sc 328. Change in catalog description to: A continued study of object-oriented modeling of the scientific domain. Advanced applications include models posed as balance laws, integral equations, and stochastic simulations.

CC1 5006, Mechanical Engineering 453, Thermal Stresses II. Approved deletion of course for WS2001. This course was approved by e-mail 1/24/01 by the UMR Campus Curricula Committee. This approval enabled the new course, CC1 4934 Mc Eng 453, Advanced Computer Numerical Control of Manufacturing Processes and Engineering Metrology, which was approved 1-18-01, to be in effect for the WS2001 term also.
For the information of the Academic Council, the following EC1s have been submitted by the University departments for an experimental course that will be offered in the near future.

EC1 1162, Nuclear Engineering 301, Health Monitoring Systems. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. (Co-listed with El Eng, Mc Eng, Ae Eng, EMech, and Cv Eng 301.) Prerequisite: Senior Standing.

EC1 1167, Physics 101, College Physics I. Approved for WS2002. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Math 6-Grade of “C” or better, or equivalent.

EC1 1168, Physics 101, College Physics II. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Math 6, College Physics I.

EC1 1170, Engineering Management 301, Electronic Commerce. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior standing.

EC1 1171, Chemical Engineering 301, Applied Mathematics in Chemical Engineering. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Math 229 or 204.

EC1 1172, Aerospace Engineering 301, Health Monitoring Systems. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior Standing. (Co-listed with El Eng, Mc Eng, Nu Eng, EMech, and Cv Eng 301.)

EC1 1173, Electrical Engineering 301, Health Monitoring Systems. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior Standing. (Co-listed with Ae Eng, Mc Eng, Nu Eng, EMech, and Cv Eng 301.)

EC1 1174, Engineering Mechanics, 301, Health Monitoring Systems. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior Standing. (Co-listed with El Eng, Mc Eng, Nu Eng, Ae Eng, and Cv Eng 301.)

EC1 1175, Mechanical Engineering 301, Health Monitoring Systems. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior Standing. (Co-listed with El Eng, EMech, Nu Eng, Ae Eng, and Mc Eng 301.)

EC1 1176, Civil Engineering 301, Health Monitoring Systems. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior Standing. (Co-listed with El Eng, EMech, Nu Eng, Ae Eng, and Mc Eng 301.)

EC1 1177, Civil Engineering 301, Construction Project Delivery Systems. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Cv Eng 248.

EC1 1178, Civil Engineering 301, Highway Infrastructure Engineering and Management. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Cv Eng 211.

EC1 1179, Civil Engineering 401, Stochastic Theory of Structural Vibration. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Cv Eng 424 or Mc Eng 307 and Stat 215.

EC1 1180, Civil Engineering 401, Public Transportation Systems. Approved for FS2001. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: Cv Eng 211 or equivalent.

EC1 1182, Education 301, Current Issues in Education: Performance Based Assessment, Beginning. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Practicing educator. (Previously approved 1/08/2001.)

EC1 1183, Economics 301, Network Economy. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Econ 221.

EC1 1184, JINI: Java Distributed Networking. Approved for SS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: First course in Java and consent of instructor.

EC1 1185, Computer Science 401, Computer Security. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Cmp Sc 285.

/J. Keith Nisbett, Chair
TIME LIMIT FOR REMOVING INCOMPLETE GRADES

CURRENT POLICY

2. Time Limit for Removing Incompletes. If you receive an "I" in any course you must complete the work in which you are deficient before the end of the tenth week of the next Fall or Winter semester or before the end of the fifth week of the next Summer Session you are enrolled at UMR. Failure to do so will result in a grade of "F" being recorded for you. You may not enroll for a course in which you have a grade of "I" on file.

PROPOSED POLICY

2. Time Limit for Removing Incompletes. If you receive an "I" in any course you must complete the work in which you are deficient within one calendar year from the close of the semester in which it was recorded. Failure to do so will result in a grade of "F" being recorded for you. You may not enroll for a course in which you have a grade of "I" on file.
REPEAT COURSE POLICY

CURRENT POLICY

8. Repeated Course Grades. A student may not enroll in a course for credit if he or she has completed the course at UMR in a previous semester and earned a grade of 'C' or higher. Students are allowed to enroll in such courses as a hearer. This rule does not apply to courses that are officially designated as "repeatable courses". The registrar's office maintains a list of which courses are repeatable. If a course is repeated, the last grade will be used in determining if the requirements of the degree are satisfied.

b. Cumulative Grade Point Average

(effective for new students entering fall of 1972 or later): A student's cumulative grade point average is calculated by dividing cumulative total grade points by cumulative total credit hours attempted using all courses taken for college credit for which a letter grade (or equivalent) has been given except courses taken under the "Pass/Fail" option. This grade point will be used by the Registrar to determine a student's eligibility for Honors at the time of graduation as defined by Section III 9. The cumulative grade point average will be used for the purpose of ranking students at the time of graduation.

PROPOSED POLICY (see last paragraph)

8. Repeated Course Grades. A student may not enroll in a course for credit if he or she has completed the course at UMR in a previous semester and earned a grade of 'C' or higher. Students are allowed to enroll in such courses as a hearer. This rule does not apply to courses that are officially designated as "repeatable courses". The registrar's office maintains a list of which courses are repeatable. If a course is repeated, the last grade will be used in determining if the requirements of the degree are satisfied. When a student repeats a UMR course in which a "D" or "F" has been received, the grade may be replaced in the calculation of the GPA. See further information under Cumulative Grade Point Average.

b. Cumulative Grade Point Average

(effective for new students entering fall of 1972 or later): A student's cumulative grade point average is calculated by dividing cumulative total grade points by cumulative total credit hours attempted using all courses taken for college credit for which a letter grade (or equivalent) has been given except courses taken under the "Pass/Fail" option. This grade point will be used by the Registrar to determine a student's eligibility for Honors at the time of graduation as defined by Section III 9. The cumulative grade point average will be used for the purpose of ranking students at the time of graduation.

(effective with UMR coursework repeated fall of 2001 or later): When a grade of "D" or "F" is received in a UMR course, the grade may be replaced in the calculation of the GPA if the course is repeated at UMR. Grades of "I", "W", "HR" or "Pass/Fail" will not replace the previous grade. All grades earned will appear on the student's transcript. A statement of the repeat policy will be included on the transcript to explain the calculation of the GPA. After repeating a course, the student must submit a Repeat Course GPA Adjustment form to the Registrar's Office to have the GPA changed. The new grade will replace the old grade in all GPA calculations in which the previous grade was used, with the exception of the UM GPA used for calculation of graduation honors. If a student does not submit the Repeat Course GPA Adjustment, both grades will be used in GPA calculations. The scholastic standing of a student for a past semester will not be changed as a result of repeating a course. This policy applies to undergraduate students only and may not be applied once the student has graduated.
## Repeat Course GPA Adjustment

University of Missouri – Rolla  
Office of the Registrar  
103 Parker Hall

Name: ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

Last                      First                      Middle

Student Number: ___________________________  Degree Program: ___________________________

### Original Course Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term:</th>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>Course No.:</th>
<th>Course Title:</th>
<th>Grade:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Repeated Course Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term:</th>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>Course No.:</th>
<th>Course Title:</th>
<th>Grade:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Return completed form to the Registrar’s Office, 103 Parker Hall

Student Signature: ___________________________  Date: ____________
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Board of Curators have approved the policy for "Review of Faculty Performance; and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Thomas has initiated the implementation of the said policy by instructing the Deans to insure that each department have developed minimum standard for overall satisfactory performance of tenured faculty by March 1; and

WHEREAS, the said policy provides at "B.1": The tenured faculty of each department or unit will develop and publish minimum standards for overall satisfactory performance.; and

WHEREAS, only recently have the departments been notified of the established date to complete the development of the minimum standards;

IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED:

That the Academic Council hereby request the Chancellor extend the date of March 1 to one that will permit the tenured faculty of each department or unit adequate time to responsibly develop the said standards.
Constitution of the Robotics Competition Team

University of Missouri-Rolla

Latest Revision January, 2001

Article I: Name

The name of this organization shall be "University of Missouri-Rolla (UMR) Robotics Competition Team" which hereafter shall be referred to as the "Team."

Article II: Purpose

The purpose of this organization shall be to:

1. Promote technological advancement and knowledge of mechanical, computer, electrical, and materials sciences
2. Apply and expand Team members' knowledge of classroom concepts to the multidisciplinary field of robotics
3. Promote the name and reputation of the University of Missouri-Rolla on a national level through participation in robotic design competitions
4. Encourage support of the Team by the University of Missouri-Rolla
5. Familiarize members with product development, marketing, and business skills through self-administration of business duties necessary to run the Team
6. Promote technical and interpersonal skills that will prepare members for leadership roles in industry
7. Promote interdisciplinary cooperation in advancing quality designs of competitive robots.

It shall be the duty of the members of the Team to ensure the following:

1. Participate in robotic design competitions.
2. Promote the University and sponsors of the Team nationally through participation in competitions and advertisement of achievements.
3. Assist in the design, manufacture, and testing of robots.
4. Members vote on subjects concerning the Team as a whole.

Article III: Membership

The membership shall consist of undergraduate and graduate students who are currently enrolled at UMR and meet all University requirements for student organizations.
Constitution of the Formula SAE Racing Team

University of Missouri - Rolla

Written: December 1, 2000
Ratified: December 6, 2000

MISSION

The mission of Formula SAE Racing Team at the University of Missouri - Rolla (UMR) is to give students the opportunity to implement what is learned in the classroom, providing them with the experience, knowledge, and social skills needed for a successful career. The Formula SAE Racing Team allows students to gain experience in team management, public relations, engineering design, fabrication, and the unique chance to follow a product from concept to implementation.

ARTICLE I: NAME

The name of this organization shall be "Formula SAE Racing Team at the University of Missouri - Rolla" which hereafter shall be referred to as the "Team".

ARTICLE II: PURPOSE

The purpose of this organization shall be to:

1. Promote technological advancement.
2. Expand Team member's knowledge of classroom concepts.
3. Encourage support of the Team by the University of Missouri - Rolla.
4. Familiarize members with the product development, marketing, and business acumen.
5. Provide skills that will prepare members for leadership roles in industry.
6. Provide interdisciplinary cooperation in advancing quality designs.

ARTICLE III: DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE TEAM

It shall be the duty of the Team to ensure the following:

1. Participate in the Formula SAE competition.
2. Promote the reputation of the University during international competitions.
3. Insure the success of the project by designing and manufacturing a competitive vehicle.
4. Members shall vote on subjects affecting the Team as a whole.
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

ACTION ITEMS

Date of Passage
January, 2000

Subject
Resolution on Video/Distance Learning

REFERRED TO
Dr. Thomas
XXX, 5. The meeting was called to order promptly at 1:30 p.m. by President Don Myers. After reading a humorous quotation, Professor Myers asked the secretary to do the roll call. Member noted as absent was: K.M. Isaac. Several substitutions were noted. There was a motion to approve the minutes of the January 18, 2001 meeting as distributed. There was a second and motion carried.

1 REPORTS AND RESPONSES

A. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. There was no IFC report
2. Professor Myers called on Professor Greg Gelles to give a brief report from the Annual Conference of the Missouri Association of Faculty Senates.
   a. Professor Gelles explained that the MAFS is made up of the Faculty Senates (or, at UMR, the Academic Council) from thirteen four-year state colleges and universities in Missouri.
   b. Professor Gelles said the main discussion topic at the Conference was the bill before the Missouri Senate and House of Representatives concerning having a Faculty Representative on the Governing Boards of State Universities. On February 6, the Conference participants lobbied for this.
3. President Myers mentioned that the Curriculum Committee has put out for consideration a change in the proposal for the Business Administration Degree and it has been posted on the web site of the Academic Council. That committee will meet on March 5, and there might possibly be a special Academic Council meeting called in March.
B. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT—Dr. Thomas, with the aid of the overhead, presented a report on two items of current concern.

1. The Chancellor said Governor Holden has recommended a budget containing a zero inflation budget adjustment which means UMR gets exactly the same dollars as last year. This would mean a loss of revenue for UMR for planning purposes in our budget of one million dollars. Also, there is no capital budget, which means the MAEEM Building will be postponed at least another year. He said that altogether, UMR faces a 3.7 million dollar budget loss.

2. Dr. Thomas showed a plot of ACT scores versus six-Year graduation rate for all technological universities in the top one and two tiers in U.S. News and World Report. He emphasized that UMR needs to move up 20 percentage points in graduation rate to reach the average of other top technological universities, and elaborated on the immediate problems and long range problems.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. One question concerned UMR’s reputation for being too hard. The question was, “Are UMR students reputed to be higher than others at graduation?” Dr. Thomas said that if one looks at starting salaries, they were not.

2. Another question asked whether the students who transfer from UMR to another engineering school stay with the same major. The Chancellor said a great number of them do.

2 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

A. CURRICULA—Professor Charles Morris presented this report.

1. Professor Morris moved to approve the CC1’s as distributed. There was a second and motion carried.

B. RETENTION—Ms. Laura Stoll presented this report.

1. After handouts were distributed, Ms. Stoll stated that this committee looked at Incomplete Grades, Repeated Course Grades, and Academic Forgiveness. She referred to the attachments that had been distributed with the agenda, as well as the handouts.
2. Professor Hal Nystrom moved to approve the new policy on Incomplete Grades. There was a second.
3. After considerable discussion, a vote was taken. The motion carried, with two opposed. (Motion attached)
4. Professor Hal Nystrom moved to approve the Repeat Course Policy as presented in the attachment to the agenda. There was a second.
5. After much discussion and comments, both for and against the proposal, a friendly amendment was proposed by Professor Carol Ann Smith for a 15 credit hour limit on repeated courses, and that a course could only be repeated once.
6. Professor Joel Burken moved to table. There was a second, and vote was taken. Motion failed. Vote was then taken on the original motion, including the friendly amendment. Motion carried with 28 for and 6 opposed. (Motion attached)

C. RULES, PROCEDURES, AND AGENDA-Professor Jeff Cawlfield presented this Report, referring to the resolution (concerning the Post Tenure Review Document) that was distributed with the agenda.

1. Professor Lenn Koederitz moved to approve the resolution. Professor Greg Gelles seconded.
2. The Chancellor said he wanted a draft from each department by March 1. He said he had talked with the Deans, and feels it is time to begin the process. He stated that we must iterate different standards in different departments.
3. Professor Carol Ann Smith moved to amend the resolution to make the date March 15. There was a second, and motion carried with one opposed.
4. Vote was then taken on the motion including the amendment. Motion carried.

D. STUDENT AFFAIRS-This report was presented by Mr. Mark Potrafka.

1. Mr. Potrafka presented the constitutions of the Robotics Competition Team and the Formula SAE Racing Team, and recommended their approval.
2. Professor Todd Hubing moved to approve both groups. There was a Second, and motion carried.

3 No old business was presented.
.4 NEW BUSINESS

A. STAFF COUNCIL-Ms. Barbara Robertson presented this report. She announced upcoming events of the Wellness Bash, Staff Awards, and Staff Appreciation Day.

B. STUDENT COUNCIL-Mr. Joe Maul reported for this group.

1. Mr. Maul said their main topic of concern at this time is FERPA. He said a new group has been formed from the schools in the UM System, called Coalition Against Parental Notification. HE said he is the Chair, and anyone can join in their fight against FERPA.

C. REFERRALS-President Myers referred the “Sticking Points” issue to the Academic Freedom Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lenn Koederitz
Secretary

*Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
REPEAT COURSE POLICY

CURRENT POLICY

8. Repeated Course Grades. A student may not enroll in a course for credit if he or she has completed the course at UMR in a previous semester and earned a grade of 'C' or higher. Students are allowed to enroll in such courses as a hearer. This rule does not apply to courses that are officially designated as "repeatable courses". The registrar's office maintains a list of which courses are repeatable. If a course is repeated, the last grade will be used in determining if the requirements of the degree are satisfied.

b. Cumulative Grade Point Average

(effective for new students entering fall of 1972 or later): A student's cumulative grade point average is calculated by dividing cumulative total grade points by cumulative total credit hours attempted using all courses taken for college credit for which a letter grade (or equivalent) has been given except courses taken under the "Pass/Fail" option. This grade point will be used by the Registrar to determine a student's eligibility for Honors at the time of graduation as defined by Section III 9. The cumulative grade point average will be used for the purpose of ranking students at the time of graduation.

PROPOSED POLICY (see last paragraph)

8. Repeated Course Grades. A student may not enroll in a course for credit if he or she has completed the course at UMR in a previous semester and earned a grade of 'C' or higher. Students are allowed to enroll in such courses as a hearer. This rule does not apply to courses that are officially designated as "repeatable courses". The registrar's office maintains a list of which courses are repeatable. If a course is repeated, the last grade will be used in determining if the requirements of the degree are satisfied. When a student repeats a UMR course in which a "D" or "F" has been received, the grade may be replaced in the calculation of the GPA. See further information under Cumulative Grade Point Average.

b. Cumulative Grade Point Average

(effective for new students entering fall of 1972 or later): A student's cumulative grade point average is calculated by dividing cumulative total grade points by cumulative total credit hours attempted using all courses taken for college credit for which a letter grade (or equivalent) has been given except courses taken under the "Pass/Fail" option. This grade point will be used by the Registrar to determine a student's eligibility for Honors at the time of graduation as defined by Section III 9. The cumulative grade point average will be used for the purpose of ranking students at the time of graduation.

(effective with UMR coursework repeated fall of 2001 or later): When a grade of "D" or "F" is received in a UMR course, the grade may be replaced in the calculation of the GPA if the course is repeated at UMR. No more than 15 semester hours will be dropped from the calculation of the student's GPA and a repeated course may only be used once in the GPA adjustment. Grades of "I", "W", "HR" or "Pass/Fail" will not replace the previous grade. All grades earned will appear on the student's transcript. A statement of the repeat policy will be included on the transcript to explain the calculation of the GPA. After repeating a course, the student must submit a Repeat Course GPA Adjustment form to the Registrar's Office to have the GPA changed. The new grade will replace the old grade in all GPA calculations in which the previous grade was used, with the exception of the UM GPA used for calculation of graduation honors. If a student does not submit the Repeat Course GPA Adjustment, both grades will be used in GPA calculations. The scholastic standing of a student for a past semester will not be changed as a result of repeating a course. This policy applies to undergraduate students only and may not be applied once the student has graduated.
TME LIMIT FOR REMOVING INCOMPLETE GRADES

CURRENT POLICY

2. **Time Limit for Removing Incompletes.** If you receive an "I" in any course you must complete the work in which you are deficient before the end of the tenth week of the next Fall or Winter semester or before the end of the fifth week of the next Summer Session you are enrolled at UMR. Failure to do so will result in a grade of "F" being recorded for you. You may not enroll for a course in which you have a grade of "I" on file.

PROPOSED POLICY

2. **Time Limit for Removing Incompletes.** If you receive an "I" in any course you must complete the work in which you are deficient within one calendar year from the close of the semester in which it was recorded. Failure to do so will result in a grade of "F" being recorded for you. You may not enroll for a course in which you have a grade of "I" on file.
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

*Special Academic Council Meeting
Tuesday, March 13, 2001; 3:30 P.M.; 204 McNutt

I. Report from the Chancellor on the current budget situation, hiring projections for next fiscal year, and other related budget items.

II. *Report from the Curriculum Committee concerning the proposed Business Degree program.

* CC1 4703 Bachelor of Science Program in Business Administration - The committee has examined the curriculum as proposed in the attached version which was distributed at the campus open session on March 1, 2001, and finds it suitable for approval. The committee wishes to draw the attention of the Academic Council to the following concerns that were deemed to be beyond the scope of this committee, but which should be carefully examined by the Academic Council. (1) The budget in this version is dramatically different from the version which was previously circulated, and reflects an expectation of a deficit in the first year and essentially breaking even in years 2 through 5. Considering current campus budget constraints, the timing of this new program should be evaluated. (2) The new program is closely tied to the establishment of a new School of Management, including a new Dean and other infrastructure associated with a School. It is unclear whether the general campus community is fully aware of the structural changes that would be triggered by this new degree program. The practicality of a new School for a degree program which anticipates 270 students after five years should be evaluated.

*Called by Academic Council President Donald Myers
MEMO TO: Academic Council  
FROM: UMR Campus Curricula Committee  
DATE: Special Meeting of Academic Council, March 13, 2001  
RE: Bachelor of Science Degree Program in Business Administration  

**CC1 4703 Bachelor of Science Program in Business Administration** - The committee has examined the curriculum as proposed in the attached version which was distributed at the campus open session on March 1, 2001, and finds it suitable for approval. The committee wishes to draw the attention of the Academic Council to the following concerns that were deemed to be beyond the scope of this committee, but which should be carefully examined by the Academic Council. (1) The budget in this version is dramatically different from the version which was previously circulated, and reflects an expectation of a deficit in the first year and essentially breaking even in years 2 through 5. Considering current campus budget constraints, the timing of this new program should be evaluated. (2) The new program is closely tied to the establishment of a new School of Management, including a new Dean and other infrastructure associated with a School. It is unclear whether the general campus community is fully aware of the structural changes that would be triggered by this new degree program. The practicality of a new School for a degree program which anticipates 270 students after five years should be evaluated.

J. Keith Nisbett  
Chair, UMR Campus Curricula Committee
XXX.6. The meeting was called to order at 3:30 P.M. by President Don Myers. Roll call was taken, and those listed as absent without prearrangement were: Martin Bohner, Patrick Giunta, Thomas Schuman, Kelvin Erickson, Kurt Kosbar, Michael Hilgers, Dan White, Dr. Gajda, and Dr. Ogrosky.

President Myers read a brief quote from Oliver Wendell Holmes. He then stated that, because this was a special meeting, only the two agenda items listed would be addressed.

1 REPORT FROM THE CHANCELLOR

A. Dr. Thomas addressed the budget concerns.

1. The Chancellor said working within the budget for the next two years would be very challenging. He said he and the Deans worked together to develop a scenario for budget cuts. He said he will be meeting with the Budget Committee on March 14.

2. Dr. Thomas said the question uppermost in everyone’s mind is, “Are we going to make the enrollment projections?” He said the higher the enrollment, the more money available there would be.

3. According to the Chancellor, the manufacturing recession has hit this region sharply. He said some agencies in the state have received worse cuts than the University.

4. In planning next year’s budget, Dr. Thomas said he has asked the Deans to anticipate and make adjustments accordingly.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Professor Don Myers asked what the consequences would be of the ruling on the Hancock Amendment. The Chancellor said the ruling was in favor of the state; however, a few items were referred back to lower courts, so there might be some necessary returns.

2. Professor Hal Nystrom asked about the length of time of the hiring freeze. Dr. Thomas said it would soon be released.

3. There was a question from the floor as to how the Chancellor envisioned the effects on the funds for Mission Enhancement. Dr. Thomas said they would be dramatically affected, but not zeroed out.
A. Professor Morris referred to the CC1 4703 Bachelor of Science Program in Business Administration.

1. Professor Morris said the committee draws to the attention of the Council that the budget in this version is very different and expresses a deficit the first year. Professor Morris also said, “The new program is closely tied to the establishment of a new School of Management, including a new dean and other infrastructure associated with the school. It is unclear whether the general campus community is fully aware of the structural changes that would be triggered by this new degree program.”

2. Professor Morris then moved to approve the Degree Program. There was a second by Professor Lenn Koederitz.

3. A lengthy discussion of the proposed program ensued.
   a. Professor Carol Ann Smith said there had been mention of a $50,000 Faculty Hire the first year and a $70,000 one the second year. She asked what kind of hire you could get for that. The Chancellor said the projected budget was a worst case portrayal, and that those numbers were suggested by Engineering Management Faculty.
   b. Dean Mitchell stated he would like to see this program started, and that it would be a useful complement to Engineering.
   c. Professor Wayne Huebner said he endorses the concept strongly—that it would add diversity to the campus and more opportunities for the students.
   d. Professor Ralph Wilkerson asked what the prospects are that this will be approved further up the system. The Chancellor said he is quite certain the Board of Curators will approve it. He said that next year, when the MBA is requested, there would be more resistance, but he believes it can be done.
   e. Professor Carol Ann Smith asked where the enrollment figures given came from. The answer was that they came from an assumption of how many would be recruited the first year, and escalate from there.
   f. Professor Smith then asked when the program would be accredited. The Chancellor said this can take place in 5 or 6 years.
   g. Professor Richard Hall asked what would happen if a student majored in a non-accredited program, and said that many of the larger companies won’t reimburse students unless attending an accredited program. The Chancellor said with any new school, it takes time to get accredited.
   h. Professor Smith asked if this would distract from programs that are struggling. Dr. Thomas asked what had prevented working on these struggling programs for the last ten years.
Professor Keith Stanek said it was time to start new programs. He said the Computer Engineering Program was started three years ago, and (even though not a lot of dollars have been pumped into it), there are 140 students in it.

4. Vote was then taken. Motion carried with 28 for and 4 against.

5. The Chancellor referred to four issues of concern voiced at the Open Forum. He briefly told how these had been addressed.

The Agenda being completed, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lenn Koederitz
Secretary

*Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
To: UMR FACULTY
Academic Council Meeting
Thursday, April 19, 2001; 1:30 P.M.; 204 McNutt

I. Approval of minutes of the February 15 and March 13, 2001 meetings

II. Reports and Responses
A. President’s Report-to include IFC (5 min.) Don Myers
B. Chancellor’s Report (10 min.) Gary Thomas
   (10 minutes for Questions and Answers)

III. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
A. Curricula (5 min.) Charles Morris
   1. Reports No. 9 and 10
B. Ad Hoc Committee on Mentoring (10 min.) Arlan Dekock
   1. Sticking Points
C. Report from Combined Committees Meeting (5 min.) Keith Stanek

IV. Old Business
A. Action Items

V. New Business and Announcements
A. Staff Council
B. Student Council
C. Graduate Students’ Council
D. Referrals

*Information distributed with agenda
MEMO TO: Academic Council
FROM: UMR Campus Curricula Committee
RE: March 5, 2001, Meeting

The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends approval of the two new proposed degree programs. The Master of Science Degree in Biomaterials and the Master of Engineering in Mining Engineering.

CC1 5053, Ceramic Engineering. Proposed new degree program, Master of Science, Biomaterials.

CC1 5054, Mining Engineering, proposed new degree program, Masters of Engineering in Mining Engineering.

The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends to the Academic Council that the curricula changes on the following CC1s be approved.

CC1 5001, Aerospace Engineering 329, Smart Materials and Sensors, FS2001. (Co-listed with ME/EM/CE/EE 329.) Approved new course for FS2001. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: Senior standing and Math 204. Description: Smart structures with fiber reinforced polymer (FRP) composites and advanced sensors. Multi-disciplinary topics include characterization, performance, and fabrication of composite structures, fiber optic, resistance, and piezoelectric systems for strain sensing; and applications of smart composite structures. Laboratory and team activities involve manufacturing, measurement systems, instrumented structures, and performances tests on a large-scale smart composite bridge.

CC1 5002, Engineering Mechanics 329, Smart Materials and Sensors, FS2001. (Co-listed with ME/AE/CE/EE 329.) Approved new course for FS2001. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: Senior standing and Math 204. Description: Smart structures with fiber reinforced polymer (FRP) composites and advanced sensors. Multi-disciplinary topics include characterization, performance, and fabrication of composite structures, fiber optic, resistance, and piezoelectric systems for strain sensing; and applications of smart composite structures. Laboratory and team activities involve manufacturing, measurement systems, instrumented structures, and performances tests on a large-scale smart composite bridge.
CC 5003, Mechanical Engineering 329, Smart Materials and Sensors, FS2001. (Co-listed with AE/EM/CE/EE.) Approved new course for FS2001. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: Senior standing and Math 204. Description: Smart structures with fiber reinforced polymer (FRP) composites and advanced sensors. Multi-disciplinary topics include characterization, performance, and fabrication of composite structures, fiber optic, resistance, and piezoelectric systems for strain sensing; and applications of smart composite structures. Laboratory and team activities involve manufacturing, measurement systems, instrumented structures, and performances tests on a large-scale smart composite bridge.

CC 5004, Ceramic Engineering. Approved curriculum changes for FS2001. Justification reads: Moved several courses from Fall to Winter and vice versa to accomplish a balance of semester hours.

CC 5005, History. Approved curriculum changes for FS2001. American & European course requirements lowered to 6 credit hours each and 2 History elective courses added for 6 credit hours. 300 level electives reduced from 12 to 9 credit hours. Justification: Since addition of Capstone (History 310), there is less need for 12 hours of 300 level courses.

CC 5007, English. Changes in the Technical Writing Minor, approved for FS2001. Description changed in catalog to read: To complete this minor, students must take English 65, 240, and 260 plus six additional hours of electives selected in consultation with their minor advisors in the English department.


CC 5014, Engineering Management 251, Marketing Management. Approved for FS2001. Changes in prerequisites from Eng Mg 209 or equivalent "TO" Eng Mg 211.


CC1 5018, Engineering Management 260, General Management-Design and Integration. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Eng Mg 251, 252, 282, one may be concurrent; senior standing "TO" Eng Mg 251, 252, and 282; senior standing.


CC1 5020, Engineering Management 282, Operations and Production Management. Approved for FS2001. Change in credit hours from 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab "TO" 3 hours lecture. Change in prerequisites from Mt Eng 121, Bas Eng 110, Eng Mg 209 and Stat 213 or 215 "TO" Eng Mg 211 and Stat 213 or 215.

CC1 5021, Engineering Management 313, Human Relations in Technical Management. Approved for FS2001. Change in course title "TO" Managerial Decision Making. Change in prerequisites from Senior or Graduate Standing "TO" Senior or Graduate Standing or Consent of Instructor. Catalog description changed to: Individual and group decision making processes and principles for engineers and technical managers with emphasis on the limitations of human rationality and the roles of social influence and organizational contexts; principles and skills of negotiation.

CC1 5022, Engineering Management 314, Management for Engineers. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Eng Mg 209 or equivalent "TO" Senior or graduate standing; students who have taken Eng Mg 211 may not enroll in this course.

CC1 5023, Engineering Management 317, Comparative and Multi-National Management. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Eng Mg 209 "TO" Senior or graduate standing.

CC1 5025, Engineering Management 324, Fundamentals of Manufacturing. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Eng Mg 282 or instructor approved equivalent "TO" Eng Mg 282.

CC1 5026, Engineering Management 328, Government Regulations; Business & Industry. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Pol Sc 90 "TO" Senior or graduate standing.


CC1 5028, Engineering Management 332, Engineering Cost Accounting. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisite from Eng Mg 230 or graduate standing "TO" Senior or graduate standing.
CC1 5029, Engineering Management 333, Management Information Systems. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from None “TO” Senior or graduate standing.


CC1 5032, Engineering Management 344, Interdisciplinary Problems in Manufacturing, Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Eng Mg 334 or Mc Eng 355 “TO” Eng 334.

CC1 5033, Engineering Management 345, Energy Management Engineering. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Eng Mg 209 “TO” Senior or graduate standing.


CC1 5037, Engineering Management 361, Project Management. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Senior or graduate standing “TO” Eng Mg 211.

CC1 5039, Engineering Management 364, Value Analysis. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Senior standing “TO” Senior or graduate standing.


CC1 5041, Engineering Management 372, Production Planning and Scheduling. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Eng Mg 282 or graduate standing “TO” Eng Mg 282.

CC1 5042, Engineering Management 374, Engineering Design Optimization. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Math 229 or consent of instructor “TO” Math 204 or 229.

CC1 5043, Engineering Management 378, Introduction to Neural Networks & Applications. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Math 229 or 204 or equivalent “TO” Math 204 or 229.

CC1 5044, Engineering Management 380, Work Design. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from None “TO” Senior or graduate standing.


CC1 5047, Engineering Management 384, Packaging Materials I. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Preceded or accompanied by Eng Mg 383 "TO" Eng Mg 383.


CC1 5049, Engineering Management 386, Safety Engineering Management. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from At least Junior Standing "TO" Senior or graduate standing.

CC1 5050, Engineering Management 388, Packaging System Design. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Preceded or accompanied by Eng Mg 383 "TO" Eng Mg 383.

CC1 5051, Engineering Management 389, Packaging Materials II. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Preceded or accompanied by Eng Mg 383 "TO" Eng Mg 383.

CC1 5055, Metallurgical Engineering 478, Thermodynamics and Kinetics of Materials. Approved new course for WS2002. 4 hours credit. Prerequisites: Graduate standing or consent of instructor. Description: The principles and applications of solution thermodynamics and kinetics are discussed relative to materials systems to explain phase equilibria, chemical processes and phase transformations. Topics considered include phase diagrams, gas-solid reactions, liquid-solid reactions, diffusion, reaction rate theory, conductivity in ceramics, nucleation and growth during phase transformation.

CC1 5056, Metallurgical Engineering, change in the Graduate Curriculum. Approved for FS2001.

CC1 5057, Ceramic Engineering 477, Atomic Structure in Solid State Materials. Approved new course for FS2001. 4 hours credit. Prerequisites: Graduate standing or consent of instructor. Description: The principles of chemical bonding in solids are discussed in terms of electronic structure and chemical bonding. The crystallography of perfect crystals is described along with reciprocal lattices and tensor properties. Finally, the characterization of crystalline materials is discussed.
For the information of the Academic Council, the following EC1s have been submitted by the University departments for an experimental course that will be offered in the near future.

Approved EC1s

EC1 1186, Mechanical Engineering 401, Modeling and Control of Manufacturing, Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Mc Eng 355, mc Eng 381.

EC1 1187, Engineering Management 401, Organizational Behavior Issues in the Age of Electronic Commerce, the Internet, and Dotcom Organizations. Approved for WS2001. 3 hours lecture. Prerequisites: Eng Mg 211 or 313 or 314.

EC1 1188, Geology 301, Isotope Geochemistry. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: Geo 130; Geo 223; Chem 3.

EC1 1189, Psychology 301, Multi-media Development and Design. Approved for FS2001. (Co-listed with Bas Eng 301.) 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Junior standing or higher.

EC1 1190, Electrical Engineering 301, Photovoltaic Systems Engineering. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Senior or Graduate Standing.

EC1 1191, Electrical Engineering 301, Cryptography. Approved for WS2002. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: El Eng 265.

EC1 1193, Geophysics 401, Electrical and Electromagnetic Geophysics. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Math 325 and Geop 285 or Geop 382.

EC1 1194, Computer Science 401, Web Date Management and XML. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: DBMS (Cmp Sc 304).

EC1 1195, Psychology 301, Cognitive Neuroscience. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Psych 305 or 330.

EC1 1196, Speech & Media Studies 301, Argumentation and Debate. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: SP&M S 85.

EC1 1197, UMR Pre-Freshman HGR 101, Hit the Ground Running. Approved for SS2001. 3 hours credit. No prerequisites.

J. Keith Nisbett
Chair, UMR Campus Curricula Committee
MEMO

To: Academic Council
From: UMR Campus Curricula Committee
RE: April 2, 2001, Meeting
(Continuation of Meeting on April 5, 2001)

The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends to the Academic Council that the curricula changes on the following CC1s be approved.

CC1 5052, Geophysics 383, Electrical Methods in Geophysics. Remove from tabled. Approved for FS2001; a change in credit hours from 3 hours lab "TO" 1 hour lecture and 2 hour lab. The last sentence in the catalog description was changed to: Several weekends are required, making a variety of electrical surveys of local features. The wording, "at student expense," was omitted in the proposed change of description by the Curricula Committee due to the fact that any questions of fees should have a campus wide approval by a higher authority and must fit in with University wide policy pertaining to assessment of fees.

CC1 5059, English 311, Teaching and Supervising Writing, approved new course for SS2002. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: 6 hours of college level writing courses. Description: Students will study contemporary and traditional approaches to writing instruction. The course will give students practice in applying composition theory and research to development of teaching methods, including course syllabi and assignments.

CC1 5061, Chemistry 464, Free Radicals in Biochemistry. Approved new course for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Chem 221, Chem 223 and Bio Sc 211. Description: The study of the basic principles of free radical chemistry and biochemistry.

CC1 5062, Mining Engineering. Approved new Minor in Mining Engineering for FS2001.
CC1 5063, Geology 325, Advanced Physical Geology. Approved new course for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Consent of instructor. Description: History and materials of the Earth's crust, structures and geological features of the surface. Study of common minerals and rocks, topographic and geologic maps, depositional systems, sedimentary classification systems.


CC1 5065, Biological Sciences. Approved curriculum changes for FS2001.

CC1 5066, Biological Sciences 218, Plant Biology. Approved changes for FS2001. Change in course number from 218 "TO" 118. Change from being an elective "TO" a required course.

CC1 5067, Biological Sciences 219, Plant Biology Laboratory. Approved for FS2001. Change in course number from 219 "TO" 119. Change from being an elective "TO" a required course.

CC1 5068, Biological Sciences 215, Zoology. Approved for FS2001. Change in course number from 215 "TO" 115.

CC1 5069, Engineering Management 469, Systems Architecturing. Approved new course for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Graduate standing. Description: The objective of the course is to provide the basic tools and concepts of systems architecturing for complex systems design and operations. These tools and concepts are reinforced with projects and case studies.

CC1 5070, Civil Engineering 314, Geotechnical Aspects of Waste Management. Approved for FS2001. Change in course title "TO" Geosynthetics in Engineering. Change in description to: Geotechnical principles are applied to design of geosynthetic systems for foundation support, earth retention, drainage, and disposal of hazardous conventional wastes. Geosynthetic testing and identification. Emphasis is on design of geosynthetic earth reinforcement, roadway stabilization, filters, and waste containment systems.

CC1 5071, Civil Engineering 345, Construction Methods. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Cv Eng 245 with a grade of "C" or better "TO" Cv Eng 248 with a grade of "C" or better.

CC1 5072, Civil Engineering 346, Management of Construction Costs, approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Cv Eng 245 with a grade of "C" or better "TO" Cv Eng 248 with a grade of "C" or better.

CC1 5073, Civil Engineering 349, Engineering and Construction Contract Specifications. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisite from, Preceded or accompanied by Cv Eng 245 "TO" Preceded or accompanied by Cv Eng 248.


CC1 5075, Management Systems, Approved deletion of emphasis area, Non-Profit Sector, effective FS2001.

CC1 5076, Management Systems. Approved change of name for the emphasis area, Public Sector "TO" be renamed, Government, effective FS2001.
CC1 5077, Ceramic Engineering, approved curriculum changes for FS2001.

CC1 5078, Education 339, Current Issues in Education, Performance Based Assessment, Beginning, for WS2002. At the request of the committee, Jana Scott and Doris Ridder provided more detail concerning the structure and assessment methods used in the course. The appropriate course numbering level was discussed. Approved for WS2002 by a 2-1 vote.

CC1 5079, Education 341, Current Issues in Education, Performance Based Assessment, Advanced, for WS2002. At the request of the committee, Jana Scott and Doris Ridder provided more detail concerning the structure and assessment methods used in the course. The appropriate course numbering level was discussed. Approved for WS2002 by a 2-1 vote.

For the information of the Academic Council, the following EC1s have been submitted by the University departments for an experimental course that will be offered in the near future.

EC1 1199, Geology 401, Advanced Mineralogy and Petrology, approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Admittance into graduate school. (Ft. Wood ECCC classes.)

EC1 1200, Geophysics 401, Adv. Engineering and Environmental Geophysics, approved for WS2001. 3 hours credit. Admittance into graduate school. (Ft. Wood ECCC classes.)

EC1 1201, Education 301, Band Directors Summer Workshop, approved for SS2001. 1 hour lecture and 1 hour lab. Graduate standing.

EC1 1202, Education 301, School Law and Finance for Teachers, approved for SS2001. 1 hour credit. Graduate standing.

EC1 1203, Education 301, How to Prepare Students for College Mathematics, approved for SS2001. 1 hour credit. Graduate standing; currently teaching or preparing to teach high school mathematics.

EC1 1204, Education 301, The Jazz Age: American Culture of the 1920’s, approved for SS2001. 1 hour credit. Junior or Senior standing.

EC1 1205, Education 301, Reading the Strategic Way, approved for SS2001. 1 hour credit. Junior or Senior standing.

EC1 1206, Education 301, Early Childhood Development, approved for SS2001. 2 hours credit. Junior or Senior standing.

EC1 1207, Education 301, Techniques of Teaching Cross-Categorical Classrooms, approved for SS2001. 2 hours credit. Junior or Senior standing.

EC1 1208, Education 301, Curriculum and Instruction of Gifted Students, approved for SS2001. Junior or Senior standing.
EC1 1209, Education 301, Parents as Partners, approved for SS2001. 3 hours credit. Junior or Senior standing.

EC1 1210, Education 301, Using Multimedia in the Classroom, approved for SS2001. 1 hour credit. Graduate standing.


EC1 1212, Basic Engineering 301, Multimedia Development and Design, approved for FS2001 previously by committee members on e-mail. 3 hours credit. Junior standing or higher. Co-listed with Psych 301, Multimedia Development and Design.

EC1 1213, Basic Engineering 301, Web Design and Development, approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. No prerequisites.


EC1 1215, Education 301, Cooperative Structures I, approved for SS2001. 3 hours credit. Teaching certification.

EC1 1216, Education 301, Cooperative Structures II, approved for SS2001. 3 hours credit. Cooperative structures I.

EC1 1217, Education 301, Reading in the Content Fields, approved for SS2001. 3 hours credit. Graduate standing.

J. Keith Nisbett,
Chair, UMR Campus Curricula Committee
On November 25, 2000 our committee was created and asked

"to look at issues of student mentoring particularly as it affects retention from a faculty perspective; to explore how faculty can contribute to improve retention and to review the issues associated with sticking points and to make appropriate recommendations to the Academic Council for consideration".

To that end we have met several times, participated in and attended the Computer Science department’s Teaching Seminar and have reviewed other documents and recommendations to arrive at this report.

The committee believes that the vast majority of UMR instructors teaches with the very best of intentions and has committed themselves to help UMR students to be as successful as they possibly can be. The committee also believes that occasionally those intentions are unintentionally misdirected. To assist both the faculty and their students to understand what might be reasonably expected of each, we submit the following recommendations. In the tradition of good science and engineering, we have attempted to make these as objective as possible in order to reduce any misunderstanding.

Before proceeding to those recommendations an oft-repeated concern needs to be addressed. This concern was echoed in President Myers’s charge to the committee. Namely,

"At the same time, faculty and administration should have very appropriate concerns that academic standards are not sacrificed . . . ."

The committee finds no evidence to suggest that anyone associated with UMR has any interest in lowering or sacrificing our academic standards. UMR students, as much as UMR faculty, take great pride in our tradition of high quality and are adamant that those standards be retained. It has on occasion appeared to the committee that this concern is put forth as a way to avoid examining cherished classroom behaviours. The committee believes that its recommendations are consistent with and will even enhance UMR’s high standards.

Contained in the Strategic Plan for the University of Missouri System - October 2000, is the following section:

Strategic Directions for the Future

Student Learning and Achievement

Strategic Goal: Develop a learner-centered environment that promotes the improvement of learning and personal development of students at all levels.

Objective 1: Redirect the educational process to focus on a learning environment as opposed to a teaching environment.
Action Steps:

1.1 Adopt the **Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education**.

The committee endorses those principles and makes its recommendations within the context of them.

**Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education**

**Principle 1: Encourage Student-Faculty Contact**

Frequent student-faculty contact in and out of classes is the most important factor in student motivation and involvement. Faculty concern helps students get through rough times and keep on working. Knowing a few faculty members well enhances students' intellectual commitment and encourages them to think about their own values and future plans.

**Recommendation:** Instructors are encouraged to use email as a tool to promote interaction with students. When a student sends an email question, the committee suggests that the student’s name be removed and then the original question plus the answer be forwarded to the entire class.

**Recommendation:** Instructors are encouraged to serve as advisors for student professional societies and groups, to attend the meetings and other activities and socialize with the students.

**Recommendation:** Instructors are encouraged to bring students to professional conferences and encourage them to present student posters or papers of their work.

**Principle 2: Encourage Cooperation Among Students**

Learning is enhanced when it is more like a team effort than a solo race. Good learning, like good work, is collaborative and social, not competitive and isolated. Working with others often increases involvement in learning. Sharing one's own ideas and responding to others' actions sharpens thinking and deepens understanding.

**Recommendation:** none.

**Observation** - UMR students do not believe this principle. In fact, they will actively resist most cooperative type assignments. UMR students arrive on campus having been very successful in high school **without** ever needing to seek help from others. They take individual pride in **not** needing help. UMR students regard asking for help, any kind of help, as a strong form of failure. All of their past successes have been achieved as rugged individualists and that’s the only way that they know how to proceed.

**Principle 3: Encourage Active Learning**

Learning is not a spectator sport. Students do not learn much just by sitting in classes listening to teachers, memorizing pre-packaged assignments, and spitting out answers. They must talk about what they are learning, write about it, relate it to past experiences, and apply it to their daily lives. They must make what they learn part of themselves.

**Recommendation:** In a course that serves as a prerequisite for a course in the same discipline, mention repeatedly with explicit examples how the current material will apply in the later semesters.
Recommendation: In a course that serves as a prerequisite for a course in a different discipline, acquire problems from post requisite course and show how the current material will be utilized in later semesters.

Recommendation: Extra curricular activities such as design competitions and co-op experience often help students better understand what they are learning. Faculty should encourage students to participate in such activities.

Principle 4: Give Prompt Feedback

Knowing what you know and don't know focuses learning. Students need appropriate feedback on performance to benefit from courses. When getting started, students need help in assessing existing knowledge and competence. In classes, students need frequent opportunities to perform and receive suggestions for improvement. At various points during college, and at the end, students need chances to reflect on what they have learned, what they still need to know, and how to assess themselves.

Recommendation: Assign grades honestly. Inform students of the letter grade scale that applies to each significant effort. During the semester, the students should know with reasonable certainty that ‘if the semester ended today I would receive a letter grade of x’.

Recommendation: one or more of the following should precede each exam
- Sample exam from previous semester
- Set of sample / example questions
- Review in class prior to exam of the salient issues that will be addressed on the exam

Recommendation: At least one significant work should be graded / returned prior to the last day to drop and not show on the transcript

Recommendation: At least 60% of the points should be accumulated prior to the last day to drop the course.

Principle 5: Emphasize Time on Task

Time plus energy equals learning. There is no substitute for time on task. Learning to use one’s time well is critical for students and professionals alike. Students need help in learning effective time management. Allocating realistic amounts of time means effective learning for students and effective teaching for faculty. How an institution defines time expectations for students, faculty, administrators, and other professional staff can establish the basis for high performance for all.

Recommendation: none.

Observation: UMR students describe their ‘effort level’ in high school as minimal. They will readily admit that they:
- Never had to study a text diligently
- Never had to take extensive notes based on a classroom lecture
- Never had to carefully budget their time
- Never had to memorize significant amounts of material
- Never had to calculate without an electronic calculator
Principle 6: Communicate High Expectations

Expect more and you will get more. High expectations are important for everyone - for the poorly prepared, for those unwilling to exert themselves, and for the bright and well motivated. Expecting students to perform well becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy when teachers and institutions hold high expectations for themselves and make extra efforts.

Recommendation: Do not use fear as a motivational device. The following are strongly discouraged

- Tests with averages in the 40's and 50's, regardless of later scaling
- Exam grades that are left exceptionally low because they ‘might’ be rescaled in the future
- Midterm grades that are only loosely correlated to final grades
- Being purposely vague about grading procedure to keep students ‘motivated’
- Structuring the class so that a ‘bad day’ can cost the student 2 letter grades or more.
- Counting any single grade effort more than 30% of the semester total.

Said in another way: Students "expect" there to be a relationship between their grade and their effort in the class. That is, more effort means a better grade. Structuring a class to keep students about two letter grades lower than what they will ultimately receive, in order to motivate them to strive for more, is demoralizing and should be avoided.

Principle 7: Respect Diverse Talents and Ways of Learning

There are many roads to learning. People bring different talents and styles of learning to college. Brilliant students in the seminar room may be all thumbs in the lab or art studio. Students rich in hands-on experience may not do so well with theory. Students need the opportunity to show their talents and learn in ways that work for them. Then they can be pushed to learning in new ways that do not come so easily.

Recommendation: Structure the class so that points may be earned in a variety of ways. Assigning all of the points via the traditional ‘three exams and a final’ is discouraged. Graded homework, laboratory exercises, individual or group projects and writing assignments are other possibilities for allowing students to earn points.


Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Carroll
Arlan DeKock, Chair
Shari Dunn Norman
Jeffrey Cawfield
Michael Hilgers
Keith Stanek
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

ACTION ITEMS

Date of Passage  Subject  REFERRED TO

January, 2000  Resolution on Video/Distance Learning  Dr. Thomas

October, 2000  Resolution on Faculty Performance Shares Plan  Dr. Thomas
XXX,7. The meeting was called to order at 1:30 P.M. by President Don Myers. Roll call was taken, and absentees noted were: James Stone, Richard Bullock, Paul Worsely, Patrick Giunta, Greg Gelles, Kristine Swenson, Shubhender Kapila, Mark Mullin, Neil Book, Dr. Gajda, Dr. Ogrosky, and Dean Mitchell.

.1 REPORTS AND RESPONSES

A. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

1. President Myers distributed copies of a resolution concerning Faculty Evaluation of Campus Administrators.
   a. Professor Myers said this resolution outlines basic policy or guidelines designed to be on a developmental basis-as part of an annual review.
   b. President Myers said the feeling at IFC was that Faculty would not be comfortable if someone made their evaluations available to the campus-therefore, neither should the administrators’ evaluations be public.
   c. Professor Ralph Wilkerson moved to approve the resolution. Professor Todd Hubing seconded.
   d. Following a very brief discussion, vote was taken, and motion carried.

2. President Myers asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the February 15, 2001 meeting and the special meeting on March 13, 2001 as distributed. Professor Hal Nystrom moved to approve. There was a second and motion carried.
3. Professor Myers stated that there is an effort at the University-wide level to develop a copyright policy. He said this went to the Patent Committee this week, and is on the agenda for IFC’s April 20 meeting. He also said Faculty will have an opportunity for input.

B. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT-Dr. Thomas presented this report on current items of interest.
1. The Chancellor said the Degree in Architectural Engineering and the MS in Biological Sciences have been approved by Board of Curators. After approval by the Board, he stated, these would by posted on the web site of the Coordinating Board for 45 days. Then they will be placed on the agenda of the Coordinating Board.
2. Dr. Thomas announced that Dr. Shah will begin his duties as Provost on July 1, 2001, and that an offer has been made to one of the Candidates for Dean of Enrollment. He also stated that he was in the final stages of appointing an Interim Vice Provost of Research.
3. The Chancellor said the Departments were asked on April 1, 2001 to come up with programs that need to be pushed. A large number of proposals were submitted.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS-There were no questions from the floor.

.2 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

A. CURRICULA-Professor Charles Morris presented this report, consisting of both March and April recommendations from this committee.
1. There was a motion to approve both degree programs presented in Ceramic Engineering, an MS in Biomaterials, and in Mining Engineering, an ME in Engineering. This was followed by a second.
   a. Dean Saperstein pointed out that the new degree programs are exciting for UMR and fit very well with Dr. Thomas’ ideas about UMR’s role in research.
2. Vote was taken and the motion carried.
3. Professor Morris then moved to approve the CC1’s as distributed. Following a second, motion carried.

B. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON MENTORING-This report on the issue of “sticking points” was presented by Professor Arlan Dekock, with an overhead presentation (see attached).

1. Professor Dekock thanked the Council for creating this important committee, and the members for serving.
2. He briefly referred to the high points of the report that was distributed with the agenda.
3. Professor Dekock said many serious issues would require further study.

C. COMBINED COMMITTEES REPORT (Academic Freedom, Admissions and Academic Standards, and Academic Assessment) - This report was presented by Professor Keith Stanek.

1. Professor Stanek referred to the report that was distributed with the agenda.
2. He then stated that this group had met with the Chancellor and two things were agreed upon: (1) No one wants to lower standards and (2) they don’t want to tell anyone how to give grades. He say, however; that, in order to approve students’ learning, classes with too many low grades would have to be noted.
3. Professor Stanek said these positive programs have already been started: Voyager Community Learning Program and Physics Learning Center.
4. After some discussion there were questions from the floor.
   a. Professor Carol Ann Smith asked where this would go now. Professor Myers said he and President-Elect Ralph Wilkerson have discussed having the RP&A Committee keep this going to a productive solution.
   b. Dr. Thomas commented that there is much to be learned on this issue from other educational institutions.
c. There was a question as to whether efforts were being made to increase ways to involve students.

5. Professor Carol Ann Smith moved to endorse the report from Professor Dekock and to have it circulated (stating this was even though she didn't agree with every statement.) Professor Ralph Wilkerson seconded. After a few comments and a friendly amendment to change wording to say “many students”, motion carried.

.3 No old business was presented.

.4 NEW BUSINESS

A. STUDENT COUNCIL
1. Mr. Joe Maul announced new STUCO officers: Keith Ziegelman as President and R.J. Agee as Vice President of External Affairs.
2. A resolution from STUCO was presented on establishing Academic Probation Advisors (see attached).
   a. Professor S.N. Balakrishnan moved to approve. Professor Hal Nystrom seconded.
   b. After much discussion, Professor Carol Ann Smith moved to table. There was a second, and motion carried.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Lenn Koederitz, Secretary

*Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
To: UMR FACULTY
Academic Council Meeting
Thursday, June 21, 2001

I. Approval of minutes of the April 19, 2001 meeting

II. Reports and Responses
A. President's Report—to include IFC  (15 min.) Don Myers
B. Chancellor’s Report   (10 min.) Gary Thomas
   (10 minutes for Questions and Answers)

III. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
A. Curricula   (5 min.) Charles Morris
   1.*Report No. 11
B. Rules, Procedure and Agenda  (10 min.) Jeff Cawlfield
   1. Committee Elections
C. Student Affairs   (10 min.) Mark Potrafka
   1.*Constitutions
      a. Photography Club
      b. The Vine
   2. Organizations that have given up approved status

IV. Old Business
A. *Action Items

V. New Business and Announcements
A. Staff Council
B. Student Council   R. J. Agee
   1. *Resolutions
C. Graduate Students’ Council
D. Referrals

*Information distributed with agenda
Memo To: Academic Council
From: UMR Campus Curricula Committee
Re: May 21, 2001, Meeting

The UMR Campus Curricula Committee recommends to the Academic Council that the curricula changes on the following CC1s be approved.

CC1 5080, Statistics 444, Design and Analysis of Experiments. Approved for WS2002. Change in prerequisites from One of Stat 343, 353, or Eng Mg 387; and one of Stat 211, 213, 215, or 217 "TO" One of Stat 353, Eng Mg 387 and one of Stat 211, 213, 215, 217, 343; or Stat 343 and one of Stat 211, 213, 215, 217.

CC1 5081, Chemistry 226, Organic Chemistry I Lab. Approved for FS2001. Change in prerequisites from Chem 8, preceded or accompanied by Chem 221 and Chem 4 or an equivalent training program approved by UMR "TO" Preceded or accompanied by Chem 221 and, either Chem 4 or equivalent training program approved by UMR.

CC1 5082, Geological Engineering 435, Advanced Concepts of Environmental Geological Engineering. Approved new course for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Graduate level course in environmental geologic studies. Description: Application of the principles of geology to the solution of engineering problems in environmental protection and remediation. Topics will include the study of geologic processes and the evaluation of geologic materials as they affect the potential for groundwater contamination, susceptibility of soils to erosion, characterization of the geologic environment for site suitability and the analysis of the criteria necessary for the selection of technologies for minimizing environmental impact.

CC1 5086, Engineering Management, curriculum change for Packaging, Manufacturing, Management of Technology, and Industrial Engineering emphasis areas. The course Stat 211 was added to the curriculum along with Stat 213 and 215. Approved for FS2001.
For the information of the Academic Council, the following EC1s have been submitted by the University departments for an experimental course that will offered in the near future.

EC1 1218, Metallurgical Engineering 301, Microfabrication Materials and Processes, Approved for WS2002. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Chem 1 or equivalent.

EC1 1219, Geological Engineering 401, Discontinuous Rock. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: A course in rock mechanics or rock engineering.


EC1 1221, Geological Engineering 301, Missouri Mineral Resources. Approved for SS2001. 1 hour lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: BS/BA Degree with Teacher Certification.

EC1 1222, Basic Engineering 401, Modern Product Design. Approved for WS2002. Co-listed with Mc Eng 401. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Mc Eng 302 or Mc Eng 350 or Mc Eng 356 or Mc Eng 308 or Mc Eng 355 or El Eng 392 or Eng Mg 350 or Eng Mg 354 or other 3xx level course with significant design content.

EC1 1223, Basic Engineering 301, Engineering Design Projects. Approved for WS2002. 2 hours lecture and 1 hour lab. Prerequisites: Bas En 220.

EC1 1224, Mechanical Engineering 401, Modern Product Design. Approved for WS2002. 3 hours credit. Prerequisites: Mc Eng 302, or 350 or 356 or 308 or 355 or El Eng 392 or Eng Mg 350 or 354 or other 3xx level course with significant design content.

EC1 1225, Education 301, Curriculum and Instruction in Secondary Mathematics Approved for SS2001. 1 hour credit. Prerequisites: graduate standing and currently teaching secondary mathematics.

EC1 1226, Education 301, Professional Development. Approved for SS2001. 1 hour credit. Prerequisite: Graduate standing.

EC1 1227, Education 301, Curriculum and Instruction in Secondary Science. Approved for SS2001. 1 hour credit. Prerequisite: Graduate standing and currently teaching secondary science.

EC1 1228, Chemistry 401, Bioinorganic Chemistry. Approved for FS2001. 3 hours credit. Prerequisite: Chem 331.


J. K. Nisbett, Chair
Constitution and By-Laws
University of Missouri-Rolla Photography Club

ARTICLE I - NAME AND PURPOSE
The name of this organization shall be "The University of Missouri-Rolla Photography Club." The purpose of the club shall be to promote and provide for a student interest in photography.

ARTICLE II - MEMBERSHIP AND VOTING
Active membership shall be limited to regularly enrolled students of UMR. UMR faculty, UMR staff, and any other persons not meeting the standards for active membership may become associate members. Only active student members may hold office, and vote in elections and on official club business.

ARTICLE III - OFFICERS AND ADVISOR
Section 1: The officers shall consist of President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer; to be elected by a majority vote of the active members present at the official meeting preceding the final official meeting of the academic year.

Section 2: The President shall be the presiding officer of the Club. The President shall preside at all meetings. The President is responsible for keeping track of inventory and maintaining the supply of consumable items. The President shall appoint an Active Member or Officer to be the parliamentarian of the Club for the purpose of establishing the proper procedure when a situation arises which is not covered by the Constitution (Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised shall be followed in all situations not covered by this constitution).

Section 3: The Vice-President shall, in the absence of the President, perform all duties incumbent of that office. The Vice-President shall be responsible for organizing special events and publicity.

Section 4: The Secretary-Treasurer shall keep the general Club records, including minutes of the Club meetings, equipment master inventory reference list, Club purchase list, attendance records, and a list of members together with their student numbers, e-mail addresses, and other contact information. The Secretary-Treasurer shall also collect from the members all money due to the Club and shall deposit same in either a local bank, local credit union, or in a University account, as decided upon by the Club; and shall pay out money only in accordance with the constitutional procedure regarding finance. The Secretary-Treasurer shall issue biannual financial statements to the club at the first business meeting of each semester and shall, at all other times, be prepared to give a current financial statement. The Secretary-Treasurer shall have, at every official meeting all papers and documents necessary for the conduct of the club business.

Section 5: The Advisor(s) must be an associate member of the club and a faculty member or staff member of UMR. An Advisor must be or become an Associate Member within two weeks of becoming an Advisor. If an Active Member wishes to add an advisor to the club, the member shall file it as a motion and nominate the person to be an Advisor. The Advisor-to-be must be present at the meeting to accept the nomination. The motion shall then be put to a vote and must pass by a simple majority. Removal of an Advisor shall follow the same process as a motion. An Advisor cannot be removed if removal would result in the Club having no Advisors.

Section 6: Succession: The Vice-President shall assume the office of President in name and duty should the office of President be vacated. All other vacancies will be filled by special election at the official meeting immediately following the vacancy.

Section 7: No person shall be eligible to hold office in the Club who is not an active member of the Club. No person shall be eligible to hold office if they are not in good academic standing with the University. No person may hold more than one office in the Club.

Section 8: Officers shall be elected for a term consisting of following fall and spring semesters. The elections shall take place at the spring semester. Only Active members who will be attending UMR for the following fall and spring semester may run for office. An exception to the previous statement is that an Active Member who would be running incumbent but not be present for spring semester may run and a special election would be held for his position at the end of the fall semester. A term begins for a newly elected officer after the end of the semester during which he or she was elected.

Section 9: Impeachment of an officer shall consist of a petition clearly outlining the basis for removal and containing signatures from forty percent of the active members of the Club. The petition must be presented to the Club. Then, a general election of two-thirds of the active membership of the Club must vote to remove the officer by a two-thirds majority of those active members present. The officer in question shall speak before the vote is taken.

ARTICLE IV - QUORUM AND MEETING
Section 1: A quorum for the transaction of official Club business shall be a simple majority of active members. Unless specified in the Constitution or By-Laws, Club business cannot be transacted outside of an official meeting or without a quorum.

Section 2: Special meetings may be called by any two officers, one of whom must be in attendance. The special meeting may only require that only officers need be present, though others may attend, depending on how the two officers calling the meeting decide.

Section 3: Special meetings shall be for the purpose stated in their announcement and only business considered to be urgent shall be brought before the Club.

ARTICLE VI - LIMITATIONS ON EQUIPMENT USE
Constitution of The Vine

Article I – Name

This Organization shall be known as The Vine, and shall be affiliated with Vineyard Christian Fellowship-Rolla.

Article II – Purpose

1. To help UMR students achieve maturity and wholeness through the resources available to them in Jesus Christ and as a part of a Christian community.
2. To encourage UMR students to be an effective part of a Christian community with a focus on the development of relationships with God and with each other.
3. To help UMR students relate to other parts of the Christian community, i.e., churches in the area, at home, and in the future.
4. To offer a positive influence and spiritual guidance to all members of the academic community.

Article III. – Membership

1. Regular Membership: any UMR student who participates in the life of the organization on the University of Missouri-Rolla campus is eligible for regular membership. Members can be inducted at any regular meeting by a majority vote of members present. Privileges of said membership include the right to vote on matters concerning the organization and hold office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Passage</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>REFERRED TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January, 2000</td>
<td>Resolution on Video/Distance Learning</td>
<td>Dr. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2000</td>
<td>Resolution on Faculty Performance Shares Plan</td>
<td>Dr. Thomas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution 0001R4

Resolution to Establish Academic Probation Advisors

Whereas: There are currently no advisors specifically trained and prepared to handle students on academic probation, and

Whereas: The students of the University of Missouri - Rolla could benefit from probationary advisors, and

Whereas: It has been stated that the University of Missouri-Rolla is currently focusing on the recruitment and retention of students, and

Whereas: Faculty advisors specifically trained in dealing with probationary issues would be beneficial to students having academic difficulties.

Therefore: Be it resolved that the students of the University of Missouri-Rolla support the creation of advisors for the sole purpose of advising students who are currently on academic probation or placed on probation in the future,

Be it further resolved, the students feel that this would be of great assistance to the students, and would fall in line with the University’s desire to retain more students.

Respectfully Submitted,

John Burns
Member-At-Large

Clarifying Remarks:

After discussing this idea with students, the following ideas were submitted and are included to assist in the creation of this position.

The advisors could either be part of each department or a separate entity, and would be a central point of information and assistance for those who are on academic probation; such as what their status entails and what they can do to return to a normal status, also they would assist in finding tutors, study groups, teacher assistance, counseling, etc.

The advisors would keep in contact with the teachers of the students who are under their advisement, and meet with the students regularly in order to keep track of progress. They would be able to advise the students in event that a student feels the need to withdraw/drop from a course, on if/which course the action needs to be taken.

The advisor would be a trusted middleperson in the event that a student needed to make up work in a class due to personal/medical problems. This would help those students who might not feel comfortable talking to their teacher, or don’t want their teachers to know the specifics of their problem.

http://www.umr.edu/~stuco/Resolutions/0001/r0001r4.html 6/5/01
Resolution 00001R5
Resolution to create University-wide policy for faculty changes

WHEREAS: Mid-semester faculty changes are a common occurrence;

WHEREAS: The vast majority of faculty members exhibit different teaching styles and expectations;

WHEREAS: A change in faculty or class structure during the semester can negatively affect a student;

WHEREAS: There is currently no policy to guide students affected by this change;

THEREFORE: Be it resolved that the students of the University of Missouri-Rolla would strongly support a policy by which a member of the department in question be required to inform students affected by a faculty change of their options and contact information for the applicable department chairperson.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

R.J. Agee
Vice President of External Affairs
UMR Student Council
XXX,8. The meeting was called to order at 1:30 P.M. by President Don Myers. Roll call was taken, and absentees noted were: Gary Mueller, Joel Burken, James Stone, Michael Meagher, Richard Bullock, Paul Worsey, Patrick Giunta, Richard Hall, Kristine Swenson, Shubhender Kapila, Kurt Kosbar, S.N. Balakrishnan, Ron Frank, Hal Nystrom, Wayne Huebner, and Michael Hilgers. Substitutions noted were Richard Bryant for Greg Gelles and Paul Parris for Gerald Wilemski.

There was a motion by Professor Charles Morris to approve the minutes of the April 19, 2001 meeting. Following a second, motion carried.

.1 REPORTS AND RESPONSES

A. PRESIDENT’S REPORT
   1. President Myers presented plaques of appreciation to Professors Lance Haynes and Jeff Cawlfield for their extended periods of service to the Council.
   2. Professor Myers reported on the April and May IFC meetings.
      a. There was discussion of the negotiations of the GE articulation agreement, whereby at any Missouri public institutions of higher learning, 40 hours can be transferred from any other institutions. This was passed by IFC, but UMC still has concerns. Vote may be taken on this issue at all campuses in the fall.
      b. Also discussed was changing the starting date for grad students and faculty. Ken Hutchinson is looking into this issue.
      c. President Myers said the Intellectual Property Document is being drafted to eventually go to the Patent Committee. He said the faculty should be getting an opportunity to provide input.
      d. Professor Myers said UMC is concerned about the Grievance Procedures, but the other campuses are not.
e. He also said concern was expressed about centralizing some services.
f. President Myers said the IFC summer retreat would be held soon, at which time the agenda and items of interest are set for next year. He asked that anyone who has items or issues that should be addressed by IFC notify him, Professor Ralph Wilkerson, or Professor Lenn Koederitz before August 1.

B. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT
1. Chancellor Thomas commented on items mentioned by Professor Myers.
   a. Concerning a potential disparity in salaries based on factors other than performance, he said he had looked at Faculty salaries by school and/or by department to see if groups (i.e. gender or ethnic) were paid at significantly lower levels than those of the unit as a whole. He said that none of the salaries appeared to be statistically outside of what would be expected due to rank and longevity.
   b. Concerning new professorships, Dr. Thomas said he is looking for funds to create additional named professorships.
   c. On the subject of Centralized Purchasing, the Chancellor said a decision would be made on July 6. The objective would be to purchase commodities would be purchased for the whole UM System, and UMR would buy from that contract. This would not apply to specialty items. Dr. Thomas said UMR might gain significant financial savings from this.
2. Dr. Thomas said that a memo went out in May concerning Faculty Performance Shares, asking that nominations be at the Dean’s offices by July 1. Decisions will be made about September 1.
3. The Chancellor said Vice Chancellor Ogrosky was expanding the LEAD Program. This was discussed by the Chancellor’s Staff Group, and Ron Bieniek was named as director of the center.
4. Dr. Thomas said two new Curators had just been here touring our campus, and everyone had done a good job showing them UMR. He said he hopes the whole Board of Curators will be here in November.
5. The Chancellor gave a brief overhead presentation on retention. He said the grade reports for Spring, 2001 show a 30% decline in the number of sections that gave 25% or more D's, F's, and W's.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS- There were a few brief questions and comments from the floor.

2 REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

A. CURRICULA- Professor Charles Morris presented this report.
   1. Professor Morris moved to approve the CC1's as distributed. Professor Dan White seconded, and motion carried.

B. RULES, PROCEDURES, AND AGENDA
   1. Professor Jeff Cawlfield distributed the ballots for election of members to Academic Council committees. He asked that the ballots be marked and given to the secretary at the end of the meeting.

C. STUDENT AFFAIRS- This report was presented by Mr. R. J. Agee.
   1. Mr. Agee presented the constitutions for two organizations-the Photography Club and The Vine.
      a. Professor Todd Hubing moved to approve the Photography Club. Following a second, motion carried.
      b. A discussion ensued concerning The Vine.
         1. Dean Saperstein said the language was not good in the constitution. He said the proposed constitution needed minor changes.
         2. Professor Lance Haynes said it's not restrictive for membership.
         3. There was a question from the floor as to whether University money is used for clubs. Mr. Agee said the groups can ask STUCO for funds, but it has to be for an event open to the whole campus. Also STUCO gives one-time startup money.
4. The Chancellor suggested a preamble stating that the organization recognize that UMR has a religiously heterogeneous student body.
5. There was no motion made on The Vine. It will now go back to the committee.

.3 No old business was presented.

.4 NEW BUSINESS

A. STAFF COUNCIL
   1. Mr. Greg Harris said his observation in working with this group is that many people move on in the same old way, while others think change is wonderful.

B. STUDENT COUNCIL-Mr. R.J. Agee presented this report.
   1. Mr. Agee presented the resolution concerning having Advisors for students on Academic Probation.
      a. Chancellor Thomas moved to approve this resolution. Dean Saperstein seconded.
      b. After some discussion, the Chancellor suggesting eliminating the word “sole” in front of purpose.
      c. There was further discussion as to whether it should be referred.
      d. Vote was then taken, and motion carried.
   2. Mr. Agee presented the resolution on creating a U-wide policy on faculty changes.
      a. The Chancellor moved to approve, and there was a second.
      b. Professor Lance Haynes proposed a friendly amendment to replace the words “are a common occurrence” with “do occur”, and to replace “no policy” with “no uniform policy”. This was accepted. Vote was then taken, and motion carried.

C. GRADUATE STUDENTS’ COUNCIL-Ms. Carmen Doudna stated that she would be representing this group now.

D. REFERRALS- The resolutions were referred to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee.

The meeting was then adjourned.
Respectfully submitted,

Lenn Koederitz, Secretary

*Minutes of the Academic Council are considered official notification and documentation of actions approved.
September 6, 2000

MEMORANDUM TO:   Department Chairs
     FROM: Walter J. Gajda, Jr. Walter
     SUBJECT: Academic free time

To promote community activities, Chancellor Thomas wishes to designate the periods of 12:30 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday and Thursday as the campus academic free time. This will begin with the Winter 2001 semester.

The attached sheet identifies courses that meet during the free time period. While the schedule is very tight and the final draft for Winter 2001 has already been returned, please make the necessary changes for your courses and return the attached sheet to the Registrar's Office by noon on Monday, September 11.

If it is not possible to accommodate the request for one or more courses, please let me know directly.

WJG/bjc

cc: Chancellor Gary Thomas
    Dean Russell Buhite
    Dean Robert Mitchell
    Dean Lee Saperstein

Phone: 573/341-4138   Fax: 573/341-6306   E-mail: gajda@ee.umr.edu

an equal opportunity institution
Hi Mariesa and Arlan,

As discussed with each of you, I made a referral at the last Academic Council meeting to the committees you chair, i.e., Admissions and Academic Standards Committee and the ad hoc Mentoring Committee, to review the issues associated with "sticking points" and to make appropriate recommendations to the Academic Council for consideration.

"Sticking points" are evidently defined by the UMR Administration as those courses that have a pattern of more than 25% of D's, W's, and F's. The administration is very appropriately interested in improving retention rates at UMR and they see these courses as points to devote efforts to resolve issues that would improve the student success rate in such courses (and therefore ultimately retention rates). At the same time, faculty (and administration should) have very appropriate concerns that academic standards are not sacrificed and that inappropriate pressure is not applied to the individual instructor to fix the problem(s) when the problem(s) are a result of multiple causes which the individual instructor does not have the authority to correct many of the root problems.

It is requested that "sticking points" issue(s)/recommendation(s) be made as a joint committee(s) report if reasonable. Although I'm reluctant to provide detailed task assignments, I will share thoughts about my thinking in how to move this forward. It seems to me that the end result of the committees effort would be identification of issues and recommendations relative to a process for resolving those issues that relate to the individual sticking point courses. On the side of Academic Standards issues, it seems to me that there are issues as to who is to determine the standards, i.e., the content and level of knowledge, especially for courses that service multiple departments and schools. Related to who establishes the standards is the issue of academic freedom of the individual faculty member and where are the appropriate academic freedom boundaries are in the classroom. I have not referred the "sticking points" matter to the Academic Freedom Committee because their charge is to “conduct hearings on cases of alleged violations of academic freedom.” At this point we don't have any alleged violations of academic freedom. In addition, there are issues that deal with appropriate class sizes for students to be successful in mastering the materials. Rumors are that some faculty make those decisions unilaterally (via grading process) and many more cases I'm sure it is made unilaterally by chairs.

Relative to the retention issues for the Mentoring Committee, it seems to me there are issues relative to whether the appropriate support systems are in place to enhance success. For instance, is the present system effective in insuring that the students have the necessary prerequisites. Is there a need for a system to insure student participation in classes, i.e., an early warning system in all the sticking point courses? A bigger issue is what systems should be in place for oversight of sticking point courses and what is the role of the individual faculty and faculty in general. There are also issues as to whether the system identifies and rewards faculty for students successfully achieving the goals of the individual courses, i.e., are student evaluations useful for identifying successful achievement of course goals and how are these used in the reward system.

As stated originally, it may not be appropriate to try to answer some issues but merely to identify them and suggest ways/structure for others in resolving them. If is to be resolve by essentially others than the faculty, then I would hope recommendations would be made relative to any involvement of faculty.

This is obviously not a simple matter and not one that can be resolved by the faculty alone. It is one that I feel the faculty needs to be involved on a "proactive" rather than a "reactive" basis. Accordingly it is important that the faculty assist in indentify the issues and try to maintain open communications (and faculty participation) with the administration to insure appropriate solutions. Let me know how I can be of further assistance.

Regards,

Don

P.S. Could you provide me some date in which it is reasonable to expect recommendations?
### FALL SEMESTER 2002

- **International Student Orientation**: August 13, Tuesday
- **Fall Semester opens 7:30 a.m.**: August 18, Sunday
- **Freshman Orientation Begins**: August 18, Sunday
- **Transfer Student Orientation**: August 21, Wednesday
- **Student Registration 8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.**: August 22, Thursday
- **Classwork begins 7:30 a.m.**: August 26, Monday
- **Labor Day Holiday**: September 2, Monday
- **Mid-Semester**: October 19, Saturday
- **Thanksgiving vacation begins 7:30 a.m.**: November 27, Wednesday
- **Thanksgiving vacation ends 7:30 a.m.**: December 2, Monday
- **Last Class Day**: December 13, Friday
- **Reading Day**: December 14, Saturday
- **Final Examinations begin 8:00 a.m.**: December 16, Monday
- **Final Examinations end 6:00 p.m.**: December 20, Friday
- **Fall Semester closes 6:00 p.m.**: December 21, Saturday

### SPRING SEMESTER 2003

- **International Student Orientation**: January 6, Monday
- **Spring Semester opens 7:30 a.m.**: January 9, Thursday
- **Student Registration 8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.**: January 9, Thursday
- **Classwork begins 7:30 a.m.**: January 13, Monday
- **Martin Luther King, Jr. Recognition Holiday**: January 20, Monday
- **Mid-Semester**: March 8, Saturday
- **Spring Recess begins 7:30 a.m.**: March 13, Thursday
- **Spring Recess ends 7:30 a.m.**: March 17, Monday
- **Spring Break begins 7:30 a.m.**: March 30, Sunday
- **Spring Break ends 7:30 a.m.**: April 7, Monday
- **Last Class Day**: May 9, Friday
- **Reading Day**: May 10, Saturday
- **Final Examinations begin 8:00 a.m.**: May 12, Monday
- **Final Examinations end 6:00 p.m.**: May 16, Friday
- **Spring Semester closes 6:00 p.m.**: May 17, Saturday
- **May Commencement**: May 21, Tuesday

### *SUMMER SESSION 2003*

- **Summer Session opens 7:30 a.m.**: June 9, Monday
- **Student Registration 8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.**: June 9, Monday
- **Classwork begins 7:30 a.m.**: June 10, Tuesday
- **Independence Day Holiday**: July 4, Friday
- **Summer Sessions closes 12:30 p.m.**: August 2, Saturday

*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>T</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>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Semester</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faculty is reminded of the religious and other holidays that a substantial number of students may wish to observe.
COORDINATED ACADEMIC CALENDAR

On November 14, 1996, the IFC adopted the following set of principles to generate future academic calendars. These principles are:

1. There will be a common first day of class for the Fall and Winter semesters. The first day of class for the Fall semester will be Monday of the fourth full week in August, and the first day of class for the Winter semester will be Monday of the second full week in January, unless this day is Martin Luther King Day, then classes will begin on Tuesday.

2. There will be common breaks during the Fall and Winter semesters. There will be a common Thanksgiving break, which includes the Wednesday before Thanksgiving through the weekend following Thanksgiving. The common Spring break will be the last full week in March.

3. The total number of class days will be between 74-76 days, with an average of 45 M/W/F and 30 T/Th classes.

4. Reading and finals periods will be set by the individual campus. Every effort will be made to make the last day of class as close as possible for the four campuses.
December 4, 2000

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of Academic Council Committees

FROM: Donald Myers, President, Academic Council

SUBJECT: Organization of election of chairs

Colleagues:

Because of the necessity to make referrals from the Academic Council to the various committees, we need to be notified as to who is the chair of each committee.

If your committee has already met and organized this fall, please let us know right away. If it has not, we would appreciate it if someone from each committee would take responsibility for calling a meeting to select a chair. We ask that you do this as quickly as possible, and let us know the name of the chair.

If any members have issues that should be addressed by the committee, they should bring those up also at this initial meeting.

If we are not notified by next Wednesday, December 13, that this election has taken place, the Academic Council office will send out a ballot. If there is anyone that does not want to be a candidate, we would need to know by Tuesday.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation in this important matter.
January 3, 2001

TO: Committee Members

FROM: Donald D. Myers  
       Academic Council President

SUBJECT: Election of Chair

As I stated in my previous memo, the Academic Council Committees need to be organized without further delay. Would you notify us of your choice for chair of the ___________ Committee. If the member with the most votes should decline, the one with the next highest number will be the chair.

Thank you for your cooperation in this important matter.
So far, these are the committees which do not have a Chair elected, that I know of.

D.6.a Academic Foundations
D.6.b Curric
D.6.i Fac. Comm.
D.6.j Grad.
D.6.p Public Affairs
D.6.q Jeff
D.6.r Mark
D.6.u Student
D.6.v June

Debbie
April 20, 2001

To: Dr. Russell Buhite, Dean, School of Arts and Sciences

From: Jeff Cawlfield, Chair, RP&A Committee

Subject: Elections to Committees

It is that time of the year again when the College of Arts and Sciences needs to elect faculty representatives to a number of campus committees and, in addition, needs to select nominees to run for election at the May 1 General Faculty Meeting. The new committee members will begin serving their terms in September. I realize the timing is a little short. I would like to receive the election results from your School to the campus committees by June 1, and the nominations for the General Faculty meeting by April 27.

To be elected by the School:

- Academic Assessment (2 yr. Term): 1 member
- Honorary Degrees (1 yr. Term): 1 member
- Library & Learning Resources (2 yr. Term): 1 member
- Parking, Security & Traffic (2 yr. Term): 2 members
- Student Conduct (2 yr. Term): 2 members
- Promotion & Tenure Review (2 yr. Term): 1 member

Nominees for election by the General Faculty:

- Academic Freedom (2 yr. Term): 2 nominees
- Public Occasions (2 yr. Term): 2 nominees
- Publications (2 yr. Term): 2 nominees

I greatly appreciate your time and cooperation. Please sent to Shirley Hobson at 309 Harris or email to shobson@umr.edu.
April 20, 2001

To: Dr. Robert Mitchell, Dean, School of Engineering

From: Jeff Cawlfield, Chair, RP&A Committee

Subject: Elections to Committees

It is that time of the year again when the School of Engineering needs to elect faculty representatives to a number of campus committees and, in addition, needs to select nominees to run for election at the May 1 General Faculty Meeting. The new committee members will begin serving their terms in September. I realize the timing is a little short. I would like to receive the election results from your School to the campus committees by June 1, and the nominations for the General Faculty meeting by April 27.

To be elected by the School:

- Academic Assessment (2 yr. Term): 1 member
- Honorary Degrees (1 yr. Term): 1 member
- Library & Learning Resources (2yr. Term): 1 member
- Parking, Security & Traffic (2 yr. Term): 2 members
- Student Conduct (2 yr. Term): 2 members
- Promotion & Tenure Review (2 yr. Term): 1 member

Nominees for election by the General Faculty:

- Academic Freedom (2 yr. Term): 2 nominees
- Public Occasions (2 yr. Term): 2 nominees
- Publications (2 yr. Term): 2 nominees

I greatly appreciate your time and cooperation. Please send to Shirley Hobson at 309 Harris or email to shobson@umr.edu.
April 20, 2001

To: Dr. Lee Saperstein, Dean, School of Mines and Met
From: Jeff Cawlfield, Chair, RP&A Committee
Subject: Elections to Committees

It is that time of the year again when the School of Mines and Met needs to elect faculty representatives to a number of campus committees and, in addition, needs to select nominees to run for election at the May 1 General Faculty Meeting. The new committee members will begin serving their terms in September. I realize the timing is a little short. I would like to receive the election results from your School to the campus committees by June 1, and the nominations for the General Faculty meeting by April 27.

To be elected by the School:

- Academic Assessment (2 yr. Term): 1 member
- Honorary Degrees (1 yr. Term): 1 member
- Library & Learning Resources (2 yr. Term): 1 member
- Parking, Security & Traffic (2 yr. Term): 2 members
- Student Conduct (2 yr. Term): 2 members
- Promotion & Tenure Review (2 yr. Term): 1 member

Nominees for election by the General Faculty:

- Academic Freedom (2 yr. Term): 2 nominees
- Public Occasions (2 yr. Term): 2 nominees
- Publications (2 yr. Term): 2 nominees

I greatly appreciate your time and cooperation. Please sent to Shirley Hobson at 309 Harris or email to shobson@umr.edu.
Hobson, Shirley D.

To: Cohen, Gerald Leonard
Subject: Nominations for U-Wide Tenure Committee

Professor Cohen,

Due to the death of my mother 3 weeks ago, I'm afraid I have neglected taking care of Academic Council business in a timely manner. This puts you and some others in the position of taking up some of the slack. I apologize for asking you to do this with such short notice. The General Faculty Meeting is May 1, and at that time we are to elect a representative and an alternate to the U-Wide Tenure Committee. According to the bylaws, the UMR Tenure Committee selects 3 of its members who are willing to stand for election to this committee. Could you get those to me by next Friday, April 27, either by email or campus mail, please.

Thank you!!!!!!!! Shirley Hobson
Hobson, Shirley D.

From: Jeff Cawfield [jdc@umr.edu]
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2001 8:55 AM
To: Myers, Donald Dean
Cc: shobson@umr.edu
Subject: Re: FW: Committee report

Don:

At RPA we decided that it would be effective to have the Chancellor report on the evening meeting of the three or four committees over the "sticking point" issues. Shirley was going to touch base with Charlotte on that.

We didn't talk about a separate report from Arlan, but we could ask that he come and do so. We thought that the Chancellor could summarize all the different committees' work and the meeting on Tuesday night. What do you think? I guess we thought a summary by the Chancellor was enough and another report from Arlan later in the meeting would be redundant.

The administrative review resolution probably should be attached for info to the agenda.

At 04:34 PM 4/11/01 -0500, you wrote:

Hi Jeff,

I would like to see a report made at the Academic Council meeting next Thursday by Arlan. He is willing to do. Was there a provision made on the agenda to do so? Should a copy of the report be attached to the mailing of the meeting announcement? Likewise, should a copy of IFC resolution on the administrator reviews also be attached to the meeting announcement?

Regards,

Don

-----Original Message-----
From: Dekock, Arlan R.
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2001 3:53 PM
To: Myers, Donald Dean
Subject: Committee report

If you would like to me report this at the A-C just let me know what time on the 19th and what approach or how long you want me to take.

4/12/01
/arlan

*******************************************************************************

Dr. Jeffrey D. Cawfield

Professor and Head of Geological Engineering
Dept. of Geological and Petroleum Engineering
129 McNutt Hall
University of Missouri-Rolla
Rolla MO 65401
573 341 4557 (office)
573 341 8074 (home)
573 341 6935 (fax)

and Associate Director of Freshmen Engineering
101 Basic Engineering Building
573 341-4974 (office)

4/12/01
4 April 2001

TO: Dr. Donald Myers, President Academic Council

FROM: Academic Freedom Committee

RE: Possible "Sticking Points" Related to "Summary of Final Grade Report"

The Academic Freedom Committee met on Wednesday, March 21, in accordance with the Academic Council's request that we evaluate the Chancellor's Report of January 18, 2001 to the Academic Council regarding issues relating to academic freedom.

No member of the faculty has approached the committee to suggest that this matter constitutes a challenge to academic freedom. Therefore, we offer the following "sticking points" only as observations.

Based upon the information presented to the committee (i.e. Academic Council minutes and attachments for January, 2001), we think it unfortunate that the "Summary of Final Grade Report" was based on data for only one semester and presented only anecdotal reasons for the number of W's, D's or F's. In other words, the report was incomplete, decidedly "unscientific," misleading and potentially intimidating particularly to junior faculty. A specific percentage (25% or more W's, D's and F's) rendered the report even more intimidating. Why this specific percentage?

While the committee is sensitive to the issue of student retention and is committed to high quality instruction, we regard the "Summary of Final Grade Report" an unsatisfactory means of dealing with student retention and the quality of instruction. Though we have no reason to believe that it was intended as such, the committee affirms that it is highly inappropriate for an administrator to tell a faculty member what grade to assign to a student. As the specific percentage is easily calculated by a faculty member while developing the final grade distribution, an implied threshold, as suggested by the referenced Report, clearly approaches an intrusion on the faculty's academic freedom.
Report of the
December 8, 2000 Meeting
of the
Admissions and Academic Standards Committee

Members in Attendance: Ron Bieniek, Steven Cardimona, Mariesa Crow (chair),
Ilene Morgan, Susan Murray

Purpose of Meeting: To discuss those courses that have a pattern of more than
25% of D's, W's, and F's and to make recommendations to
the Academic Council

Discussion:

The committee discussed and identified several possible reasons for students obtaining
grades below C is courses. These reasons may be (but are not necessarily limited to):
1. Insufficient preparation for course – non-adherence to prerequisite structure or
prerequisite material not sufficient to prepare student for course
2. Poor study habits and motivation on part of student
3. Poor instructional style and motivation on part of instructor

The committee felt strongly that instructors must not lower the course standards for the
purposes of assigning higher grades, but acknowledged that there are several areas that
have potential for improvement.

Recommendations:

Insufficient preparation
The committee felt that the quality of advice that students received from freshman
advising and in their home departments is very good. However, some students disregard
the advice of their advisors and take courses for which they are not prepared (either by
pre-requisite structure or by level of incoming test scores) or they take too heavy of a
course load. Advisors should be empowered to have their recommendations binding.
This must be supported by the administrative infrastructure.

In the case of prerequisite courses not preparing students for subsequent courses, the
burden should be placed upon the department chairs to ensure the level of instruction of
lower level and prerequisite courses. One suggestion is to require comprehensive
competency exams over prerequisite material before students can proceed to the next
level.

Poor study habits and motivation on part of student
It was noted by the committee that the UM-Rolla community does a good job of stressing
the importance of study habits to incoming students and providing numerous resources
for students for improving study habits (workshops, instructor-led study sessions, etc.).
However, there is no hard incentive for students to participate in these activities.
Students often over-estimate their level of mastery of a subject and frequently realize too late (or never) in a semester that they are doing poorly. Thus the committee recommends that the faculty take greater responsibility for helping students assess their level of subject matter competency (pop quizzes, blackboard problems, etc.) and motivating students to participate in study habit improvement activities. Students should be (in some cases) coerced into taking personal responsibility for learning. One potentially successful program that could be used as a framework is the Physics "LEAD" program (see attached description).

Poor instructional style and motivation on part of instructor
The committee felt that instructional style and outcomes are the responsibility of the department chairs. While there are real and substantive awards for excellent teaching, there is little real and substantive penalty for poor teaching. In addition, there is little real incentive to motivate the "average" teacher. It was noted that poor teachers are frequently assigned to the undesirable classes: the "service" courses or fundamental required courses, while assigning the best teachers for elective and graduate classes. The Deans should hold the Chairs accountable for the quality of instruction in their department.
Description of LEAD Program at the University of Missouri - Rolla

UMR is a strong institution with exceptional students. Yet, during their initial three or four semesters, a significant number of our students struggle with their coursework and with their adjustment to UMR's environment. This adversely affects their academic performance and their satisfaction with their educational experience, and negatively impacts retention. Furthermore, many of our students have insufficient familiarity with and understanding of the roles of leadership and teamwork in career development even though they have attained a high level of academic competency in their major disciplines.

Under the auspices of the Office of Student Affairs, a coordinated and cost-efficient campus-based program of Learning Enhancement Across Disciplines (LEAD) has been launched to address these issues. It is primarily aimed at high-enrollment introductory courses while also encompassing a variety of other courses. It is designed to attract a large fraction of UMR students having a broad range of backgrounds, academic needs and desires without requiring major changes in the normal operation of academic departments.

Discipline-based faculty, accomplished peer instructors, and professionals trained in personal development form the core of the new program. They staff student-oriented LEAD Centers during fixed hours each week, generally in lieu of office hours. They act as guides rather than tutors, encouraging students to take greater personal responsibility for their learning in an atmosphere of cooperative engagement and teamwork. The main characteristics of a LEAD center are:

1. Cooperative/collaborative learning amongst students;
2. Promotion of teamwork & leadership skills (e.g., problem solving & personal responsibility);
3. Direct interaction with faculty for content material and various role model attributes;
4. Faculty and peer-instructors who use modified-Socratic methods that help guide students;
5. Confidence building through actual personal proficiency in a course's material;
6. Structured to reinforce the unity of knowledge, skills & insights across discipline boundaries.

Such centers are venues designed to improve student learning skills and understanding of the learning process at teachable moments. There are currently learning centers for introductory physics, chemistry, and calculus. Although emphasis is on cooperative learning in the centers, LEAD peer tutoring is also available for a wide-range of courses (eighteen at present), monitored by participating faculty and professional staff. The program supplies funding for peer tutors and for learning center peer instructors.

The immediate academic goal is to enhance student self-confidence and self-efficacy through actual achievement. LEAD instructors serve as role models and mentors for a diverse student clientele, and also demonstrate the commitment of UMR to student development, success and well-being. They are also more readily able to identify students who need alternative methods of academic assistance and personal counseling.

The LEAD program is structured to smooth the dialogue and increase the benefits of exchanges of experiences, insights, and ideas among the professional participants in the same department and across administrative units. As a result, participants develop approaches that enhance student achievements and help implement the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education that the UM Board of Curators has approved. This is expected to increase student satisfaction and retention, develop intellectual and emotional maturity, and promote cooperation, teamwork and leadership.

For further information, contact Prof. Ronald Bieniek (bieniek@umr.edu) or Dr. Denise Schlake (dschlake@umr.edu).
Draft Report
Ad hoc Mentoring Committee

April 7, 2001

On November 25, 2000 our committee was created and asked
"to look at issues of student mentoring particularly as it affects retention from a faculty
perspective; to explore how faculty can contribute to improve retention and to review the
issues associated with sticking points and to make appropriate recommendations to the
Academic Council for consideration".

To that end we have met several times, participated in and attended the Computer Science
department’s Teaching Seminar and have reviewed other documents and recommendations to
arrive at this report.

The committee believes that the vast majority of UMR instructors teaches with the very best of
intentions and has committed themselves to help UMR students to be as successful as they
possibly can be. The committee also believes that occasionally those intentions are
unintentionally misdirected. To assist both the faculty and their students to understand what
might be reasonably expected of each, we submit the following recommendations. In the
tradition of good science and engineering, we have attempted to make these as objective as
possible in order to reduce any misunderstanding.

Before proceeding to those recommendations an oft-repeated concern needs to be addressed.
This concern was echoed in President Myers’s charge to the committee. Namely,

“At the same time, faculty and administration should have very appropriate concerns that
academic standards are not sacrificed . . . .”

The committee finds no evidence to suggest that anyone associated with UMR has any interest in
lowering or sacrificing our academic standards. UMR students, as much as UMR faculty, take
great pride in our tradition of high quality and are adamant that those standards be retained. It
has on occasion appeared to the committee that this concern is put forth as a way to avoid
examining cherished classroom behaviours. The committee believes that its recommendations
are consistent with and will even enhance UMR’s high standards.

Contained in the Strategic Plan for the University of Missouri System - October 2000, is the
following section:

Strategic Directions for the Future

Student Learning and Achievement

Strategic Goal: Develop a learner-centered environment that promotes the improvement
of learning and personal development of students at all levels.

Objective 1: Redirect the educational process to focus on a learning environment as
opposed to a teaching environment.
Action Steps:
1.1 Adopt the **Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education**.

The committee endorses those principles and makes its recommendations within the context of them.

**Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education**

**Principle 1: Encourage Student-Faculty Contact**

Frequent student-faculty contact in and out of classes is the most important factor in student motivation and involvement. Faculty concern helps students get through rough times and keep on working. Knowing a few faculty members well enhances students' intellectual commitment and encourages them to think about their own values and future plans.

**Recommendation:** Instructors are encouraged to use email as a tool to promote interaction with students. When a student sends an email question, the committee suggests that the student's name be removed and then the original question plus the answer be forwarded to the entire class.

**Recommendation:** Faculty are encouraged to serve as advisors for student professional societies and groups, to attend the meetings and other activities and socialize with the students.

**Recommendation:** Faculty are encouraged to bring students to professional conferences and encourage them to present student posters or papers of their work.

**Principle 2: Encourage Cooperation Among Students**

Learning is enhanced when it is more like a team effort than a solo race. Good learning, like good work, is collaborative and social, not competitive and isolated. Working with others often increases involvement in learning. Sharing one's own ideas and responding to others' actions sharpens thinking and deepens understanding.

**Recommendation:** none.

**Observation** - UMR students do not believe this principle. In fact, they will actively resist most cooperative type assignments. UMR students arrive on campus having been very successful in high school without ever needing to seek help from others. They take individual pride in not needing help. UMR students regard asking for help, any kind of help, as a strong form of failure. All of their past successes have been achieved as rugged individualists and that's the only way that they know how to proceed.

**Principle 3: Encourage Active Learning**

Learning is not a spectator sport. Students do not learn much just by sitting in classes listening to teachers, memorizing pre-packaged assignments, and spitting out answers. They must talk about what they are learning, write about it, relate it to past experiences, and apply it to their daily lives. They must make what they learn part of themselves.

**Recommendation:** In a course that serves as a prerequisite for a course in the same discipline, mention repeatedly with explicit examples how the current material will apply in the later semesters.
Recommendation: In a course that serves as a prerequisite for a course in a different discipline, acquire problems from post requisite course and show how the current material will be utilized in later semesters.

Recommendation: Extra curricular activities such as design competitions and co-op experience often help students better understand what they are learning. Faculty should encourage students to participate in such activities.

Principle 4: Give Prompt Feedback

Knowing what you know and don't know focuses learning. Students need appropriate feedback on performance to benefit from courses. When getting started, students need help in assessing existing knowledge and competence. In classes, students need frequent opportunities to perform and receive suggestions for improvement. At various points during college, and at the end, students need chances to reflect on what they have learned, what they still need to know, and how to assess themselves.

Recommendation: Assign grades honestly. Inform students of the letter grade scale that applies to each significant effort. During the semester, the students should know with reasonable certainty that 'if the semester ended today I would receive a letter grade of x'.

Recommendation: one or more of the following should precede each exam

- Sample exam from previous semester
- Set of sample / example questions
- Review in class prior to exam of the salient issues that will be addressed on the exam

Recommendation: At least one significant work should be graded / returned prior to the last day to drop and not show on the transcript

Recommendation: At least 60% of the points should be accumulated prior to the last day to drop the course.

Principle 5: Emphasize Time on Task

Time plus energy equals learning. There is no substitute for time on task. Learning to use one's time well is critical for students and professionals alike. Students need help in learning effective time management. Allocating realistic amounts of time means effective learning for students and effective teaching for faculty. How an institution defines time expectations for students, faculty, administrators, and other professional staff can establish the basis for high performance for all.

Recommendation: none.

Observation: UMR students describe their 'effort level' in high school as minimal. They will readily admit that they:

- Never had to study a text diligently
- Never had to take extensive notes based on a classroom lecture
- Never had to carefully budget their time
- Never had to memorize significant amounts of material
- Never had to calculate without an electronic calculator
Never had to spend several hours preparing for an exam

The faculty on the other hand assumes that UMR students arrive on campus prepared to carry out all of the above skills. **There is a major disconnect here that the committee felt unprepared to address.**

**Principle 6: Communicate High Expectations**

Expect more and you will get more. High expectations are important for everyone - for the poorly prepared, for those unwilling to exert themselves, and for the bright and well motivated. Expecting students to perform well becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy when teachers and institutions hold high expectations for themselves and make extra efforts.

**Recommendation:** Do not use fear as a motivational device. The following are strongly discouraged

- Tests with averages in the 40's and 50's, regardless of later scaling
- Exam grades that are left exceptionally low because they 'might' be rescaled in the future
- Midterm grades that are only loosely correlated to final grades
- Being purposely vague about grading procedure to keep students 'motivated'
- Structuring the class so that a 'bad day' can cost the student 2 letter grades or more.
- Counting any single grade effort more than 30% of the semester total.

Said in another way: Students "expect" there to be a relationship between their grade and their effort in the class. That is, more effort means a better grade. Structuring a class to keep students about two letter grades lower than what they will ultimately receive, in order to motivate them to strive for more, is demoralizing and should be avoided.

**Principle 7: Respect Diverse Talents and Ways of Learning**

There are many roads to learning. People bring different talents and styles of learning to college. Brilliant students in the seminar room may be all thumbs in the lab or art studio. Students rich in hands-on experience may not do so well with theory. Students need the opportunity to show their talents and learn in ways that work for them. Then they can be pushed to learning in new ways that do not come so easily.

**Recommendation:** Structure the class so that points may be earned in a variety of ways. Assigning all of the points via the traditional 'three exams and a final' is discouraged. Graded homework, laboratory exercises, individual or group projects and writing assignments are other possibilities for allowing students to earn points.


Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Carroll  Jeffrey Cawfield
Arlan DeKock, Chair  Michael Hilgers
Shari Dunn Norman  Keith Stanek