



28 Jan 2021

## Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes Jan. 28, 2021

Missouri University of Science and Technology Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate\\_min](https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate_min)

---

### Recommended Citation

Missouri University of Science and Technology Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes Jan. 28, 2021" (2021). *Minutes & Agendas*. 151.

[https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate\\_min/151](https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate_min/151)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars' Mine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes & Agendas by an authorized administrator of Scholars' Mine. This work is protected by U. S. Copyright Law. Unauthorized use including reproduction for redistribution requires the permission of the copyright holder. For more information, please contact [scholarsmine@mst.edu](mailto:scholarsmine@mst.edu).

**Volume XIII, Number 4**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**January 28, 2021**

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order by President Steve Raper. Roll was called by Secretary Kathryn (KC) Dolan. Those whose names are grayed out below were absent.

Akim Adekpedjou, Julia Alexander, Venkat Allada, S.N.Balakrishnan, Stuart Baur, Jeff Cawfield, Amitava Choudhury, Steve Corns, William Fahrenholtz, Mahalet Fikru, Darin Finke, Mark Fitch, Samuel Frimpong, Michael Gosnell, Sarah Hercula, Mike Hilgers, Kelly Homan, Ali Hurson, Matt Insall, Ulrich Jentschura, Kurt Kosbar, K. Krishnamurthy, Ashok Midha, Fui-Hoon (Fiona) Nah, Parthasakha Neogi, Jonathan Obrist-Farner, Lonnie Pirtle, Jorge Porcel, Steve Raper, Prakash Reddy, Melissa Ringhausen, Chaman Sabharwal, William Schonberg, Michael Schulz, Sahra Sedigh Sarvestani, Kathleen Sheppard, Jeff Smith, Nancy Stone, Shoaib Usman, Jee Ching Wang, David Westenberg, Daniel Willis, Maciej Zawodniok

**II. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the November 19 meeting were distributed prior to the meeting.

The motion to approve the minutes was tabled.

A moment of silence was observed to remember Dr. S.N. Balakrishnan, Curators' Professor of Aerospace Engineering.

**III. Campus Reports**

**A. Staff Council**

Amanda Kossuth, Staff Council President, spoke about staff appreciation events coming up this spring. All events will be virtual, and staff council will be sending an email asking for nominations for staff excellence.

Please be aware of your employees and their mental wellbeing. If you see someone in need, please refer to them to the services that are offered on campus.

## **B. Student Council**

Lawrence Hierlmeier, Student Council President, relayed that he had met with Dr. Northcut, Interim Vice Provost of Academic Support, regarding academic dishonesty cases on campus. Student Council is working on getting a message out to students about what is going on and how to be proactive.

Dr. Kate Drowne, Interim Dean of the College of Arts, Sciences, and Business is working with student council to send a survey to students to get feedback on things such as textbook costs and more.

Student Council officers have been consulting with Chancellor Dehghani on a new recruitment program called S&T Champions. This program will send high performing upperclassman back to their high schools around Missouri to advertise our campus and organizations that help with student retention.

## **IV. A. Guest Speaker-B. Chancellor**

Beth Chancellor, UM System Vice President for Information Technology spoke about the draft email policy. UM Risk Management, Legal and Compliance would like to make changes because of several security breaches that happened because of successful phishing attacks. Those breaches cost the university both financially with its reputation. There are also many new data privacy regulations that are popping up. Many employees across the system use their university account for private use, and in many cases, that is how we have gotten involved with some of the legal cases involving the university. Educating employees on phishing has not been effective, and because of the risk and compliance issues, we are trying to take a more corporate view of email. Certain types of information will be prohibited from being stored such as social security numbers, credit card numbers, patient information, and things that are either restricted by Regulation laws or that can be used for identity theft. Users will still be able to manage or intend to manage every single transmission of that type of information. There is a proposal to sweep emails after a certain period of time. After student feedback, the amount of time email will be kept is still being considered - current proposal is 5 years. To avoid losing emails, move your emails into subfolders. The intention is to be a sweep of your inbox and your sent items only. Communication will be sent out before any emails are swept and there will be stricter adherence to storage quotas. The quota may change over time because we will have more options with Microsoft storage.

Human resources will be adding a requirement for supervisors to make sure important emails and documents are saved before employees leave.

Former students, alumni and retirees must request to keep their email account when they leave and should have a legitimate purpose for keeping their email. Current

retirees will be grandfathered in and will not lose their university email account. There will be parameters for their eligibility to keep an email account. There is some draft verbiage that has gone to the retiree associations. The details are still being fine-tuned. Student accounts will be deactivated 12 months from the end of their last enrolled term. Students can request an extension or request to keep their email. All abandoned accounts, regardless of whether they belonged to a former student or former employee or retiree will be deactivated if they haven't been logged into in the last six months. All deletions have a 45 day grace period, so if an account has been locked the person will have 45 days to let the help desk know they are still using their account and have it unlocked. A request will be going to the general officers and senior leaders to approve the policy as soon as she feels like they have completed all of their vetting which this is part of that process. Technical issues and policy enforcement will take time, so emails will not be swept immediately. There is a risk for people who are no longer technically affiliated with the university in maintaining their email accounts and sending emails to individuals in appearing as though they may be representing the university. Emeritus faculty will automatically get to keep their email account. Please send any additional questions to Beth Chancellor.

## **V. President's Report**

Faculty Senate President Steve Raper presented and shared that there will be an open forum, scheduled for February 16 from 3pm to 5pm, in relation to the proposed revised by-law changes. After the meeting on January 28, 2021, the faculty senators and all faculty will be emailed the proposed changes. The Zoom details for the upcoming February 16 meeting that Dr. Tom Schumann will be leading will also be emailed out. A new degree proposal, a BS in Environmental Science came through for approval and requires FS and Curricula Committee (CC) approval. There are no issues with CC and it appears to be pro forma. The proposal can be distributed to the FS is requested. The IFC had meetings on December 11 and January 22. The Past FS president, President, and President Elect represent our campus and try to identify things that may be pertinent to faculty. The IFC is continuing to work on CRR's and providing perspectives for the four campuses.

The budget is always discussed and what is coming in the year to come. The upcoming year looks relatively okay, but it's still uncertain.

COVID-19 is always discussed and S&T always appears to be in a better position than the other campuses.

There is a Board of Curators meeting on February 4<sup>th</sup>. There are some important topics that will be coming up related to the campuses. There was general discussion with President Choi to include consolidations, enrollment, and the Council of Chancellors.

## **VI. Administrative Reports**

### **A. Chancellor's Report**

Chancellor Dehghani started his presentation and reported that he was happy to report that S&T had one of the lowest infection rates of the four campuses. S&T had four hundred plus cases, but no severe sicknesses. There is no indication whatsoever that there was a transmission via the five areas of the campus: classroom, laboratory, library, research area, or any of the common areas controlled by the University. Ninety percent of the cases were in communal living situations outside of the campus and in athletics. S&T has been working very hard on enrollment and we have some very successful numbers.

There is a new Provost coming to campus, Colin Potts, from Georgia Tech will be joining us in June and will attend the next faculty senate meeting. Steve Roberts will remain an integral part of the leadership team on campus.

The Council of Chancellors has been discussing some very difficult topics. One of those being consolidation in regard to eLearning. All of us have some concerns about it, but system has put \$20 million towards that so everyone should benefit. S&T is participating at the lowest sample level and we are not going to go into it until we actually have a sense of the organizational structure and the promise of success. The last thing we want to do is harm ourselves by participating in something that is not up to the standards of the university. Every decision that is going to be made at the system level will be made at the Council of Chancellors level first. Before the Council of Chancellors, consolidation decisions were made at the system level with the President and Vice President. Now, Chancellors all are going to participate in every discussion that is going to have any effect whatsoever any of the campuses so that's been very, very positive. An advisory committee has been formed, and every campus gets to have members on that committee. Members of the advisory committee are not faculty; they are typically a representative, for example, a trustee. Another group that we have put names forward is a group that the curators will consult with in order to make any decision that's at the curators' level and then any decision that's going to be made at the system level. On the table is something called Manufacture Missouri Ecosystem. The Chief of Staff of the Governor will be at S&T tomorrow for a discussion. A lot of conversations happening now are due to the budget and legislative funding. It seems like we will have a good year for the legislative funding. Some additional funds have come in, and we have been very blessed in raising money for our arrival campaign. The last topic in front of the Council of Chancellors is the tuition for next year. As an outcome of the consolidation, we, as a campus get to decide what our tuition rate increase will be within, of course, the confines of the legislative processes.

### **B. Provost's Report**

Interim Provost Roberts presented and wanted to honor Dr. Balakrishnan. An update

was provided on the current recruiting status for students. Our freshman applications and admits don't look profoundly different between 2019-2021, but our deposits are significantly ahead. In January of 2020 we had 593 freshman deposits and for 2021 we already have 897 deposits. In terms of graduate students for fall 2021 we are doing good as well. The application and admin numbers are very impressive and we anticipate that with the opening up of travel we will have a very robust incoming class of both undergraduates and graduate students in the fall 2021 semester. Our fall-to-spring retention for freshmen or first year students was almost 95% and that will have an effect on our second year retention. Thank you to all of you in the classroom and all of you who are engaging with students in any manner. Thank you to our incredible recruiting team and their work with faculty and department chairs in creating an incredible welcoming experience for students.

Faculty had some concerns regarding annual performance evaluations this year and what department chairs will be doing with them this spring and in the future. Department chairs will be submitting annual faculty performance reviews through MyVita. Some faculty are concerned that they will have great difficulty in making sure that the Chair is using MyVita as a reporting platform. Annual reports of teaching, research, and service can be attached as a PDF for the department chair to use. The CRR's state that when a faculty member is evaluated, he or she is evaluated against two things, the department's standards for research, teaching, and service as well as against the faculty members' individual workload distribution. The department chair then uses a rating scale of each of the three categories: teaching, research, and service. Ratings of outcomes will be either satisfactory or unsatisfactory, and there's an overall evaluation or rating of unsatisfactory or satisfactory for the entire evaluation. A chair may note significant concerns about performance in a category but can still assign a satisfactory rating in that category, if the faculty member met the standards in that category. This change comes as a way to bring S&T into consistency with UM System campuses.

The colleges, faculty senate officers, and some department chairs have been working on a COVID-19 impact/disruption statement. Faculty can voluntarily choose to use this statement and include it with their annual performance documents or their promotion and tenure documents.

## **VII. Reports of Standing Committees**

### **A. Curricula**

Steve Raper presented on behalf of the Campus Curricula Committee (CCC). The committee met on December 16 and will meet again on February 10. The committee reviewed 45 course change forms, 24 program change forms and 6 experimental course requests.

The CCC moves for Faculty Senate to approve the program change forms and course change forms.

*Motion passes.*

## **B. Public Occasions**

Sahra Sedigh Sarvestani presented and stated the Public Occasions Committee moves that Saturday, October 9 be adopted as the date of Homecoming 2021.

*Motion passes.*

## **C. Administrative Review**

Wayne Huebner presented on behalf of the Administrative Review Committee (ARC). The ARC is charged to review certain members of the administration on an annual basis. Committee members include Diana Ahmad, Huebner, Bih-Ru Lea, and Kelly Liu. The positions up for review are;

- Chancellor (Dehghani)
- Vice Chancellor Finance & Operations (Plain)
- Chief Diversity Officer (Outar)
- Deputy Provost for Academic Excellence (Brow)
- Vice Provost and Dean Enrollment Management (Sivadasan)
- Vice Provost Global Learning (Moore)

The ARC is seeking faculty senate approval today of these six individuals to be reviewed. If approved, the committee will immediately ask them to provide their job descriptions, to be posted as part of the review process during the month of February. The ARC is charged with developing the specific questions that would be used for the review. The questions will be submitted to FS for approval at the February 26 meeting. In February, the individual administrators are being asked to prepare a statement of accomplishments that would be provided for the faculty for the purposes of the review. The review itself would take place the last part of March over a two-week period and then the ARC will summarize the results and submit them to the Faculty senate officers on April 16. The final report with the results will be submitted for presentation on May 14.

The ARC moves that Faculty Senate approve the committee to move forward on reviewing those six academic administrative positions.

*Motion passed.*

## **D. Academic Freedom and Standards**

Kurt Kosbar presented on behalf of the Academic Freedom and Standards Committee (AFS). The AFS wanted to summarize some of the instructional mode specifications and some questions that were directed toward the AFS committee.

S&T Student Academic Regulations specify the amount of instructional time, preparation time, and total time students should expect to spend in a class.

A credit hour is the credit obtained from passing a course requiring approximately 800 minutes of instructional time during a session. Students may need to spend an additional 1,600 minutes preparing and studying, for a total time commitment during the session of 2,400 minutes ... Laboratory and experiential learning courses may choose a different balance between instructional and preparation/study time...

The regulations also specify who determines if absences are allowed, and what consequences they may have

The individual instructor determines the number and nature of absences allowable in each course ... Sanctions may be imposed for excessive absences up to and including dismissal from the course. If the instructor intends to attach a formal sanction (grade reduction or dismissal from the course) to inadequate attendance, they must include in the course syllabus the specific expectations and steps to be taken in such cases.

S&T Student Academic Regulations do not define, recognize, or reference modes of instruction.

<https://registrar.mst.edu/academicregs/>

The S&T Registrar's web page recognized two types of interaction; face to face and online. The types of class formats are; recitation/seminar/discussion, laboratory, independent study and conventional classroom.

Looking at other campuses, Mizzou has a traditional format that doesn't involve any online work other than video recordings posted for viewing after the presentation is completed, web facilitated that uses 1-29% online, blended which is 30-70% online, online is 80-100%, and online E-Learning is strictly 100. UMKC has a different approach. They have in person learning but we did not get specifics from the Registrar's Office. They have blended where they count the number of meetings on campus as long as it's five or more meetings it's considered a blended learning course. They have online campus courses, where one to four meetings are held on campus. Then they have strictly online courses both synchronous and asynchronous where there are no meetings held on campus. UMSL in person is 0-29% online and blended is 30-74% online.

The following questions were posed to the committee:



S&T Student Academic Regulations state “The individual instructor determines the number and nature of absences allowable in each course.” Do the instructional mode requirements alter this?

If a student physically attends less than 71/30/1 percent of a classroom/blended/partially online class, is the instructor obligated to drop them, or give them a failing grade?

If a student physically attends more than 0/75/30 percent of a wholly-online/primarily-online/blended course, is the instructor obligated to drop them, or give them a failing grade?

Is an instructor allowed to present more than 29/74/99 percent of classroom-based/blended/primarily-online courses online, provided they make available at least 71/30/1 percent of the same course material face-to-face? Example –a classroom instructor allows students to attend every lecture live, but also presents it live as a zoom session.

If the instructor presents some of the course material online, are they obligated to monitor student use of the online resources, to verify students have devoted sufficient time to qualify as “attending” the online portion of the course?

If an instructor offers to attend a classroom in-person to present a lecture, but knows in advance that all students would prefer to participate remotely, is the instructor allowed to give the lecture only as a zoom session, and count it as an face-to-face meeting? If so, can the instructor give the zoom meeting from any location, or must they be in the assigned (now empty) classroom during the zoom session?

Will blended and partially online courses be assigned sufficient classroom space, to allow the instructor to meet with the entire section at once, for the maximum amount of time an instructor is allowed to do so? If not, where is the required face-to-face interaction expected to occur? How small must the student groups be, and how much time is the instructor expected to invest in these face-to-face meetings?

Is an instructor required to be in a classroom during a face-to-face meeting? (In at least one classroom-based section this semester, the instructor requires students to be in the classroom at class time, while he presents the material over a zoom session, from a distant location.)

Will the declaration of weather/pandemic/other emergencies, which force movement of face-to-face meetings to online, change the percentage of course content which must be held face-to-face? If so, will this change be automatic, or at the discretion of some person or group? How will it be communicated to instructors and students?

Are instructors obligated to put the minimum and maximum attendance guidance/rules for their assigned instructional mode in their syllabi -especially if it can result in a student being dropped from, or failing, a course?

What, if any, meeting space will the university provide to instructors who are required to conduct 1% or more of their classes face-to-face?

Will the registrar reserve a room large enough to accommodate 100% of the enrolled students for the amount of time the class will be taught face-to-face, for exams or other purposes? If not, will any meeting space other than the instructor's office be made available?

If a classroom/lab is available only for a portion of the class meeting time, or only for a portion of the students enrolled in the class, who will decide on the appropriate size of the space and times it is available to the class?

## **E. Committee on Excellence in Teaching**

Dan Oerther presented on behalf of the Committee for Effective Teaching (CET). In September of 2019 the Curators and President asked the Provost of each university to identify and report a baseline for effective teaching, create and implement a plan to improve teaching effectiveness, and document improvements. Faculty Senate previously approved a definition of effective teaching for Missouri S&T and the use of the "CET score" as a baseline for our university. Faculty Senate also approved the plan presented by the CET to improve the existing instrument used to produce the "CET score." CET identified five categories of questions, and mapped the existing questions to the categories. Additional new questions were also developed. The CET proposes to send an email to all faculty to solicit feedback on the proposed new instrument. Department chairs and associate deans have been made aware of details through presentations. The CET also proposes a presentation to student government. The CET proposes to use the collected input to further refine the proposed new instrument, and to perform a pilot test in the spring 2021.

The CET made a motion to the faculty senate to formalize a policy describing the availability of CET scores. The motion included background on the history of the availability of the CET scores at Missouri S&T, as well as additional information regarding the availability of equivalent information at other campuses within the UM System and across the US.

There was motion to table the motion by the CET to allow senators an opportunity to collect information from constituents.

*Motion to table passes.*

As a point of clarification, Dan noted that the existing CRR states that the Committee makes, "recommendations to the Faculty Senate, and the Provost, regarding the instruments used for student evaluation of teaching, the procedures for conducting these evaluations, and policies related to the public disclosure of the evaluation results."

It was noted that the existing CRR states that Standing Committees, including the CET, “report through the Faculty Senate unless otherwise provided for in these bylaws.”

Dan noted that the Committee was sharing its recommendation with both the Faculty Senate as well as with the Provost.

Dan concluded by inviting anyone to share any written document of policies related to the “public disclosure of the evaluation results.”

## **F. Budgetary Affairs**

Mark Fitch presented on behalf of the Budgetary Affairs Committee (BAC). There are no outstanding referrals. CFO Cuba Plain shared with BAC how the Kummer Institute (KI) as a separate entity works with S&T. The money is put into an endowment and will have an annual yield. For the year the KI board approves a budget proposed by S&T which results in accounts being made at S&T. There are specifically things for KI that’s approved and those funds are drawn on.

For the big picture, the budget is on target so far. The governor released about \$5 million of federal pass-through money from the first round of COVID funding. This money will be used to continue the powerplant demolition and to move the electrical substation by the power plant somewhere else and to modernize it. The second Federal COVID-19 relief act has \$8.1 million dollars that should come to S&T. Of that money, \$2.6 million is for student scholarships.

Money in the academic units has decreased each of the three years from 2019-2021. When your expenditure is greater than your revenue, then you draw down from an account, which is a deficit. The expenditures have been relatively steady, and the two colleges over the last three years have had a decrease in expenditures.

Finance and operations and student affairs run very large budgets, so they come across as a very large percentage of the total money spent. Finance and operations pays the power bill and builds buildings and student affairs operates the residence halls. Sponsored programs’ general operating revenue decreased tremendously and that reduction was taken from F&A funds which is thus money the departments won’t be receiving. There have been increases. For example, university police had a significant increase which is spending of auxiliary money. Enrollment management has a 61% increase in expenditure from two years ago, but it was even more last year. Marketing and communications had a 10% growth per year and human resources had a 33% growth. The Provost Office has been running a massive deficit over the years and this year plans not to. The Chancellor’s Office this year has \$1.5 million of endowment revenue planned to be spent.

## **G. Information Technology**

John Singler presented on behalf of the Information Technology Computing Committee (ITCC). The FS had a referral to ITCC regarding the announced decommissioning of most greenscreen production classrooms. The plan is to form an ad hoc committee to investigate. The committee is starting to be formed but is not finished yet. If you have feedback, please send it to your ITCC representative or John Singler.

## **VIII. New Business**

### **A. Ad Hoc Committee for Distance Education**

Steven Corns presented and informed FS that an ad hoc committee for distance education will be looking at providing guidance on changes and updates to resources and procedures. The committee will work closely with BAC and ITCC. The committee plans to work fairly closely with CAFÉ, global learning and the Provost Office.

The committee has not been formed yet and will be taking nominations. Please contact Steve Corns to submit a name.

## **IX. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:21 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,  
K.C. Dolan, Secretary