

**Rules, Procedures and Agenda (RP&A) Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, April 9, 2008
1:00 – 3:00 PM
Electrical Engineering 236**

Attendance: Kurt Kosbar, Eun Soo Park, Klaus Woelk, Andrew Ronchetto, Doug Carroll, Alex Dempsey, Steve Raper, Barbara Hale, Partho Neogi, Buce McMillin, Keith Nisbett, Don Myers

1. Approval of April 9, 2008 RP&A Agenda. The Agenda was approved.
2. Approval of Minutes from March 11, 2008 RP&A Meeting. The minutes were approved.
3. Agenda for April 17, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting. The approved agenda is attached at the end of the minutes.
4. FS SB 389 Ad-Hoc Committee (S. Raper). The committee recommends that paper forms continue to be used in collecting the data. The questions for Senate Bill 389 should be added to the current form so that students only fill out one form at the end of the semester in evaluating the instructor. The committee recommends that only the most recent scores would be posted for each course. The committee recommended four questions for students to answer in evaluating the instructor. The questions and the details of the committee report are at the end of the minutes.
5. VPAA SB 389 Committee (D. Carroll and L. Haynes). This committee has not been active recently. The committee needed input from the Ad-Hoc committee above as to whether the faculty want to use paper forms or on-line forms in collecting the data, and what questions would be used for students to evaluate the instructors. Now that these issues have been decided, the VPAA SB 389 committee can work out the details of how the data will be collected and posted.
6. Nepotism Policy (IFC Representatives). There is a nepotism policy in the collected rules, and it appears that the common practice of hiring both spouses is in violation of the rules. But in order to attract qualified people to Rolla, we often need to provide both of them a job. Having spouses working at the university can lead to conflict of interest issues with regard to salaries, tenure, promotion and other issues. Discussion will continue on this topic.
7. Academic Dishonesty (IFC Representatives). Faculty have a lot of latitude in making academic assessments of student work. Faculty can recommend disciplinary action, but there must be due process for the student(s). Disciplinary action must be made by a third party. UMC has an academic dishonesty statement on their web site that they recommend faculty put on their syllabus, which allows faculty to assign a failing grade in the course for academic dishonesty. UM Legal is supportive of giving a zero on the assignment for

academic dishonesty, but is not supportive of giving a failing grade in the course. Student Council plans to provide input of what students consider academic dishonesty to be. Discussion on this topic will continue.

8. Graduate Student Support. The primary issue is whether to waive tuition and fees for graduate students. This was referred to the Graduate Faculty.
9. Intellectual Property Ad-Hoc Committee (D. Myers). The committee recommends that there be a permanent standing committee for Intellectual Property. A Bylaws change is recommended to establish the committee. The proposal from the committee is shown at the end of the minutes.
10. Conflict of Interest Ad-Hoc Committee. Sometimes conflict of interest is desirable. The conflict of interest should be identified and managed, perhaps by an oversight committee. Discussion will continue on this topic.
11. Discipline Specific Curricula Committees (K. Nisbett). The Curriculum Committee will recommend approval of the DSCCs proposed by the Provost at the Faculty Senate meeting April 17th.
12. Other Old Business with Faculty Standing Committees
 - a. Panel of Peers / New Funds (Budgetary Affairs). Originally 60 proposals totaling \$8M were submitted. The panel selected 8 proposals totaling approximately \$1M to forward to the provost as an unranked list. The committee also submitted a ninth proposal for GTA funds to support the graduate program. Comments were made on each proposal with regard to: (1) Does it serve the interest of the department?, (2) Priority was given to hiring new faculty, (3) Less emphasis for administrative positions, (4) Does it address the strategic plan?
 - b. SRI Reallocation (Budgetary Affairs). Not Discussed.
 - c. Endowment Income Tax (Budgetary Affairs). Not Discussed.
 - d. Compensation of faculty/administrators (Budgetary Affairs). A chart was provided showing the raises for assistant professors, associate professors, professors, and administrators over the last five years. Budgetary affairs will present this information at the Faculty Senate meeting April 17th.
 - e. Post Tenure Review Procedures (Personnel). This discussion will be postponed until after the annual evaluations this year.
 - f. NTT Campus Implementation (Personnel). The committee met with VPAA Schwartz. He indicated that between ½ and 1/3 of the faculty on campus may become non-tenure track. The non-tenure track faculty

must have different responsibilities than the tenure track faculty, or they will be eligible for tenure.

- g. Best Practices for forming dept. tenure committees (Tenure). The committee will begin working on this soon.
 - h. Campus Policy on Handling Student Concerns about Instructors (AF&S, Student Affairs). The committees will ask for input from the VPUG.
 - i. Improving Advising on Campus (Student Affairs). The committee will ask for input from the VPUG.
 - j. Monitor progress of new P&T procedures (Tenure). Not Discussed.
 - k. Residential College (Curricula). Staffing of the Special Program for the Residential College Courses is currently proposed as individual names rather than positions. The curriculum committee recommends that there be a better description of how the program will be staffed as people come and go in different positions. There was quite a bit of discussion about how students feel about taking the residential college courses. Some students like the courses and some do not like them. Should students be required to take the courses in order to live in the residential college? Student Affairs will weigh in on this issue at the next meeting.
 - l. Global Studies Minor (Curricula). The Curriculum Committee will recommend that a special program be established for Global Studies at the Faculty Senate meeting April 17th.
 - m. Public Occasions for 2007-08 (Public Occasions). Not Discussed.
 - n. Emergency Preparedness (Facilities). Not Discussed.
13. Adjourn. The meeting was adjourned.

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

Thursday, April 17, 2008
204 McNutt Hall; 1:30 PM

- I. Call to Order and Roll Call
- II. Approval of February 21, 2008 meeting minutes
<http://faculty senate.mst.edu/documents/FS.Minutes.02.21.08.pdf>
- III. Campus Reports and Responses
 - A. President's Report (5 min.) F. Blum
 - B. Administrative Report (5 min.) J. Carney III / W. Wray
 - C. Staff Council Report (3 min.) C. Dew
 - D. Student Council (3 min.) B. Groenke
 - E. Council of Grad. Students (3 min.) R. K. Singh
- IV. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
 - A. Curricula (10 min.) K. Nisbett
DC / CC / EC Forms
Discipline Specific Curricula Committees
Special Program - Residential College
Special Program - Global Studies Minor
 - B. Public Occasions (5 min.) G. Venayamoorthy
 - C. Budgetary Affairs (5 min) R. Brow
 - D. Faculty Senate SB 389 Ad-Hoc Committee (5 min) S. Raper
 - E. Conflict of Interest Ad-Hoc Committee (10 min) K. Krishnamurthy
 - F. Intellectual Property Ad-Hoc Committee (10 min) D. Myers
- V. Old Business
 - A. Report on Current Referrals and Actionable Items
- VI. New Business and Announcements
- VII. Adjourn

Faculty Senate SB 389 Ad-Hoc Committee Report to RP&A April 9, 2008

The Ad Hoc Committee recommends the following four questions:

1. I would tell other students that the instructor was an effective communicator. [This question was modified at the Faculty Senate Meeting April 17, 2008 to read “I would tell other students that the instructor was effective in communicating the content of the course.”]
2. I would tell other students that the instructor described and consistently followed course and grading policies.
3. I would tell other students that the instructor was prepared for class.
4. I would recommend this instructor to other students.*
*This question should be listed last.

The Ad Hoc Committee further recommends that the data will be collected using the current CETI process and paper-based form using a five point scale as follows:

Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree

The Ad Hoc Committee recommends the results from these questions will be shown for each course the instructor teaches, reporting only the most recent evaluations for each course. *(Example: Instructor will teach courses EMSE 137 and EMSE 253 in the semester students will register for class. The instructor has taught both classes many times over the past years. Students will see the evaluations for both classes the last time each was taught.)*

Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Intellectual Property Committee Recommendations

April 9, 2008

It is recommended that an “Intellectual Property Committee” be formed and made one of the Faculty Standing committees. The following description for the committee is recommended and that it be incorporated into the Missouri S&T Bylaws.

Intellectual Property Committee

- (1) This committee is concerned with the formulation and implementation of intellectual property policies and procedures. It reviews and makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate, Chancellor and Provost on patents and copyrights matters.
- (2) The committee consists of seven (7) members of which six (6) are faculty elected by the Faculty Senate and one (1) is an administrative member appointed annually by the Provost. The faculty members shall serve for two years with three members elected each year. The committee shall be chaired by a faculty member. Priority for nominated members should be those with patent and/or copyright experience and appropriate representation from engineering, liberal arts, management and science academic departments.