School of Mines and Metallurgy Alumni Academy
Minutes of October 2, 1998
109 Campus Support Facility
9 am - 11 am

Executive Summary

ACTION: Produce and distribute ballots. *(Dean's Office)*
ACTION: Produce new version of By-laws and distribute with minutes. *(Dean's Office)*
ACTION: Name Nominating Committee. *(Chairman Wolf)*
ACTION: Prepare project selection sheet to go with ballot. *(Dean's Office)*
ACTION: Create Alumni Academy Scholarship Fund. *(Dean's Office and Tom O'Keefe)*
ACTION: Request volunteers for Scholarship Committee. *(Chairman Wolf)*
ACTION: Membership should continue legislative ambassadorship efforts for next budget cycle. *(The Academy)*

Introduction
Due to the unexpected absence of Mr. Jeffrey Zelms, current Chair of the School of Mines and Metallurgy Alumi Academy, the meeting was chaired by Professor Robert V. Wolf, incoming Chair. He proceeded by asking for introductions around the room.

Those in attendance were:

**Academy members:**
- Paul Dowling
- Melvin Nickel
- Robert Brackbill
- Dick Hunt
- Thomas O'Keefe
- Harold Krueger
- Dick Bullock
- John Bartel

**Representatives of UMR:**
- Lee Saperstein, Dean, School of Mines and Metallurgy
- Richard Hagni, Chair, Geology and Geophysics
- John L. Watson, Chair, Metallurgical Engineering
- Wayne Huebner, Chair, Ceramic Engineering
- Kevin Lindsey, Development Associate
- Phil Campbell, Development Officer
- Kimberely Barks, Dean's Office, School of Mines and Metallurgy

Professor Wolf made a brief personal introduction of Kevin Lindsey and Phil Campbell, noting that Kevin and Phil are new members to the development staff with this being their first full Academy meeting other than meeting with the Executive Committee. The Academy membership welcomed them.

The first topic of discussion was the review of the minutes of the Academy meeting of April 23, 1998. Noting that the minutes had been mailed to each individual Academy member, a motion was posed by Dick Hunt to accept the minutes as distributed. The motion was seconded and accepted by vote.
At this time the chairmanship of the Academy was turned over to Professor Robert Wolf. Chairman Wolf made note that Jeff Zelms’ service as the second chair of the School of Mines and Metallurgy was very much appreciated. The sentiment was noted by all members present.

Nominations

The next agenda topic was to discuss the nominees to the Academy for the 1999 induction ceremony. In the folder distributed, there was a list of resubmitted nominees from past years, along with the five new nominations received from Academy members previous to this meeting. Chairman Wolf made note that all nominations will cease after this meeting today. Chairman Wolf asked for other nominations from the floor, noting that we will supply biographical material needed for the ballot, which will be mailed out within the month. With this schedule, the ballots would be returned in time to have a January Executive Committee meeting to tally votes and get invitation letters out to the new members early. [ACTION: Produce and distribute ballots. Dean’s Office]

The nominations from the floor were:

James B. Chaney - Mining Engineering '48  Nominated by Dick Bullock

Avery A. Drake - Geology '50 (USGS) Nominated by Dick Hunt  (Dick Hunt also asked about how many members were going to be inducted this year? Chairman Wolf noted that it was decided to elect approximately fifteen members again this year.)

John Watson posed the question about how the posthumous nominees are elected? Chairman Wolf noted that it was decided to have the Executive Committee vote and not put the posthumous nominees on the ballot.

Charles Y. “Boots” Clayton (posthumous nominee) Nominated by Thomas O'Keefe

Norbert Neumann  Nominated by Thomas O'Keefe

Kimberely Barks made note to the Dean that Reade Beard had passed away and that Harry Windecker was requested to be removed by the nominator. Both nominees were removed from the list of prospective nominees.

Robert Brackbill raised the topic, when voting for new members, that we need members who want to help the school and want to be involved. Also noted is whether or not members not present for the ceremony should be inducted? Chairman Wolf asked if this was a topic the membership wished to discuss?

The membership wished to discuss this, and John Bartel felt strongly that new inductees should be required to be present in order to be inducted. He moved that all new inductees be required to attend the induction ceremony to be inducted into the School of Mines and Metallurgy Alumni Academy. Dick Hunt seconded the motion.

Lee Saperstein interjected to note that it was discussed at the beginning of the Academy’s creation that sometimes there are exceptions (i.e. infirmities of members). He also pointed out
that we would probably be finding exceptions with a few inductees. Therefore, added to the motion and seconded, was the understanding that attendance to the induction ceremony could be waived for specific exceptions as deemed appropriate by the Executive Committee. A vote was taken and the motion was passed.

Lee Saperstein also apologized for the reading of full biographies for inductees that were not present at the April induction ceremony. By the time it was realized, he felt it would have been rude to ask Ron Kohser to stop reading mid-point.

**Nominating Committee:**

Chairman Wolf remarked that in response to an action at the April 23rd Academy meeting, the Executive Committee has a proposal for a Nominating Committee. Creating a Nominating Committee would call for changes to the By-Laws. The By-Law changes would include a division of Section III. Section III would be divided into two parts: A. Executive Committee and B. Nominating Committee. The additions under III.B. are:

III.B.1. The Nominating Committee create an annual slate of new members for the Academy in accordance with the requirements of Section I. Membership Qualifications.

III.B.2. The Nominating Committee members will be five in number plus a chair. Their term of service is two years and they may serve multiple terms. The Chair of the Nominating Committee will be a member of the Executive Committee.

III.B.3. Members of the Nominating Committee will be selected by the Executive Committee.

Chairman Wolf continued by noting that the purpose of the Nominating Committee is to handle nominations in the next step beyond the acceptance of nominations. The Nominating Committee will go through a list of qualifications and make a recommendation to the Executive Committee. With the consent of the Executive Committee, the Nominating Committee would bring the slate of nominees to the open meeting.

Lee Saperstein remarked that it was hoped that the Nominating Committee would be pro-active in developing a slate of nominees and would keep the membership up to date.

Bob Brackbill noted that he remembers, during previous discussions on this topic, that if the membership says there is room for fifteen members or even ten members, the Nominating Committee would give them that many names.

Discussion ensued on the subject of a Nominating Committee with the following questions/concerns:

- John Bartel asked for a definition of the goal of the Academy, is it a significant contribution to industry or to UMR? In answer to this question, Lee Saperstein answered that the goals are combined. If so, John Bartel wondered why didn't we group them and bring them aboard.
Bob Brackbill showed concern that this would eliminate voting. He feels that the voting process does not really work, you vote for people you know. Lee Saperstein remarked that the idea of the Nominating Committee is that they would research the nominees in detail before ballots are mailed.

Dick Hunt remarked that the nominating comes from the disciplines, but Lee Saperstein interjected that we are getting pretty good results from the voting process.

To have a slate of nominees with just an approval or disapproval vote would be less work. John Bartel asked if there was a way to add to profiles, some kind of ranking of Present vs Potential contribution to UMR. John Bartel thought that this would just give another thing to look at when looking at potential nominees.

Bob Brackbill asked what use it would have if the Nominating Committee would rank individuals? Lee Saperstein responded by saying he would be reluctant for the Nominating Committee to do that, it would just be their opinions.

It was noted that the Boards that the nominees serve on also need to be listed. Others were reluctant at this idea.

The Nominating Committee should be sure that we are reaching cut; outreach is what will bring in the best nominees. It was also noted though, if the people are doing their job they will show up on the list anyway.

John Watson made note that when the School put the School of Mines and Metallurgy Academy together, they were adamant that it was to be an honor above all else, not to raise money. If the Academy wants to do more for the School that is great, but it is not a requirement. He also felt that there should not be any expectations, first it was to honor and then to set a standard to those who follow.

Lee Saperstein made note of the four items on the Charter for the School of Mines and Metallurgy Alumni Academy: Recognition, Ambassadorship, Consultancy, Support. The word Support was to provide an avenue of support, not to require support.

Chairman Wolf ended the discussion by remarking that a motion would accommodate any of these items and that it can always be changed if necessary. A motion was posed by Paul Dowling to accommodate the By-Law changes with a second by John Bartel. There was no further discussion and the motion passed. It was noted by Chairman Wolf that passage of this motion is based upon the Nominating Committee being used in the most appropriate way and to try different ways to find what works. [ACTION: Produce new version of By-laws and distribute with minutes. Dean’s Office] [ACTION: Name Nominating Committee, Chairman Wolf]

Projects

Dick Hunt expressed a sentiment that the Academy is trying to feel their way to where they want to be, but that they haven’t quite found it yet. John Bartel continued with this sentiment noting that there were others elected to the Academy had objections to raising money. It was again noted by several members that support does not mean just money.
Lee Saperstein went on to note that the activity of the Academy helps UMR do well no matter what kind of support it is. He also went on to note the ballot for Academy projects, which was handed out at the April meeting. The ballot was divided into several categories, some financial and some personal (i.e. Students, Departments and Faculty, Facilities). It was asked of the membership at the April meeting to mark their top five choices of ways they felt the Academy could get involved. After the ballots were tallied, the top five choices were divided between personal and financial which are:

1. Scholarship support (nine votes)
2. Promote research contacts (six votes)
3. Student design projects (six votes)
4. Department development boards (five votes)
5. Guest speakers (five votes)

Lee Saperstein went on to note that the other projects of interest (each with four votes) were: promoting Admissions Ambassadors; developing a School fund for equipment support, and adopting a campus improvement project such as the 14th Street Plaza south of McNutt Hall.

Lee Saperstein remarked that we have already got a good start on a fund for projects by making note of the gift from Rex Alford of $5,000 for unrestricted use for the School of Mines and Metallurgy Alumni Academy. This donation has been deposited into a development fund for use by the Academy for projects of their choice. This opened the potential for discussion and/or adoption of projects, some of which will need to be supervised in some fashion.

Bob Brackbill asked Lee Saperstein directly, “What would he prefer of all of these projects?” Lee Saperstein answered that there was no question, that these were tight fiscal times and things that benefit students and faculty are needed and are very useful. Continuing with this discussion, the same question was asked of the Department Chairmen that were present. Their answers are listed below:

John Watson, Metallurgical Engineering - their department is not as worried about scholarship support, would rather have equipment at this time.

Richard Hagni, Geology and Geophysics - their department is also not as worried about scholarship support, and would rather have equipment.

Wayne Huebner - their needs are the opposite; they need more scholarship money. They would like any ambassadorship help in recruiting students. They feel that this is always helpful.

Chairman Wolf asked for any expressions of interest. There was no overwhelming choice, but was noted that if there is any narrowing of choices to be done, they need to do it as a group. After this discussion, Chairman Wolf put forth an idea about including a sheet, along with the ballot, for members to indicate their specific interests and what they would be willing to make a contribution to. We could then take those ideas and work with them from there. [ACTION: Prepare project selection sheet to go with ballot. Dean's Office]

Wayne Huebner told the membership that he feels the most valuable thing an alumnus could do is to come to campus and tell them stories about their career, it is very inspiring to the students.
He has even considered the idea of having an Academy member teach a class for a week. He feels the students need to know what they need to build on, to see those things in our alumni. Dick Hunt also commented that the students can also be very inspiring to alumni.

Chairman Wolf added to Wayne Huebner’s comments that this expands greatly the possibilities for those who select the Speakers Bureau, and we should make sure members understand this. It is requested that this type of wording be added to the section under Speakers on Campus.

Lee Saperstein remarked that when they come to the point where there is a need to approve a fund and its disbursements, that it would be handled by the Academy. It may be that a working group to supervise how this would be done is needed. Continuing on Lee Saperstein’s comments, Bob Brackbill agreed that this group would oversee these funds in the name of the Academy when they are received, to zero in on the top priorities.

Lee Saperstein noted, in getting back to the question Bob Brackbill asked about top priorities for the School, the items that come to his office are, in descending order:

- Urgent needs for matching funds on equipment,
- opportunities for meetings, for travel money,
- help on graduate assistantships,
- faculty salaries from endowments.

Lee Saperstein noted that having monies for these types of things would free up some dollars to help with other things in the School. Dick Bullock also noted that software should also be noted, not just hardware. It was agreed that this was in the realm of faculty support.

Tom O’Keefe asked about starting a scholarship that would be offered in the Academy’s name. Discussion continued, with the following ideas being discussed:

- Just to get something started, it could be a minimal scholarship and have time to grow.
- Would it be a high school student or a current UMR student? If a UMR student, should we start the scholarship the freshman year or sophomore year? By this, would we ensure that they would stay in the School of Mines and Metallurgy?
- Why couldn’t the scholarship be of the type to help a student that was in need but not necessarily the top student in their class? These students need help too, and can be very successful if given the chance. Student could show leadership potential, not just be looked at by their test scores. Many agreed that UMR does scare away some of the very students who would be successful if they had some way of being shown that they could be.
- The challenge is how to distribute equitably. What do we assess? It was decided it had to be workable. Would the criteria for selection include an emphasis on future potential? Do we give the authority to the department to give out scholarships?
Lee Saperstein interjected and asked if the membership would like to have a presentation from admissions on how setting up a scholarship is handled? The answer was no, they did not feel that would help.

Chairman Wolf asked about consideration of Tom O'Keefe's suggestion for an Academy scholarship. It was decided it should be considered. After a few more questions, regarding whether it was a singular scholarship, for in-state or out-of-state students, a motion was posed by Dick Hunt to start a scholarship fund in the name of the School of Mines and Metallurgy Academy to go to the student with the most need and potential for leadership. Bob Brackbill seconded the motion and it passed uncontested.

Tom O'Keefe volunteered to research ways in which to find the monies to support this scholarship fund. Lee Saperstein asked for authority to find the best vehicle to establish this account. The Academy is the donor and the School will work with the system to get the fund established in the best way possible: probably a quasi-endowment, which would earn income from the principal. He asked to add this to the motion, which was seconded and passed uncontested. Lee Saperstein will work with Phil Campbell and Kevin Lindsey to get the paperwork underway. [ACTION: Create Alumni Academy Scholarship Fund. Dean's Office and Tom O'Keefe] [ACTION: Request volunteers for Scholarship Committee. Chairman Wolf]

Chairman Wolf continued by proposing that we wait to see what we come up with from questionnaire that will be sent out to the entire Academy membership to get more specific interest in other projects.

Development report:

Chairman Wolf introduced Phil Campbell, Development Officer in the University Advancement Office.

Phil Campbell started his presentation by mentioning the qualitative goals of the Full Circle Campaign, which are:

- First to preserve the unique traditions of UMR, which include:
  - an emphasis on engineering and science
  - rigorous academics
  - hands-on research and learning
  - creative problem solving

- Second, to enhance the preparation of UMR graduates for leadership in their professional career by emphasizing:
  - education of the total student
  - teamwork
  - communication

Phil Campbell continued his presentation, noting that these qualitative goals were folded into specific quantitative goals for the Full Circle Campaign. He continued by stating the objectives of the campaign:
> attract outstanding faculty
> increase student financial aid
> provide new and updated facilities
> plan for future challenges.

The presentation continued by remarking that the Full Circle Campaign is divided into five categories:

> Faculty and Department Support (i.e. professorships, faculty development)
> Facilities and Equipment (i.e. Electrical & Civil Engineering building renovations, campus beautification)
> Program Enrichment (i.e. library acquisitions, design competitions)
> Annual and Unrestricted (i.e. to be used as deemed necessary)
> Scholarships.

The presentation by Phil Campbell continued as he stated the results of the Campaign with four of the seven years complete. At this point we have raised $43 million toward the goal of $60 million. Seventy-six percent of these gifts are outright gifts (money in hand), with fifteen percent being deferred gifts (bequest pledge, trust or life insurance), and nine percent being multi-year pledges (committed but not yet received). Of these gifts 14,496 donors are alumni and 5,191 are friends and organizations (business and corporate gifts).

Phil Campbell continued by breaking these numbers down into School/College/Program divisions. The School of Mines and Metallurgy has a goal of $15 million of which we have received $10.3 million (69%). If you break these numbers down further, you can see the results by Campaign category:

> Annual and Unrestricted (Goal: $4.6 million; Reached: $5.2 million)
> Facilities and Equipment (Goal: $9.0 million; Reached: $6.5 million)
> Program Enrichment (Goal: $12.65 million; Reached: $4.7 million)
> Faculty and Department Support (Goal: $16.75 million; Reached: $8.0 million)
> Scholarships (Goal: $17.0 million; Reached: $18.8 million)

When you break these numbers down in the School, they are as follows:

> Annual and Unrestricted (Goal: $1.0 million; Reached: $1.1 million)
> Facilities and Equipment (Goal: $1.7 million; Reached: $0.65 million)
> Program Enrichment (Goal: $2.5 million; Reached: $1.05 million)
> Faculty and Department Support (Goal: $5.9 million; Reached: $2.01 million)
> Scholarships (Goal: $3.8 million; Reached: $5.5 million)

Phil Campbell concluded his presentation by mentioning some of the specific support given to the School of Mines and Metallurgy so far:

> Faculty Support - Robert H. Quenon Chair/Professorship in Mining Engineering
> Laboratories - J. Richard Hunt Three-Dimensional Seismic Interpretation Laboratory in Geology and Geophysics and the Moeller Brothers Endowment which provides for new equipment purchases and equipment maintenance in Metallurgical Engineering
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Scholarships - Catherine and Robert Brackbill Engineering Scholarship Fund for Petroleum, Geological and Mining Engineering; Donald Hewson Radcliffe trust for Geology and Geophysics; Dale Irwin Hayes Scholarship for engineering students; and Thomas A. and Joan M. Holmes Scholarship which encourages out-of-state students to attend UMR.

Phil Campbell asked if there were any questions regarding his presentation. The only questions asked were:

1. Was Tom Holmes' scholarship a School of Mines and Metallurgy or University wide scholarship? The answer was that Tom Holmes' scholarship is for support of UMR students, not just School of Mines and Metallurgy students.

2. If the Academy Scholarship that will be created would be credited to the Campaign? The answer was yes, it would be credited to the Campaign appropriately.

There were no further questions and Phil Campbell thanked the Academy for their time.

Chairman Wolf introduced Lee Saperstein, Dean, School of the Mines and Metallurgy, to give a presentation on the status of the School.

Lee Saperstein started his presentation with overheads on enrollment statistics and research statistics. He first mentioned the slide on enrollment statistics. On this slide he also included the year 1982 along with the six consecutive years starting in 1993. This was done in an effort to show that the University of Missouri-Rolla had a boom in students that year. After 1982 it started decreasing and has continued to decrease ever since. This is a big concern to the School of Mines and Metallurgy and is the reason for the first of two Strategic Action items for the 1998-99 fiscal year. It states that the goal of the School of Mines and Metallurgy is to reach an enrollment of 800 students. The purpose of the table is to show what it would take from each department within the School to reach that goal.

Lee Saperstein continued his presentation by discussing the slide on research expenditures and goals for the future. The second Strategic Action item for 1998-99 is to increase the research productivity in the School of Mines and Metallurgy to an average of $100,000 in research dollars per faculty member. If this number is reached we should be able to reach our goal of $5 million in research.

Discussion continued with Lee Saperstein leading discussion about ways in which these goals could be reached. Some concerns/outcomes of the discussion are listed below:

- The question was raised about the job market. The job market is fantastic at this time with none of our graduates unemployed.

- Some of our best prospects are in the ranks of undecided Freshmen Engineering students. We need to persuade those students into the School of Mines and Metallurgy.

- One of the goals of the School is to have the most productive faculty on the campus, referring back to 1982 when our faculty (~50) were putting out twice the research as in other schools on the campus.
The State is augmenting the mission of all public universities. This envolved into the Mission Enhancement project that would bring in permanent support for the campus. Of this ~$6.5 million that will be going to the University system for 1998-99, ~$1 million is coming to UMR. The first year of funding is for Infrastructure (i.e. Infrastructure Center, Computer Engineering), and Manufacturing (i.e. undergraduate and graduate program instruction and research), from which the Metallurgical Engineering department will receive a faculty position. The next year of funding will call on the Assembly for Materials, Geotechnology and Environment. These will directly benefit the School of Mines and Metallurgy by bringing in four new faculty members. Lee Saperstein repeated that these are permanent dollars of support and encouraged the Academy members to put in a good word with their Congressional representatives. Continuation of this money depends entirely on us producing students and research support. [ACTION: Membership should continue legislative ambassadorship efforts for next budget cycle. The Academy]

The University of Missouri-Rolla has also been working with the Assistant to the President for Federal Relations, Steve Knorr. Steve Knorr is helping us talk to the congressional delegation to have some research budgets augmented. The University of Missouri-Rolla put in proposals for ~ $11 million of suggested projects in this year's appropriations bill. From these requests, approximately $4.0 million of new projects are coming to UMR next year. These projects will work directly with the Materials Research Center, Rock Mechanics and Explosives Research Center, and a Demining project with Dr. Mitchell. The School of Mines and Metallurgy's share is $2.5 million and most likely this will put us over our goal of $5 million and show the state that they have invested in the right school.

If the TEA (Highway Bill) passes, there will be a substantial increase in requests for stone. The stone industry is gearing up for the need to produce more.

Harold Krueger asked of Lee Saperstein how we compared to other schools? Lee Saperstein answered that we do very well, with some of our programs being first or second in the nation.

Lee Saperstein noted a few other announcements:

- Lunch is on us, there is a Leadership Luncheon Buffet at 11:30 am. If you need a ticket, you can get one from Kimberely Barks on your way out.
- There were several Academy members who were unable to attend and send their regrets: David Bartine, Robert Keiser, Walter Leber, Marvin Nevins, Robert Peppers, Robert Quenon, and Jim Spehr.
- The April meeting and induction ceremony will be help on April 29, 1999. The day will follow a similar schedule to last year: lunch, meeting, social hour, dinner, induction ceremony. We hope to see you there.
- List of Academy members is in your folders, could you please double check addresses, making particular note to seasonal addresses or email addresses.

After these announcements, Lee Saperstein asked if there were any further comments or questions. A motion was posed to adjourn, it was seconded and the meeting adjourned at 11:06 am.

_Minutes taken by Kimberely R. Barks
Approved by Dean Lee W. Saperstein and Chairman Robert V. Wolf_