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MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

November 17, 1981

Senate Chambers

I. Call to Order:

President Stephen Melsheimer called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the meeting of October 21, 1981, were approved after the correction of the word "accepted" to "adopted" in paragraph one under III.A and paragraph two under III.C.

III. Committee Reports:

A. Admissions and Scholarship:

Senator Kimbell sought instruction from fellow senators on the question of whether or not examinations should be given in classes the week preceding final examinations. After a brief discussion of the matter, the Senate instructed Senator Kimbell to represent the Senate as favoring leaving the option to the instructor as to whether a test would be given.

Senator Kimbell also reported that members of the Admissions and Scholarship Committee would soon begin reviewing relevant sections of the revised Faculty Manual.

B. Policy:

Senator Rollin announced that the Policy Committee would meet on November 18, 1981, to consider questions relating to the revision of the Faculty Manual. He also said that consideration of that document would begin in the Senate in December and suggested that a special meeting of the Senate would likely be called, perhaps in January, in order to have the revised manual ready to present to the Clemson Board of Trustees in February.

C. Research:

Senator Ham, reporting on the continuing study of a policy on consulting, said that the matter was still being discussed with various deans and Provost David Maxwell. His committee, he added, would also be revising relevant sections of the revised Faculty Manual.

D. Welfare:

Senator Quisenberry reported that a study of the need for a day-care center was leading to the drafting of a resolution on the question. The resolution will be offered next month. He also said that Senator Lindenmeyer had drawn the attention of the Committee to a fund-raising effort by an organization called The Human Endeavor, USA. He explained that an explanation of the administrative authorization of fund-raising through payroll deduction would soon appear in a Clemson University Newsletter.
E. Commissions and Ad Hoc Committees:

Senator Huffman, senatorial representative to the Graduate Admissions Committee, said that data and ideas were being gathered. A likely result of the study would be granting more responsibility to the various graduate departments around campus. Meetings with Dean Schwartz and Provost Maxwell are currently being held.

Senator Quisenberry, representing the Senate on the University Life Insurance Committee, said that a letter concerning the program was soon to be mailed to all participants. He noted that a 20% dividend would be paid and that insurance coverage would increase by 25% for most participants.

Senator Sieverdes, Faculty Senate representative to the Committee on Admissions and Continuing Enrollment, reported that a subcommittee recommended the addition to the University catalogue of a "Special (Non-matriculated) Student Status." The cumulative maximum credits this student can take is set at 15.

Senator Quisenberry, representative to the Honors Program Committee, asked Senator Idol to report since Senator Quisenberry had been unable to attend the latest meeting (November 4). Senator Idol reported that he had tried, on behalf of his colleagues in the College of Liberal Arts, to delay the implementation of the concept of Calhoun College and the raising of eligibility requirements from 3.0 to 3.4 on the grading scale until the matter could be thoroughly studied by the various colleges. No motion to delay could be entertained inasmuch as an administrative decision, based on at least tacit faculty approval, had been made to proceed. As a consequence, the new policy governing the Honors Program will go into effect in the Fall of 1982.

IV. President's Report:
See Attachment A for the full report.

V. Old Business:
There was no old business.

VI. New Business:
Following a brief executive session to consider the wording of salutary letters to Senator Strom Thurmond and President Bill Atchley, the Senate voted unanimously to send letters to the aforesaid persons expressing gratitude for the recently announced gift of Senator Thurmond's letters to the Robert M. Cooper Library and to the establishment of the Thurmond Institute. (See Attachments B and C.)

The Senate next considered the revised Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University. Senator Rollin moved its acceptance, a motion seconded by Senator Huffman.

A motion to remove the phrase "Emeritus Faculty" from Section 1 of Article I failed. Two other motions carried: (A) Article II, Section 20, was changed to read as follows: "Two-thirds of the membership of the
Faculty Senate shall be the quorum for the transaction of all business. (B) Article V was amended to read: "[1] Constitutional amendments may be proposed by either of two methods." Once these changes were approved, the Senate voted unanimously to accept the revised Constitution and to forward it to the Faculty for a vote next month.

The next item of business was the election of Senator Michael Vatalaro to the Fine Arts Committee.

The final item of business was the motion, made by Senator Lindenmeyer, to have the Senate consider FS-81-11-1 for adoption. The motion was linked to the recent effort of a group of associated charitable organizations known as The Human Endeavor, USA to seek donations through payroll deductions from Clemson employees.

Questions concerning the history and purpose of the organization were answered by Frank Blechman, spokesman from Columbia for the group. The Senate approved a motion by Senator Quisenberry that the matter be considered by the Welfare Committee before other action was taken. The Senate then voted to approve a motion to have the Welfare Committee review all solicitations by charitable organizations on campus.

(See Attachments D and E.)

VII. Adjournment:
The Senate adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John L. Idol, Jr., Secretary
The Faculty Senate

Senators Absent:
L. Blanton
H. Harris
D. Miller
E. Olive

JLIJr/lm

Enclosures
November 5, 1981

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. You should have recently received the final draft of the revised Faculty Constitution (PC-2, dated October 10, 1981) along with a cover letter from Senator Rollin outlining the changes made since PC-1 was reviewed by the Senate in August. Action on this Constitution is the major business item for the Senate at the November meeting. Please study it carefully before the meeting.

2. Enclosed is a draft of a policy on admissions prepared by the administration. It is under study by Admissions and Scholarship.


* Dr. Jim Strom of the Development Office advised the Deans on the increased possibilities for industrial support as a consequence of recent tax law changes. His office is working to assist faculty in pursuing these possibilities.

* The consulting policy is still under review.

* The General Education proposal will be revised to reflect faculty input obtained, and resubmitted to the colleges for further review.

* Provost Maxwell noted that requests for sabbatical replacements must include an analysis of departmental workloads and justification of need before a replacement would be authorized. Also, funds for replacements are not tied to the sabbatical salary released - either more or less may be granted, depending on need.

* The Deans voted to send President Atchley a record of their unanimous support of the MWF/TTh schedule proposal.

Respectfully Submitted,

Stephen S. Melsheimer
President

SSM/nhs
November 17, 1981

4. Cabinet Meeting, November 12, 1981
   * Standard stationary approved for holders of named professorships, and a recommended standard format for individual business cards was approved.

   * Approved the University Group Insurance Committee recommendations to (1) pay a 20% dividend for 1980-81; (2) increase the coverage by 25% at the current premium rates; (3) increase the maximum coverage and age limits.

   * Approved a recommendation to the Board of Trustees that the College of IM&TS be renamed the College of Commerce and Industry, with Schools of Textiles, Accountancy, and Business.
Dear Senator Thurmond:

On behalf of the Faculty of Clemson University, the Faculty Senate wishes to express its appreciation for your generous and historic donation of your public papers and memorabilia to Clemson University. These materials will be invaluable to scholars at Clemson and from other institutions, and will stimulate further development of programs at Clemson in areas such as history and political science.

As important as your papers are in their own right, the related developments - the Thurmond Institute and the Thurmond Center - are just as exciting and of comparable importance to the long range development of Clemson University. The Thurmond Institute programs will bring renowned scholars and political leaders to our campus, and bring bright young minds to study here. They will help us serve the needs of the State of South Carolina and America through public service programs. The facilities of the Thurmond Center will serve these programs, but the Theater and the Continuing Education Center will also support a much broader spectrum of cultural, educational, and public service activities in programs throughout the University in areas as diverse as biomedical engineering, drama, and agricultural economics.

Again, our sincere thanks for your gift which has made all of this possible.

Sincerely,

Stephen S. Melsheimer
President, Faculty Senate

SSM/nhs
On behalf of the Faculty of Clemson University, the Faculty Senate wishes to congratulate you for your success in obtaining the public papers of Senator Strom Thurmond for Clemson University. We also wish to express our appreciation for the efforts of yourself and others under your leadership who made this historic acquisition possible. The proposal which led to this success - centered around the Thurmond Institute and the Thurmond Center - will multiply the significance of the papers themselves. This unique combination of the Thurmond Papers, the educational and public service programs of the Thurmond Institute, and the building complex composing the Thurmond Center, speaks well for the vision you have for the future of Clemson University.

Again, congratulations and thanks for your efforts on behalf of Clemson University.

Sincerely,

Stephen S. Melsheimer
President, Faculty Senate

SSM/nhs

cc: Mr. Thomas B. McTeer, Jr.
Clemson University
Faculty Senate

RESOLUTION 81-11-1

Whereas the current charity drive for "The Human Endeavor" involves participating organizations some of which may be characterized as quasi-political in nature, and

Whereas the Senate and its agencies are promoting these organizations and their political motives and other vested interests at taxpayers expense, and

Whereas the literature mailed to each faculty and staff member soliciting contributions does not state the specific purposes of each participating organization thus encouraging contributions without adequate information, be it therefore

Resolved that the Faculty Senate disapprove of the means used to solicit for this charitable drive and call attention to the inappropriateness of these means to the Administration. Furthermore, be it therefore

Resolved that the President of Clemson University be requested to contact the appropriate State body that authorized this campaign and express the opinions of the Senate.
November 17, 1981

MEMO TO THE CLEMSON FACULTY SENATE:

As a new charitable organization coming to you in tough economic times, we understand that you will naturally and properly have many questions about who we are and what we do. We are providing you with copies of the S.C. Charities Payroll Deduction Law passed by the 1981 General Assembly to help you understand the new situation in which we are all working. We are also here personally to answer any questions you might have.

Particularly we would want you to be aware of three points:

1) All charitable giving is based on trust of the public. If people do not know the work of a community organization and respect that work, they will not give. Where charitable drives are operated as a tax, where everyone is required to give and where there are no choices, respect for the charitable process is limited or injured. Where donors are given a wide range of charitable options giving goes up. No one loses!

2) In the last twenty years, many new community organizations have grown up to meet the needs of the poor & minorities, and to address the complex social relationships of our society. These groups provide both traditional direct human services and indirect services. They are nonetheless charitable in that they are non-profit, they benefit the public in general, and provide an educational, scientific or beneficial service.

3) The US Supreme Court has affirmed that charitable giving is a form of free speech, protected by the Constitution. If one charity is given a forum for its message, other groups which are similar in structure and purpose cannot be denied the same platform arbitrarily or capriciously. This principle is recognized in the new State Law governing Payroll Deductions.

(MORE, OVER)
THE HUMAN ENDEAVOR, USA is a new federation created this year to comply with the new state law. Despite very short time periods, we were able to compile our legal structure and meet the requirements of the law. We have been found charitable, not political, after extensive review by the Secretary of State's Charities Division, and the Comptroller General, with advice from the Office of the Attorney General. We have been certified as charitable by The S.C. Tax Commission and the US Internal Revenue Service, both of which recognize The Human Endeavor USA as tax deductible.

We regret if in the first year's rush we were not able to develop literature which is as descriptive as you and we would like. We look forward to working with you in the future and are open to any questions you might have.

Sincerely yours,

Frank Blechman
Secretary-Treasurer
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

December 15, 1981 Senate Chambers

I. Call to Order:
President Stephen Melsheimer called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes:
After the minutes were corrected to show that Senator Morgan had not made the motion credited to him on page 3 of the minutes, the minutes of November 17, 1981, were approved.

III. Committee Reports:
A. Admissions and Scholarship:
Senator Kimbell reported that the Committee had not met formally to consider revisions of the Faculty Manual but, instead, had forwarded individual comments on policies relevant to teaching to the Faculty Manual Committee.

On the matter of the current state of the review of scholastic regulations, he said that regulations are undergoing consideration by the President's Council.

B. Policy:
No report.

C. Research:
Senator Ham, noting that discussions on a policy regarding consulting was continuing, said that a report on the matter would be made in January.

D. Welfare:
No report. Senator Bennett at this point informed Senator Quisenberry that certain of his constituents were seeking changes in existing parking regulations. Senator Bennett requested investigation by the Welfare Committee, a request readily agreed to by Senator Quisenberry.

E. Commissions and Ad Hoc Committees:
Senator Huffman, chairman of the Senate's ad hoc committee on graduate admissions, reported that discussions are going forward with appropriate administrators.

Senator Hood, representing the Senate on the Patent Committee, reported that a policy concerning profits made from inventions was now being drawn up. He invited comments and suggestions from fellow senators.
Speaking as Senate representative to the Undergraduate Commission, Senator Palmer said that statements and forms concerning faculty evaluation by students were forthcoming. The reaction of the Senate was to be requested. Senators Bennett and Senn asked President Melsheimer to arrange for the Senate to see the forms under consideration before they went to Provost Maxwell. President Melsheimer promised to arrange for distribution of the forms, if at all possible.

IV. President's Report:
See Attachment A for the full report.

V. Old Business:
Senator Hood, having been granted Senate approval to raise a matter not on the agenda, reported that he had recently seen a master plan for campus development that would take from research use a good many acres of land and would give them, instead, to a golf course and condominiums. He called upon the Senate to back him in his request that President Melsheimer name an ad hoc committee to study the matter. His motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.

The Senate next considered a few amendments to the revised Faculty Constitution. President Melsheimer requested that the changes suggested after a reading by the administration be accepted as friendly amendments. Senator Huffman's motion to have them so accepted was passed unanimously, with Senator Miller abstaining.

The Senate then voted to add to the agenda the consideration of a salutary letter to the 1981 University Football Team. The contents of the letter and the Senate's wording of the letter were considered in executive session. Back in regular session, the Senate voted to send a letter of congratulations. See Attachment B.

Without formally acting on Senator Quisenberry's motion that an ad hoc committee be named to consider the matter of salutary letters, the Senate agreed to refer the matter to the Advisory Committee.

The final action of the Senate was consideration of the revised version of the Faculty Manual. A member of the revision committee, Michael Jutras, was introduced at this point. Then, led by Senator Rollin, chair of the revision committee, the Senate considered all of Part I and a portion of Part II before reaching the self-imposed adjournment time of 4:00 p.m. Comments were taken under advisement by Senator Rollin, and clarifications were offered by President Melsheimer and Senator Rollin.

The review will continue in January.

VII. Adjournment:
The Senate adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

J. L. Idol, Jr., Secretary of The Faculty Senate

Senators Absent: L. Blanton, P. Kline, and S. Wainscott
FACULTY SENATE

December 4, 1981

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

1. The Commission on Undergraduate Studies reviewed the proposed changes in Academic Regulations in meetings on November 18, 20, and 23. They adopted a package of regulations which includes the Faculty Senate recommendation of a 2.0 GPR standard for good academic standing, and the Student Senate proposal to limit the number of drops in a student's academic career (14 hours maximum) rather than altering the drop date. Their recommendation now goes to the President's Council.


*The basketball game - final exam conflict on December 12 was discussed. The Council was informed that all conflicts for players have been removed (the time of the girls game was changed to 5:30 p.m.), and that this situation was a result of recent final exam and TV contract changes and would not re-occur.

*The NCAA reorganization questions for Special Convention were discussed.

*Orange Bowl matters including ticket distribution were presented.

3. Please note that our annual Board of Trustees Reception is scheduled for Friday, January 22, 1982, from 5:00 - 7:00 p.m. at the Alumni Center. Note also that the inaugural President’s Ball will be the same night at 9:00 p.m.

4. Provost Maxwell and several faculty members have noted areas of the 11/17 draft of the Constitution in which the language might lead to misinterpretation or ambiguity. A list of revisions to clarify these points is on the Agenda. In my view, none of them effect substantive changes in our intent. I will ask the Senate to accept them as friendly amendments, and recommend them to the Faculty as such.

5. The Faculty Manual draft to be reviewed will be sent to you separately.

Respectfully Submitted,

Stephen S. Melsheimer
President

SSM/nhs
FACULTY SENATE
AMENDMENTS TO 11/17/81 CONSTITUTIONAL DRAFT: CHANGES ITALICIZED

Section

I.2 [3] The functions of the Faculty shall be to approve candidates for degrees; to fulfill its responsibilities in academic matters such as curriculum, requirements for earned degrees, academic regulations, admissions and registration; to make faculty recommendations on the appointment, tenure, and promotion of its current and prospective members through departmental and collegiate review processes; to participate in the selection and evaluation of academic administrators as provided for in established University policies; to participate in formulating policies affecting the teaching, research, and public service functions of the University; and to consider any matters that may affect the welfare of its members.

[Comment: avoids possible misinterpretation that only peer review is involved.]

II.5 [28] The Grievance Board shall consist of three Faculty Senators, along with two alternates, elected by the Senate annually. The members and alternates shall all be from different colleges. The Chairperson is designated by the Advisory Committee. The Board hears grievances brought to it in accordance with Faculty Grievance Procedure II.

[Comment: avoids possible misinterpretations that grievances are brought directly to Board, and that Chairperson is sixth member of Board.]

II.2 [2] Each Collegiate Faculty exercises the authority and responsibility of the Faculty on academic matters pertaining to the individual college, subject to the primary authority of the several departmental faculties on academic matters pertaining to the respective departments. Specifically a Collegiate Faculty approves candidates for all graduate and undergraduate degrees, and recommends all proposals for new or revised academic requirements, courses, and curricula within the college. Where provided by college By-Laws, collegiate peer review processes offer recommendations on appointment, re-appointment, tenure, and/or promotion in addition to the primary recommendations which emanate from the peer review processes of the several academic departments.

[Comment: deletion of peer has same purpose as I.2 change]

IV.3 [3] The Curriculum Committees shall review all curricular proposals in their respective areas of jurisdiction that emanate from the several Collegiate Faculties, and shall ensure the adherence of such proposals to all applicable University policies and regulations. The Curriculum Committees may receive or initiate curricular proposals whose effect would be University-wide, but may not act upon such proposals until all Collegiate Faculties have had an opportunity to review and respond to them.

[Comment: avoids interpretation that colleges can "pocket veto" proposals.]

V.2 [2] A proposed amendment may be submitted by at least ten members of the Faculty to the Faculty Senate at a regular meeting of that body. The Faculty Senate must vote on the proposed amendment at no later than the fourth meeting after submission. A simple majority vote of the Faculty Senate is required for the proposed amendment to be submitted to the Faculty.

[Comment: deletion removes possible ambiguity as to vote required for passage of amendment by Senate.]
6. President's Council - December 11, 1981

The Council began action on the Academic Regulations Package. The policies considered were adopted in general as recommended by the Committee on Undergraduate Studies, except that the provision for Senior Special Exams were reinstated for a single F in the last semester; also, the 2.0 GPR requirement is being revised; the meeting continues tomorrow.
To the 1981 Clemson University Football Team:

The Faculty Senate congratulates you, your coaches, and all others directly associated with the football program on your outstanding 11-0 season record and "Number One" national ranking. We wish you the best of luck in completing an undefeated season and winning the "National Title" with a victory over Nebraska in the Orange Bowl.

Such an outstanding season would not have been possible without discipline and dedication. Your efforts are appreciated by the faculty and the entire University.

Congratulations once again!

Sincerely,

Stephen S. Melsheimer, President
For the Faculty Senate
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

January 12, 1982

I. Call to Order:
President Melsheimer called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes:
The minutes of the meeting of December 15, 1981, were corrected to show
(1) that the session began at 1:30 p.m., (2) that Senator Huffman chairs
an ad hoc committee on graduate admissions, which recently met to discuss
admissions generally, and (3) that the Senate had not acted on Senator
Quisenberry's motion to have an ad hoc committee to examine the question
of salutary letters but that the body had agreed informally to refer the
matter to the Advisory Committee. These matters having been resolved, the
Senate adopted the minutes.

III. Committee Reports:
A. Admissions and Scholarship:
   No report.
B. Policy:
   No report.
C. Research:
   No report.
D. Welfare:
The Welfare Committee continues to study the parking problem. A reso-
lution concerning day-care services for the University will be intro-
duced at the next meeting.
E. Commissions and Ad Hoc Committees:
The Senate's representative to the Undergraduate Commission, Senator
Palmer, reported that further action on forms for faculty evaluation
had been postponed until the Commission's February meeting. Presi-
dent Melsheimer reminded the body that a draft of the form had been
distributed to each senator. He also said that he had asked Senator
Kimbell and the Admissions and Scholarship Committee to review the
form.

Speaking for the ad hoc committee on the University's master plan,
Senator Ham announced a meeting of that newly created committee.

IV. President's Report:
See Attachment A for the full report.
President Melsheimer answered a few questions concerning the package of academic regulations recently approved (December 16, 1981) and gave additional explanations about the uses of a J visa.

V. Old Business:

The Senate resumed the process of reviewing the Faculty Manual. As in the December meeting Senators Rollin and Melsheimer responded to questions about wording or interpretation of existing policy. Potential problems were pointed out by a few senators, and a few sections appeared to require further investigation or thought before receiving a final wording. Michael Jutras, a member of the Faculty Manual Revision Committee, was on hand to assist in the review.

One section in particular, that covering consulting policy, led to considerable discussion and the introduction of Resolution FS 82-1-1, which passed unanimously after the deletion, by friendly amendment, of one clause. (See Attachment B for the full text of the resolution.) Following the passage of the resolution, the Senate then unanimously accepted the substitute wording suggested by the Research Committee, with the exception that the phrase "and to the public" was struck. Also passed unanimously was the motion to delete the whole of paragraph 2 under the heading "Consulting." (See Attachment C for the full text.)

VI. New Business:

None.

VII. The Senate adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

John L. Idol, Jr., Secretary of The Faculty Senate

JLIJr/1m

Attachments

Senators Absent:
V. Quisenberry
L. Blanton
D. Miller
FACULTY SENATE
January 6, 1982

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

   * The Deans began their review of the draft Faculty Manual. A
     subcommittee was established to review and report.

   * The 2.19% budget cut amounts to $1,500,000, and is planned to be
     obtained from: (1) A one-time $50 student surcharge; (2) The
     equipment budget; (3) Deferral of maintenance; (4) Sale of
     physical plant assets; and (5) Athletic department contributions.
     In Public Service areas, the principle cut will be elimination
     of some regulatory and meat inspection programs. In addition, a
     general freeze on filling positions in all areas is in effect.

   * The Provost's Advisory Committee on Planning was announced.

   * A committee to study consolidation of system engineering, engineering
     management, and management science has been established.

2. President's Council - December 16, 1981
   * The Academic Regulation's Package was approved unanimously. The com­
     promise probation system retains the 2.0 GPR standard for good
     academic standing recommended by the Senate, but with an altered
     probation system. The attached sheet details this system. The
     President is studying the academic regulations package, and expects
     to make his decisions on implementation by the end of this month.

   * The MWF/TTH class scheduling proposal was adopted overwhelmingly. Again,
     the President's decision is expected in the near future.

   * The Graduate Academic Regulations package was adopted. The final package
     retained a residence requirement for M.S. degrees.

   * No word has been received on whether the Governor will allow the surcharge.

   * Plans for Fall 1982 admissions are to return to the Fall 1981 levels
     (2100 freshmen, 400 transfers).

   * Deletion of Physical Science 101/102 is being considered due to low
     enrollment.

   * Foreign student visa policy was discussed again. A relaxation of
     the J visa requirement to a J visa recommendation was considered
     as a policy modification, and seems likely to be adopted.
January 12, 1982

PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Continued)

4. Please note that our reception for the Board of Trustees is Friday, January 22, 1982, from 5-7 p.m. at the Alumni Center. Spouses of Senators are invited.

5. The membership of the Provost's Advisory Committee on Academic Planning is as follows:

Dr. C. Stassen Thompson  Agri. Econ & Rural Sociology
Prof. Bennie L. Cunningham  Agri. Extension Admin.
Prof. Peter R. Lee  Arch Studies
Dr. Barbara M. Raetsch  Elem & Sec. Ed.
Dr. Linvil G. Rich (Chairman)  Env. Systems Engr.
Dr. Thomas E. Wooten  Forestry
Dr. Hugh H. Macaulay  Economics
Dr. Earl E. Burch  Industrial Management
Dr. Robert A. Waller  Dean, Liberal Arts
Dr. Mary Ann Kelly  Nursing
Dr. Joel V. Brawley  Math Sciences
Dr. Ellis L. Kline  Microbiology
Mr. Alden L. McCracken  Asst. V.P., Budgets and Planning
Dr. Chris J. Duckenfield  Director, Computer Center
Dr. A. E. Schwartz  Vice Provost
Dr. J. V. Reel  Vice Provost

6. F.S. Advisory Committee - January 5, 1982

* The Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Master Plan was appointed. Senators Muriel Bishop, John Fisher, Donald Ham (Chairman), and Clay Hipp, plus Professors D. C. Costen and Jose Caban.

* The procedures for salutary letters were reviewed, and reaffirmed. The Advisory Committee did recommend that the Senate not add such letters to the agenda on the floor except in unusual circumstances.
ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL - ACADEMIC REGULATIONS I, II, III

(Rationale: retains 2.0 GPR as "good academic standing", and places students on notice (probation) if deficient; however, provides more flexible standard for continued enrollment.)

I A, B, C Original Committee on Undergraduate Studies Proposal

II A In the event that a student is placed on academic probation, notification to that effect will be placed on the grade report for that term in which the student's academic deficiency occurred, and for each term the student remains on probation. The student who clears probation by returning to good academic standing will have notice to that effect placed on the grade report for that term. No notation concerning probation is placed on the official transcript.

A student who has been placed on academic probation will be subject to suspension or dismissal at the end of a subsequent Spring Semester and/or Summer School if his or her cumulative GPR is below the minimum standards for continuing enrollment. In exceptional cases, the Dean of the College in which the student is enrolled may recommend to the Provost that a student on probation with a GPR below these standards be suspended or dismissed at the end of any term of enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Level*</th>
<th>Minimum Cumulative GPR Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 50</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 80</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 or more</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, a student on probation who averages at least a 2.3 GPR and passes at least 12 credits per regular semester while on probation will be permitted to continue enrollment on probation even though his or her cumulative GPR is below the standard given above.

The initial failure to qualify for continued enrollment will result in suspension from the University for one regular academic semester. Notice of academic suspension will appear on the student's grade report and permanent record. Suspended students will be permitted to enroll in summer school, and may have their regular enrollment reinstated immediately if the summer work brings their cumulative GPR above the minimum standard. Upon readmission after suspension, necessarily on probation, a subsequent failure to meet the requirements for continued enrollment before clearing probation will result in dismissal from the University, and notice of dismissal for reasons of academic ineligibility will be entered on the student's grade report and permanent record.

III A A student who has been dismissed may petition the Appeals Subcommittee of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee for readmission after at least one regular semester. A denied appeal does not preclude subsequent appeals after an intervening regular semester. Should a student be reinstated, necessarily on probation, the permanent record will reflect this action.

III B, C Original Proposal

* Credit Level is defined as the sum of all credits attempted at Clemson University, plus credits received by advanced placement or special examination, plus credits transferred to Clemson University.
Resolution on Consulting Policy

WHEREAS, Consulting is generally viewed as being highly beneficial to the professional development of all faculty members; and

WHEREAS, the fact that consulting by faculty of some colleges which provide a wider variety of services should not, in itself, constitute a conflict of interest; and

WHEREAS, safeguards have been erected, through administrative approval and statutory laws, to protect against conflicts of interest; and

WHEREAS, there is currently discriminatory policy that prohibits consulting in South Carolina by faculty of certain colleges; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate recommends that each request for approval of consulting be reviewed on its own merits by the appropriate administrative officer
Private Outside Employment

Introduction

Private outside employment refers to private consulting activities and also to other remunerative "outside activities" of faculty members. Consulting activity is defined as professional work intimately related to a faculty member's area of expertise and duties at the University. "Outside activities" refer to outside employment or business activities (other than personal financial transactions) designed to enhance the income or wealth of the faculty member but not directly related to his field of expertise as a faculty member. It should be clearly understood that professional employment by the University presumes a commitment of time and effort far beyond simply meeting scheduled duties such as classes. The overall performance of the faculty member as monitored by administrators and colleagues will be reflected in decisions on tenure, promotion and salary. Obviously, excessive engagement in private outside employment of any kind will have a detrimental effect on professional performance.

Consulting

Consulting activity can be highly beneficial to the professional development of the faculty member, and thereby to the University if kept within reasonable bounds. The University, therefore, encourages such activity subject to safeguards that have been erected against conflicts of interest and/or diminution of the quantity and quality of professional services rendered to the University as a normal part of the faculty member's duties and responsibilities. The primary safeguard consists of the requirement that the faculty member secure the advance approval of the department head and dean for consulting activities. Each request will be evaluated on its own merits, and heads and deans will ensure that no conflicts of interests exist, that the amount of consulting is not excessive, and that no conflict with University duties is present, and that such activity is beneficial to the University.
Outside Activities

Outside activities are not viewed as beneficial to the University, are not encouraged, and must pose no conflict of interest or result in any lessened contribution by the faculty member to the University. Outside activities by full-time faculty members are not permitted at any time at which the faculty member has duties to perform. The outside activities of part-time as well as full-time faculty members must not impinge upon the services provided to the University.

Use of University Facilities and Equipment

University facilities and equipment will not be used in furtherance of outside activities in any instance, and may only be used in furtherance of consulting activities in instances in which:

a) Such facilities and equipment are not available commercially, and

b) Approval in advance is secured from the Vice President for Business and Finance.

Reporting Requirements

A form for securing approval in advance for consulting activities is attached. This form must be submitted for any proposed consulting that is to occur during the faculty member's period of employment. Faculty members who are employed for nine months need not complete this form for consulting that is to occur during the period in which they are not employed by the University but they should consult with their department head in advance if a question of conflict of interest exists.
Faculty members are not required to secure advance approval for outside activities but should be prepared to disclose the nature and extent of such activities to their department head and dean if a question of conflict of interests or impingement upon proper performance of duties arises.
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Request for Approval of Consulting

In compliance with the provisions of the University policy on consulting, this form must be submitted by a faculty member prior to making final arrangements for consulting while under contract with the University. For continuing projects, this form must be submitted annually. The burden of submission lies with the faculty member.

I, __________________________ (Name), Rank of __________________________, request authorization to engage in the following remunerative consultant activity during contractual periods of University service.

1. Description of the activity:
   Employer: __________________________ (firm, agency, or individual)
   Nature: __________________________
   Dates of Activity: __________________________ to __________________________
   (A) Indicate the number of hours per week or month during which you will be involved in this consulting project or activity:
   Indicate the total number of hours of such consultation during the academic year:
   (B) The signature of the individual at the bottom of the form is a certification that no conflict with regularly scheduled University duties will be involved and that you will carry out your full-time responsibilities to the Institution.
   (C) Explain the justification for this request in the light of the guidelines enumerated in the University Consulting Policy:

2. My contract with the University is on a (check one) _____ fiscal year or _____ academic year basis.

Signed: __________________________ Date: __________________________
Faculty Member/Rank

Recommended: __________________________ Date: __________________________
Department Head

Approved: __________________________ Date: __________________________
Dean

Copies: (1) White: Dean's Copy (2) Canary: Department Head's Copy
(3) Pink: Faculty Member's (4) Green: Provost's Information
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

January 26, 1982

I. Call to Order:
President Melsheimer called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

II. President's Report:
President Melsheimer commented briefly on the items contained in his written report to the Senate. (The full report is attached.) Senator Bennett asked whether a timetable had been set for the implementation of recently approved changes in academic regulations.

President Melsheimer expressed his concern over the availability of seats in the football stadium for incoming faculty. So many season tickets have been sold that few seats remain.

III. Old Business:
Resuming on page III:15 of the new Faculty Manual, the Senate continued its review and worked until the first reading was completed. As before, Michael Jutras attended to assist Senators Rollin and Melsheimer in the review process.

Senator Rollin said that a new section -L- had been added to state the existing policy on the use of human subjects in research. He was asked by the Senate to include also the University's policy on the use of animals in research.

The Senate also requested that the amount of liability insurance carried by the University to cover suits brought against faculty for actions and decisions made in the line of duty be stated in dollar value.

The Senate also discussed briefly such matters as maternity leaves, sick pay for summer sessions, the function of staff members in the administrative offices of the provost and vice-presidents, and changes in wording involving patents.

Upon concluding the first reading, members of the Senate spontaneously applauded the work of Senator Rollin and other members of the revision committee.

IV. Adjournment:
The Senate adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John L. Idol, Jr., Secretary of The Faculty Senate

JLIJr/im

January 26, 1982

AGENDA

Call to Order

President's Report

Old Business

a. Review of Faculty Manual (continued)

Adjournment

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. The review of the Faculty Manual will resume on page III:15. Give special attention to the balance of Section III, and to Section VI (except the Constitution) in your preparation for the meeting. Sections V, VII, and VIII are largely informational. Section IV does contain important policy, but much of it is outside University control. Please come to the meeting prepared with notes on substantive matters that need to be raised. If we do not complete our initial review at this meeting (as seems likely), we will need to schedule another special meeting later in the week to be able to have a complete draft to the Senate for approval at the February 9 meeting.

2. President Atchley has approved the revised Academic Regulations passed by the President's Council with one minor change. The MWF/TTh class scheduling recommendation was also approved, but 15 minute class breaks will be retained on MWF.

3. The President's Council was briefed on January 15 on the Campus Master Plan being developed. The final report of the consultants is nearing completion.
President's Report (cont'd)

4. Athletic Council - January 19, 1982

*Football ticket prices were raised to $12, with $15 for the U.S.C. game. New season tickets for faculty or anyone else will be very limited.

*The Athletic Council was advised that no information had yet been received from the NCAA as a result of the preliminary football investigation.

5. Board of Trustees - January 22, 1982

*The Faculty Constitution was approved, and thus is now in effect.

*A policy was approved which provides out-of-state tuition abatement for academic recruiting scholarships of $1,500/yr or more. Previously, Poole Scholars were specifically exempted from out-of-state tuition.
I. Call to Order:
President Melsheimer called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes:
Minutes for the meetings of both January 12 and 26 were approved as distributed.

III. Committee Reports:
A. Policy:
No report

B. Research:
No report

C. Scholastic Policies:
Senator Kimbell reported that the Scholastic Policies Committee had reviewed the proposed form for student evaluation of teaching and classroom instruction and had discussed the form with Doris Helms, chair of the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee. He observed that a survey of pertinent studies of Faculty evaluations had revealed problems in how much dependence should be placed on teacher evaluations. He moved that the Senate accept the report of the Scholastic Policies Committee. Following queries from Senators Bennett and Kline concerning whether the form sought to evaluate both the course and the teacher, Senator Kimbell read a memorandum from Provost Maxwell to Professor Doris Helms concerning the use of the new evaluation form. See Attachment A.

D. Welfare:
No report. Senator Quisenberry announced that the Welfare Committee would meet next week.

E. University and Ad Hoc Committees:
Senator Huffman reported that the Committee on Graduate Admissions had recently held meetings with Dean Schwartz and others and that a report would soon be made.

Senator Ham announced a meeting of the Master Plan Ad Hoc Committee for next week.

Senator Graham said that a list of Poole Scholars had been drawn up, the usual factors of grades and predicted GPR being the basis on which selection was being made.

IV. President's Report:
Commenting on points made in his written report to the Senate, President Melsheimer stressed the date of election of new senators and made preliminary arrangements for a meeting of the Advisory Committee to nominate a slate of officers for the coming year.
He also responded to the Senate’s request to seek further information about the process to be following in selecting someone to replace Dean Kenneth Vickery, who is retiring in June. President Melsheimer promised to seek more information, which he plans to give to the Advisory Committee, which will act for the Senate should immediate action be in order.

In any case, the full Senate will receive a report on his findings in March.

V. Old Business:

The Senate began its second reading of the revised Faculty Manual by agreeing to give tentative approval to Draft (12-1) of Parts I, IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII with changes indicated at the meeting, subject to review of the completed draft.

As the review went forward, President Melsheimer and Senator Rollin pointed to changes in wording or additional facts inserted. (A summary of changes and additions appears as Attachment C). President Melsheimer reported that a policy on funeral leave did exist and that it would be included. He also said that a statement concerning the position and duties of the dean of the Graduate School had been overlooked in the first draft. A description of that office has been added.

Following this second reading of Parts I, IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII Senator Hood moved that the Senate accept these sections and permit the revision to be passed forward for administrative review. The motion carried.

The Senate next turned to Draft (1-20) of Parts II and III, the sections having been rewritten or revised in response to suggestions and motions made during the first reading. Several additional revisions were distributed (See Attachment C).

The following change was approved for Section F, paragraph one. The words "and a recommendation forwarded to the appropriate administrator" were added to the last sentence of that paragraph. Under paragraph two of Section H, the word "promptly" was inserted before the word "informed" in the first sentence.

These changes having been made, the Senate voted to accept Part II.

A few changes were made in Part III also, the first being the deletion of the last sentence of the third paragraph of Section A. The second change was the deletion of paragraph three in Section H, following a vote on a motion by Senator Harris. On a motion by Senator Kline, the Senate also voted to delete the second sentence of the fourth paragraph of Section H.

Senator Bennett sought clarification of paragraph six of Section H, but no change of wording was deemed necessary.

Part III was then accepted.

VI. New Business:

None
VII. Adjournment:
The Senate adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John L. Idol, Jr., Secretary
of the Faculty Senate

Enclosures

Senators Absent:
Cross, D. L.
Hudson, L.
Blanton, L.
Fisher, J.
Miller, D.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Doris Helms, Chairperson, Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee
FROM: W. David Maxwell, Provost
SUBJECT: Use of Proposed Student Evaluation of Teacher and Classroom Instruction

Should the evaluation form that is being developed by your committee be adopted for the general use of the faculty at Clemson University, that form should be used by all faculty, whether or not any other departmental or college form is used. The results of the form are the property of the faculty member on whom the instruction report was made. Under no circumstances will the results of this study be published in any booklet or in any other manner. However, the factors, means, and medians for the department and the colleges will be made available to the department heads and the deans.

Faculty members are expected to use the form to identify their own weaknesses and to improve their teaching performance. Faculty members who offer teaching effectiveness as a reason for merit salary increases, promotion, and/or tenure should be prepared to present evidence of that teaching effectiveness. While the analyses of this form will be considered acceptable evidence of teaching performance, they are by no means the only acceptable evidence. Faculty in those departments that have classroom visitation programs and peer review of teaching method may wish to use those as evidence of teaching effectiveness in addition or instead.

I thank you for the work that you are doing in developing this very important instrument for the improvement of classroom teaching at Clemson University. Please feel free to share this memorandum with the members of your committee and to attach this memorandum on any report that you would forward to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Faculty Senate.

pmh
The Committee met to review the work of the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee, a University standing committee, that had just completed a review of the March 2, 1981 report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluation of Teachers. The Ad Hoc Committee was charged by J. V. Reel, Assistant to the Provost, in September of 1980 "with examining Clemson's present instrument for faculty evaluation to determine whether the University should continue using it or if a better evaluation form should be employed." The Ad Hoc Committee was to design a new instrument if the present form was not satisfactory. The purpose of any such instrument being to "improve undergraduate education" and to "aid in making tenure and promotion decisions."

From a review of the literature that pertained to their charge, the Ad Hoc Committee concluded the following:

"The ultimate test of the usefulness of student rating as a measure for improving teaching is whether teaching does in fact improve as a result of the ratings. Experts in this area disagree profoundly. A number of studies have found no improvement at all, while a few studies have found very positive results. Most probably, improvement of teaching is a function of the individual faculty member's potential, desire, and need for improvement, and taking that perspective, improvement must remain in the hands of the individual faculty members. In short, it is highly unlikely that teacher improvement can be forced on the faculty by the use of a universal teacher evaluation like this questionnaire."

Concerning personnel decisions, the Ad Hoc Committee concluded:

"To sum it up then, the committee insists that it is only with the greatest of caution that student evaluation can be used in personnel decision-making, and then only if all other factors and variables are taken into account, if the teacher's scores over a period of time are judged and not those scores gained on a short term or a one class basis, and if the instrument is used in conjunction with other measures on which the decision can be based."

The conclusions were subsequent to the Ad Hoc Committee's reporting that:

"The data which has been reviewed by this committee strongly suggests that the use of formal student ratings of faculty is a reasonable way to measure student reaction, and that students evaluate teaching fairly and perceptively for the most part."

"This committee most strongly endorses the idea of using student ratings both for improvement of teaching and for assessing teacher effectiveness in personnel decisions. It is absolutely necessary, however, that this questionnaire, or any questionnaire of this sort, be used and administered according to the conditions that were proven over a number of studies to have validity: that most appropriate comparisons that can be made are of teachers with comparable students under comparable teaching conditions who aim toward similar goals."
The Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee has agreed that the instrument proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee "does indeed, measure teacher effectiveness." They also agree, with which we concur, that course ratings (as opposed to teacher effectiveness) be made a feature of the instrument. In addition, they feel that other forms of teacher effectiveness evaluations such as peer reviews could be used and that a "self-report" instrument might make it easier for faculty to compare their own perceptions to those of students.

We concur with the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee in the following recommendations.

1. The uses and misuses of student evaluations of teacher effectiveness in personnel decisions be communicated to all administrators who will be receiving evaluation data.

2. The administration should be asked to convey in writing as to the specific use to which teacher evaluations will be put.

3. Assuming item 2 is forthcoming and reasonable, an evaluation procedure should be implemented as soon as possible with testing and developing over a two year period for purposes of validity.

In conclusion, we endorse the concept of student evaluation in "spirit only" at this time. Our concerns are with the ultimate use of such an instrument without a firm commitment from the administration. We also feel such an instrument to be much more viable at the department level than at the college or university level, and that although an instrument should have a common core, flexibility in its composition should be provided.

Respectfully,

Jim Kimbell
Summary of Changes between Faculty Manual Draft (12-1) and Draft (1-20)

Part I

Minor revisions to Outline History (B) and minor revisions to description of President in (D).

Part II*

Changes are in (C, D, E, F, H, L, O, P). Generally, changes suggested by Senate were implemented.

Part III*

(A) contains many changes, some at request of Provost (e.g., modification of Faculty Workload description). (D, F, H, I) also contain substantive changes.

Part IV

(B) on Liability Insurance requires another discussion of wisdom of printing coverage limit. "Funeral Leave" does exist, and is added to (I). Some additional information on the retirement policy was added to (B) in the State Retirement System section.

Part V

The additions to the description of the Provost's responsibilities (concerning budgets) discussed at the last Senate meeting was added to (D). A new Section (E) has been added describing the Dean of the Graduate School. It notes that the Dean is one of the Vice-Provosts; indicates the responsibility of the Dean in fulfilling the aims of the graduate program. The Dean is coordinator of graduate programs, advises Provost on policies, and chairs the Graduate Curriculum Committee and the Commission on Graduate Studies. Several corrections are also made in (H).

* Parts II and III of Draft (1-20) will be distributed before meeting. Other Parts will not be distributed. Note also that the letters designating sections are keyed to the (12-1) draft.
Part VI

Corrections and additions (mainly regarding Commission on Student Affairs) are made in Sections (C, D). (H) is revised as discussed at last Senate meeting to follow more clearly the policy approved by the Senate and the Board of Trustees.

Part VII

(I) on the Motor Pool is corrected in regard to reimbursement for use of personal vehicles to go to airports and on trips of over 300 miles. Other minor corrections.

Part VIII

No changes of consequence.
II:26  [2] "The annual University budget received from the state includes an allocation for salaries. A portion of this is available for salary increases. Normally, the three possible components of salary increments for an individual are cost-of-living, merit, and promotion."

II:26  [4] line 2 change "adjustments" to "increments"

II:26  [5] line 3 change to "and the President."


III:4  [18] Incomplete grade definition is "I -- incomplete work (applicable only when a relatively small part of the course requirements remain undone, and the work which was completed is not failing ("F") in quality)."

III:4  [19] "A student receiving an "I" is allowed thirty days after the beginning of the next regular semester to make up the incomplete work. One extension of the deadline may be granted in unusual circumstances if approved by the instructor and department head. The extension must specify the nature and amount of work to be completed and a deadline date, and must be forwarded to the registrar within the original thirty day period. A grade of "I" that is not made up by the deadline automatically becomes an "F." Graduate students are subject to somewhat different restrictions (consult the Graduate School Catalog)."

III:11  [2] "A request for sabbatical leave shall be submitted to the department head or equivalent administrator on a standard University form and ..."

III:11  [3] Delete first sentence; change second sentence to "the head shall forward a recommendation on the requested sabbatical leave to the dean..."

III:15  [3] line 8 delete "working"

III:15  [3] lines 13-15 change vacation clause to "...Vacation leave is accrued at the rate of one and one-half days for each twenty working days. Such leave may be taken only during the time period supported by the summer employment funding source(s), and is subject to approval on form CUBO-400."
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

March 9, 1982

I. Call to Order:
President Melsheimer called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes:
The minutes of the meeting of February were corrected to reflect a statement by Senator Kimbell concerning Faculty evaluation and to include more specific references to materials covered in the Senate's second reading of the Faculty Manual. The minutes were then approved.

III. Committee Reports:
A. Policy:
Senator Rollin called attention to two handouts regarding policy matters and asked fellow senators to give thought to them and to respond to the memorandum regarding revision of review procedures for academic administrators (See Attachments A and B).

B. Research:
No report

C. Scholastic Policies:
Senator Kimbell reported that the Student Senate was trying to have a policy established to bring about a standard syllabus for all teachers. The matter is tentatively on the agenda of the Undergraduate Commission.

D. Welfare:
Senator Quisenberry said that it appears that Clemson's faculty does not have the prerogative of withdrawing from the Social Security System, since any change of status would have to be effected by the South Carolina Retirement System.

D. University and Ad Hoc Committees:
Senator Ham presented for review and discussion the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Master Plan for University Development. The report was adopted unanimously after Senator Rollin was assured that the matter concerning pedestrian safety would be covered in a separate resolution.

Senator Morgan then reported on the activities of the Summer School Committee. His report was a brief elaboration on the items covered in Attachment D. Discussion by various senators brought to light the fact that a few department heads are able to pay a limited amount of money to staff who direct doctoral dissertations during the summer months.

IV. President's Report:
President Melsheimer called attention to the minutes of the Advisory Committee meeting of February 17, at which time the matter of soliciting candidates for the office of Dean of Admissions and Registration was discussed. See Attachment E. He said that a resolution on the question would be introduced by Senator Huffman under the heading of New Business.

President Melsheimer then answered a few questions concerning budgetary
issues in his report. A likely result of Clemson's reduced budget would be that no new positions would be allowed. Whether old positions becoming vacant would be refilled remained unknown at present.

In answer to Senator Fisher's question about whether promotions would be frozen, Senator Melsheimer said that Provost Maxwell's position remained the same: no money, no promotion. Senator Quisenberry asked whether anyone not promoted this year because of Provost Maxwell's policy would automatically be promoted next year. President Melsheimer replied that he would confer with Provost Maxwell as to what the policy would be regarding this situation. See Attachment F for the full text of the President's Report.

V. Old Business:
The Senate then acted to approve a few revisions and corrections to the Faculty Manual. Following brief explanations of the nature of the revised and corrected text, Senator Ham moved acceptance of the changes, his motion carrying unanimously. See Attachment G.

VI. New Business:
The Senate elected Senator Robinson to be its next Vice-President/President Elect in a contest between him and Senator Senn following the withdrawal of Senator Hipp.

Senator Sieverdes defeated Senator Bishop in the election for Secretary.

Senator Huffman, seconded by Senator Rollin, moved the adoption of FS-82-3-1, a resolution on the selection of the Dean of Admissions and Registration. Two questions concerning the position itself were posed: Is it a staff position? Is it an academic position? One question was raised about whether equal and fair employment practices were met in the matter by which the existing vacancy was announced. The resolution then passed by voice vote. See Attachment H for the full text.

Senator Huffman, seconded by Senator Bennett, next moved the adoption of FS-82-3-2, a resolution on the relocation of the Office of Admissions and Registration. The resolution passed unanimously. For the text, see Attachment I.

Senator Bennett, seconded by Senator Palmer, then moved adoption of FS-82-3-3, a resolution on pedestrian safety on the Clemson campus. The resolution passed unanimously. For the full text, see Attachment J.

VII. Adjournment:
The Senate adjourned at 5:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John L. Idol, Jr. Secretary
of the Faculty Senate

JLIJr/lm
Enclosures
A POINT OF INFORMATION TO FACULTY SENATORS

As you know, the new Faculty Constitution requires that each college elect an official college alternate to the faculty Senate at the time that new Senators are elected. Consequently each college must devise a system whereby these alternates shall be elected.

What some may not realize is that if a college decides that the individual garnering the next highest number of votes is to be the alternate, certain problems ensue. First, it is possible that an individual who is willing to stand for election as Senator may not also be willing to serve as an Alternate. Second, it may be that some individuals would be willing to stand for Alternate but not to stand for Senator. Third, since Senators may not run for re-election except under special circumstances, Senators who are just completing their terms of office would not be eligible for consideration as Alternate when the slate of nominees is used to select both Senator and Alternate.

This third point is of some importance because the advantages of having one who has just completed a Senate term as elected Alternate over an individual unfamiliar with the nature and functions of the Senate are self-evident.

The Policy Committee asks that you share these observations with your colleagues and your deans prior to your college's election meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger B. Rollin, Chairperson,
(for the Policy Committee)
March 9, 1982

Memorandum to: The Faculty Senate
From: The Faculty Senate Policy Committee
Subject: A Proposed Revision of the Policy on the Review of Academic Administrators (Faculty Manual Draft 2-12, VI. 3.4)

The Policy Committee asks that Senators respond individually to the proposed revision of present University policy set forth below. Since it is likely that the Committee will present a proposal for action at the April 13th meeting, Senators are asked to contact Chairperson Rollin (#3030) or any Committee member by March 29th. Your cooperation will be appreciated.

(Italics indicate changes from Draft 2-12)

(3) Before the end of a department head’s fifth year in office, the appropriate dean shall conduct a formal review of that head’s performance. This review shall include evaluations of said performance by the tenured and tenured-track members of the affected department. Such evaluations shall be solicited according to the following procedure: after consultation with the faculty of the affected department, the departmental faculty Advisory Committee, meeting in the absence of the head, shall recommend to the dean an equivalent supervisor a procedure for obtaining viewpoints. Said procedure could include: personal interviews with each tenured and tenured-track faculty member by the dean or by a faculty member from another college assigned by the Provost; a departmentally or collegially developed questionnaire; or any combination of these or other methods developed by the Advisory Committee. Should the department’s faculty Advisory Committee and the dean be unable to agree upon a procedure, the matter shall be resolved by the Provost. At the discretion of the dean, the affected department’s faculty Advisory Committee may be enlisted to assist in other ways in the conducting of the formal review. When the review process has been completed, the dean shall make a report to the Provost.

RATIONALE. While many faculty are on excellent professional terms with their deans, there are now and likely always will be situations in which the dean/faculty relationship is "delicate." And some faculty simply are made uncomfortable by having to evaluate their heads in one-on-one interviews with the dean of the college. Under such circumstances the mandated personal interview between the individual faculty member and the dean may not elicit the very kinds of information the dean seeks. Anonymity is often a better guarantor of frank responses, as the designers of student evaluations of faculty have long recognized. Therefore it is desirable that a more flexible system of faculty evaluation be devised, one which can better suit the evaluation procedures to the affected individuals.
As charged by the Faculty Senate, the committee has reviewed information pertinent to the University Master Plan to assess the potential impact that implementation of the Plan would have on teaching and research programs. Besides reviewing preliminary drafts of the Master Plan, the committee reviewed statements of potential impact from the College of Agricultural Sciences and the College of Engineering. The committee also attended a presentation of the Master Plan by James Boniface, Lockwood Greene Architects/Engineers and discussed the Plan and many of the drawings in detail with Mark Wright, Assistant Campus Master Planner.

The Plan, developed by Lockwood Greene Architects/Engineers and Edward Pinckney/Associates is very comprehensive. The consultants obviously did a tremendous amount of background work and took into account a wide variety of considerations. Having future University development follow a well-conceived master plan will undoubtedly be in the best interests of the University as a whole in the long run.

The committee identified two recommendations in the Plan, however, that could have a significant impact on academic programs ... the proposed site of the chemistry building and the golf course/lake shore housing proposal. The present recommendation to locate the chemistry building directly behind Sirrine Hall has one significant drawback. That location would physically separate chemistry entirely from the other departments in the College of Sciences as well as from those academic departments that rely heavily on the Department of Chemistry and Geology. A site presently designated for a "learning resources center" near Barre Hall seems a more logical site for the chemistry building. This site is close to the other science departments and is more centrally located for students in agriculture, engineering, forestry, and nursing.

However, the University administration has approved the hiring of consultants to design and plan the chemistry building. The committee recommends that no site for the building be firmly set in the Master Plan until such consultants with specific experience and expertise in planning chemistry buildings study all factors involved and make their recommendation regarding the best location.

The golf course/lake shore housing proposal, if implemented, would seriously affect academic programs by necessitating the relocation of a number of facilities used for teaching and research. For example, the proposed development would eliminate present research plots, fields, pastures, orchards, and a laboratory of the College of Agricultural Sciences and two research laboratory
facilities of the College of Engineering. Replacing the engineering facilities would cost over $350,000 and relocating the Agriculture areas could cost more than $1.5 million with an additional annual expenditure of over $95,000. Certainly, lands administered by the College of Forest and Recreation Resources would also be affected by any Agriculture relocation. No attempt has been made to place a monetary impact on that probability at this time.

More important, however, is the direct impact that relocation could have on faculty and students. If field laboratory and demonstration areas are further removed from campus, travel time increases and instructional time decreases. If the continuity of research areas and facilities is not maintained through adequate advance planning and funding, the professional reputation and advancement of individual faculty members could be seriously affected. In the instance of the fruit orchard research plot, a minimum lead time to avoid serious impact is estimated as five years.

In some situations relocation of facilities may be desirable and even beneficial. However, individual researchers and departments must receive adequate funding and the necessary time to minimize interruption to their programs. The committee strongly recommends, where future development such as the proposed golf course will require relocation of facilities, that the specific problems be re-studied by way of an additional effort by the consultants in conjunction with University officials and affected faculty in order to define concrete alternative courses of action and scheduling/phasing for relocation proposals.

Donald L. Ham, Chairman
Muriel Bishop
Jose Caban
D. C. Coston
John Fisher
E. Clay Hipp
College of Sciences
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES
February 25, 1982

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Fred Morgan
RE: Summer School Committee Meeting
February 24, 1982

1. Jerry Reel reported that

a. A Carnegie Institute Report in the early 1950's stated that a faculty member normally teaches 24 semester hours per nine months, which accounts for 60% of his/her activities. Summer school teaching accounts for 100% of his/her activities, and, hence, $60%/24\text{ hours} = 2.5\%$/hour for summer school teaching.

b. Currently summer school teaching pay varies from 1.1% to 3.6% per hour at colleges across the nation.

c. The average full time load in summer school is around 1 hour/week (which is Clemson's standard, i.e., full time load is two 3-hour courses per session [approximately 6 week sessions]).

d. DAPS is using last summer's data to see if summer school could have been self-supporting had faculty salaries (and benefits based thereon) been 3.33% per hour.

2. A resolution to the Board of Trustees is being considered to waive out-of-state fees for summer school in hopes of increasing enrollment.

3. Dr. Reel's office is launching an advertising campaign aimed specifically at high school seniors in hopes of increasing summer school enrollment. Dr. Reel's goal is to avail summer school teaching to all that desire it.

FM: dh
February 17, 1982

MINUTES

Faculty Senate Advisory Committee

Present were: Webb, Ham, Kimbell, Idol, Armistead, Nicholson, Huffman, Dick, S. S. Melsheimer, Rollin, Olive, Bennett

1. Nominations for 1982-1983 Senate offices were made as follows:

Vice-President/President Elect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bobby Robinson</td>
<td>Webb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Hipp (I. M.)</td>
<td>Rollin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Senn (Psych)</td>
<td>Rollin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secretary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Dixon (Engr)</td>
<td>Olive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Sieverdes (Soc.)</td>
<td>Rollin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriel Bishop (Chem.)</td>
<td>Huffman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. President Melsheimer reported that the only solicitation of candidates for the Dean of Admissions and Registration vacancy was through the Personnel Division listing of vacant positions. Also, there are no plans for any form of open review committee to screen candidates and forward recommendations to the Vice President for Student Affairs. After lengthy discussion of these matters, and the previously expressed Senate opinion that the office of Admissions and Registration should be placed under the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, an Ad Hoc Committee of Roger Rollin, Jim Kimbell, and John Huffman (Chairman) was appointed to formulate appropriate expressions of the Senate positions on these matters for action by the Senate at the March 9 meeting.
March 3, 1982

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. No comments were received from the Senate regarding the tentatively approved sections of Faculty Manual draft 2-12, thus it stands as approved and has been forwarded to the administration.

2. Please bring your copy of the Faculty Manual (Senate approved draft 2-12) to the meeting. I anticipate still another revision of the Consulting Policy (Section III.H) being placed before the Senate, and there may be a few other revised items for Senate consideration resulting from the administration's review of draft 2-12.

3. As directed by the Senate, I conferred with President Atchley regarding the Dean of Admissions and Registration vacancy. Dr. Atchley indicated that this is a staff position, and that the procedures for advertising and selecting staff positions were being followed in soliciting candidates and making the choice of a new Dean of Admissions and Registration. An Ad Hoc Committee was established by the Advisory Committee to review the situation and formulate an expression of the Senate view on this matter (Resolutions FS-83-3-1, 2).

4. As indicated in a previous memorandum, the nominees for Senate office are:

   Vice-President/President-Elect
   Clay Hipp
   Bobby Robinson
   Dave Senn

   Secretary
   Muriel Bishop
   Chris Sieverdes
   Marvin Dixon

5. At its February 15, 1982 meeting the Council of Academic Deans unanimously adopted a recommendation that the University utilize the opportunity of the upcoming vacancy of Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs to relocate the office and its functions (admissions, registration, and scheduling) from the Vice President for Student Affairs to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

6. Dr. J. Charles Hester has been officially appointed as Director of the South Carolina Energy Research and Development Center.
7. Dean Mary Lohr has been appointed to chair a committee to study the feasibility of a University Day Care Program.

8. The attached 1983-84 academic calendar developed by the Academic Calendar Committee has been approved by the President. At the February 26, 1982 meeting of the President's Council two proposals from the Commission on Faculty Affairs regarding the calendar (attached) were forwarded to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies for review for possible use in future calendars.


* President Atchley reviewed current estimates of the 1982-83 budget situation for the deans. Unless changes are forthcoming, we may fall about $2.9 million short.

* President Atchley indicated there is a serious possibility of converting our retirement program to a non-contributory plan by picking up the 6% employee contribution in lieu of the proposed 6% raise this year.

* President Atchley also indicated that a private foundation would be formed to receive the contributions and to build the facilities of the Strom Thurmond Center.

* President Atchley also advised the deans that the Office of Admissions and Registration would not be relocated at this time.

* Vice-Provost Schwartz announced that a pilot run of the Faculty Workload Analysis would be made this spring in 16 selected departments.

SSM/nhs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 15, M</td>
<td>Orientation, new students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 16, 17, Tu, W</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18, Th</td>
<td>Classes begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, F</td>
<td>Last day to drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, F</td>
<td>Fall break begins after last class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, W</td>
<td>Classes resume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 23, W</td>
<td>Thanksgiving holiday begins after last class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 28, M</td>
<td>Classes resume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 6, Tu</td>
<td>Classes end after last class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7, W</td>
<td>Reading Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8-10, Th-Sat</td>
<td>Final Examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12-14, M-W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, Th</td>
<td>Candidate grades due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16, F</td>
<td>All other grades due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 20, Tu</td>
<td>Graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 5, Th</td>
<td>Orientation, new students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6,7, F, Sat</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, M</td>
<td>Classes begin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16, F</td>
<td>Last day to drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16, F</td>
<td>Spring break after last class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 26, M</td>
<td>Classes resume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7, Sat</td>
<td>Honors and Awards Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, F</td>
<td>Classes end after last class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30-May 5, M-S</td>
<td>Final Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, M</td>
<td>Candidate grades due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8, Tu</td>
<td>All other grades due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11, F</td>
<td>Graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17, Th</td>
<td>Summer session registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18, F</td>
<td>Classes begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3, F</td>
<td>Last day to drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22, F</td>
<td>Final exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, M</td>
<td>All grades due,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, M</td>
<td>Orientation, new students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 26, Tu</td>
<td>Summer session registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, W</td>
<td>Classes begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 4, W</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7, Sat</td>
<td>Classes meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19, Th</td>
<td>Last day to drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1, W</td>
<td>Final exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2, Th</td>
<td>All grades due,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 4, Sat</td>
<td>Graduation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended by the Academic Calendar Committee
1/26/82

OK
Bill Atchley
as correct
2/10/82
February 22, 1982

Commission on Faculty Affairs

Recommendations on the Proposed 1983-84 Academic Calendar

At its February 18, 1982 meeting the Commission on Faculty Affairs reviewed the proposed 1983-84 Academic Calendar. The Commission recommends the following steps be considered to reduce the length of the academic year before final action is taken on the calendar.

(1) Alter the graduation ceremony to a strictly ceremonial form, with no check on the performance of the "graduates" in their last semester until a later date. This form of graduation ceremony could take place the day following final exams, and could shorten the academic year by 8 days. A number of schools do use this format. At the ceremony students are awarded degrees conditional on satisfactory completion of the last semester, and actual diplomas are mailed later.

(2) Reduce the amount of class scheduled each semester from 15 weeks to 14 weeks and two days. The 1982-83 and proposed 1983-84 lengthened each semester to 15 weeks to even out the number of classes on all days of the week. While laudable, this does appreciably increase the length of the academic year. The return to 14 weeks plus two days would reduce the academic year by 6 days. It would not reduce our semester length below the practice of similar neighboring institutions.

While the longer academic year of the proposed 1983-84 gives students more for their money, it also costs the University more to provide. In addition, it interferes with the scheduling of summer school so as to maximize possible attendance; interferes with transfers and with our students taking specialized courses offered elsewhere in the summer; and interferes with other summer opportunities for students and faculty.
ATTACHMENT G

FACULTY SENATE

March 9, 1982

FACULTY MANUAL REVISIONS/CORRECTIONS


IV.H - page 13, paragraph [1] - sentence added at end: "Note that outside employment is not permitted during the August 15 - May 16 contract period except as provided in Section III.H, Private Outside Employment."

I.B - Chronology will be expanded.

II - Sections F and G will be switched, and Section H moved after J to improve sequence.

II.D - page 6, paragraph [2] - provision for termination of Instructors after fifth year clarified to avoid misconstruction that appointment to other ranks is precluded.

II.G - page 10, paragraph [6] - corrected to reflect fact that periodic review is provided only for endowed chairs, not titled professorships.

II.N - page 20, paragraph [3] - paragraph deleted; dates not correct, paragraph added little, if anything.


VI.G - pages, 32, 32 - editorial revision places procedure for selection of President ahead of procedures for other academic administrators. Enhances clarity of policy.
[2.] Consulting. Consulting activities can contribute to the professional development and stature of the faculty member, and thus may be of benefit to the University as well as to the faculty member, so long as such activities are kept within reasonable bounds. The University, therefore, encourages consulting activities, provided that they present no conflicts of interest and result in no diminution of the quantity and quality of professional services rendered to the University as part of the faculty member's normal duties and responsibilities. The primary safeguard is the requirement that the faculty member secure advance approval for consulting activities from the department head and the dean. Department heads and deans shall evaluate the merits of each request to consult to ensure that the activity is beneficial to the University in that no conflicts of interest exist, no conflict with University duties or responsibilities is present, and the total amount of consulting by the faculty member is not excessive. Guidelines developed by the dean of each college for use in this evaluation shall be provided to the faculty after review by the Provost to ensure consistency with this policy.

[3.] Outside Activities. Outside activities are not viewed as beneficial to the University and are not encouraged. If engaged in, they must pose no conflict of interest or result in any lessened contribution by the faculty member to the University. The outside activities of part-time as well as full-time faculty members must not impinge in any way upon the duties and responsibilities of the faculty member to the University.

[4.] Use of University Facilities and Equipment. University facilities and equipment shall not be used in the furtherance of outside activities in any instance, and shall only be used in the furtherance of consulting activities when: 1) such facilities and equipment are not available commercially, and 2) approval in advance has been secured from the Vice President for Business and Finance.

[5.] Reporting Requirements. A form for securing approval in advance for consulting activities must be submitted for any proposed consulting that is to occur during the faculty member's period of employment. Faculty members on nine-month appointments need not complete this form for consulting that is to occur during the period in which they are not employed by the University.

[6.] Faculty members are not required to secure advance approval for outside activities, but should be prepared to disclose the nature and extent of such activities to their department head and dean if a possibility of conflict of interest or impingement upon the proper performance of duties arises.
Whereas, the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Admissions and Registration at Clemson University is regularly involved in the formulation of academic policies and in academic decision-making; and

Whereas academic decisions made in the office of the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Admissions and Registration have far-reaching effects upon the academic program of Clemson University and thus upon vital areas of faculty concern and responsibility; and

Whereas University policies for the selection of academic administrators provide procedures for active and thorough recruitment of candidates for vacancies, and for search-and-screening committees that include faculty and student representation; and

Whereas the projected vacancy in the office of the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Admissions and Registration, an office primarily concerned with academic matters, has not been processed in keeping with the spirit of such procedures, thus rendering it impossible that the competition for said office will be open to the widest range of candidates; therefore

Be It Resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that the University Administration fill the office of Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Admissions and Registration on a temporary basis, during which time an appropriate procedure for solicitation of candidates for the vacancy and an appropriate search-and-screening committee can be devised and implemented.
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION FS-82-3-2

Relocation of Office of Admissions and Registration

Whereas, the office of Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Admissions and Registration of Clemson University participates in the formulation of academic policy and is engaged in the administration of academic policies and academic decision-making in such areas as admissions, continuing enrollment, registration, and financial aid; and

Whereas in recognition of the academic functions of this Office and to facilitate the communications and coordination of this Office with the other academic offices of the University the Faculty Senate of Clemson University on January 15, 1980, recommended that the Office of Admissions and Registration be placed under the direction of the Vice President for Academic Affairs; therefore

Be It Resolved that the Faculty Senate requests the President of Clemson University to establish a plan for the orderly and timely relocation of the Office of Admissions and Registration under the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION FS-82-3-3

Pedestrian Safety on Campus

Whereas a number of traffic accidents have occurred along South Carolina Highway 93 including one causing the recent death of Shuh-Nan Pan, therefore,

Be It Resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends to the Administration that the University immediately take all steps necessary with the appropriate agencies (City, County, and State) to enhance the traffic safety for pedestrians on Highway 93 and in other areas adjacent to the campus.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE.

April 13, 1982

I. Call to Order:

President Melsheimer called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

II. Introduction of New Senators:

New members of the Faculty Senate and alternates were introduced by President Melsheimer. The Faculty Senate roster was corrected to reflect these changes and changes of addresses and telephone numbers.

III. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the March 9 meeting were corrected to reflect that the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Master Plan for University Development was adopted (instead of accepted). The minutes were changed to show that Senator Sieverdes defeated Senator Bishop in the election for Secretary. The minutes were then approved.

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Policy:

Senator Rollin reported that the Policy Committee met 15 times during the year in dealing with two major projects: (1) Faculty Constitution and (2) Faculty Manual. The University received Senate recommendations regarding the following policy items: revision of the Faculty Manual, sabbaticals, faculty ranks, faculty tenure, emeritus faculty, endowed chairs, Faculty Grievance Procedure II, awarding of honorary degrees and selection of academic administrators. Senator Rollin reported that during the 1982-83 session, the impending issues will be the evaluation of academic administrators and the procedures whereby appointments are made to University commissions, councils, and committees. See Attachment A.

B. Research:

Senator Ham stated that the Research Committee considered these items during the past year: (1) proposed guidelines for review of theses and dissertations - compromise actions were adopted by the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research, (2) visa status of foreign students was satisfactorily resolved, (3) Graduate Academic Regulations Report - a compromise version was accepted by the administration, and (4) the consulting policy was examined and a compromise policy was accepted by the administration. See Attachment B.

C. Scholastic Policies:

Senator Kimbell reported that the committee reviewed and made recommendations concerning a wide variety of issues. The committee reviewed (1) the Provost's draft on Enrollment Policies and Procedures for Students Applying for Admission for 1983-84, (2) the University Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee's review of an ad hoc teacher evaluation report which assesses student evaluation of teachers, (3) the general education requirements as recommended by the Academic
Deans' Council, (4) academic regulations, and (5) M-W-F, T-Th schedule pattern and a provision for meeting classes on the hour and half-hour. See Attachment C.

D. Welfare

Senator Quisenberry reported that the committee had examined fringe benefits while working closely with former Senator Stassen Thompson who is now a member of the Governor's committee on Fringe Benefits for State Employees. This committee is examining means of improving fringe benefits to state employees without increasing state spending. The Welfare Committee also examined parking and the possible implementation of a child care center on campus. See Attachment D.

E. University and Ad Hoc Committees:

Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Admissions:

Senator Huffman reporting on graduate admissions policy stated that the committee had received input from department heads, and faculty and had also reviewed admissions procedures identified in catalogues of comparable universities. The committee also met with the Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School as well as the Provost to discuss these matters. No concrete decisions on the admissions policies or appeals system were reached.

Senator Baron questioned the "fact-finding" nature of the committee by claiming that the committee was recommending changes. Baron noted that the tone of the report went further than mere "fact-finding." Senator Bennett commented on unequal treatment from college to college. The Provost has not seen the committee report. Motion was made to accept the report. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Following the committee reports Senator Wainscott asked if faculty members must excuse a student from class for participation in University-related activities. It was not clear how the policy was applied.

V. President's Report: (See Attachment E)

1. President Melsheimer called attention to the fact that each college should elect one of its Senators to the Advisory Committee. The committee must meet next week in order to select standing committee members and prepare a slate of nominees for other faculty representatives.

2. President Melsheimer displayed a bound copy of the new Faculty Manual and recognized Senator Rollin for his significant contribution in completing the revision. Approval of the manual is expected by the Board of Trustees at their April meeting.

3. It was announced that the University budget is $2.7 million short and that cuts will be made in the operating budget. The library director has distributed a review list of periodicals to departments prior to their termination. The list was comprised of journals which the library staff determined were not unshelved during the past year.

4. At the President's Council meeting on March 26 it was announced that five more Alumni Professorships were funded and the Edwards Fellowships were increased to ten. Also a new university Scheduling Committee has
been proposed by the Provost. Each college shall appoint a schedule coordinator so that classroom scheduling can be centralized in the future.

5. President Melsheimer announced that the Athletic Council voted to retain Fencing as an intercollegiate sport, but without athletic scholarships. The women's Field Hockey was recommended to be dropped as an intercollegiate sport, but retained as a club sport. Team members would not receive athletic scholarships. In other business, President Atchley intends to appoint a self-study committee to study recruiting procedures.

6. President Melsheimer reported that President Atchley intends to keep the Dean of Admissions and Registration a staff position within Student Affairs.

7. President Melsheimer discussed the current budget situation. Senator Miller asked if the Advisory Committee had any suggestions regarding library procedures for the termination of periodicals. He suggested that the review for budget cuts also be extended to the Physical Plant. Senator Burnett noted that university accreditation depends on adequate library resources. He stated, "To become a Top-Twenty university in the U.S., the library should be the last place to cut." Some discussion followed regarding the quality of periodicals on the cut list. Senator Ulbrich noted that cuts should be equitable across all colleges. President Melsheimer reported that equipment and travel budgets will be severely cut. Hiring will be frozen including new faculty positions except on emergency basis.

Considerable discussion centered around funds available for promotions. According to the Provost, if no funds were available for promotions, then all persons who were reviewed for promotion and "approved" would be returned to the promotion pool the following year. A question was raised about the feasibility of a "dry" promotion, because of the interest in recognizing a significant achievement in the career of a person being promoted.

8. Senator Bennett moved that the Faculty Senate "vigorously" oppose the proposed change in the new academic regulations of "good academic standing" to "graduation academic standing." The issue is the definition of terms. The motion did not receive a second. Senator Huffman moved that the issue regarding the definition of "good academic standing" and satisfactory progress be referred to committee for review. Motion was adopted unanimously by voice vote.

9. Senator Baron commented on FS resolution 80-2-1, Summer School Employment, which allows colleges to offer additional courses on a break-even basis. President Melsheimer stated that the rate of pay for instruction issue is still under study.

10. President Melsheimer commented on the accomplishments of the past year: class scheduling, Faculty Grievance Procedure II, academic regulations, Faculty Constitution, consulting policy, Faculty Manual, and other committee activities. See Attachment E for a summary of the actions taken on Faculty Senate resolutions. Senator Hood praised the work of President Melsheimer during the past year and thanked him for his contribution. Senator Ham came forward and presented President Melsheimer with a gift from the Faculty Senate.
IV. New Business:

1. A motion passed that the Faculty Senate go into executive session to discuss policy matters. Executive session commenced at 4:51 p.m. and ended at 5:05 p.m.

   A motion was made to adopt the following resolution:

   **FS-82-4-1**

   Be it resolved that the Policy Committee reexamine the University Policy on the review of department heads.

   The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

2. Senator Hood introduced Cindy Powell, Editor of *The Tiger*.

3. Senator Palmer read a letter of commendation addressed to former senator, Eugene Park for his 34 years of service to the University as a member of the Mathematics faculty. A motion to accept the letter was made by Senator Palmer and passed by unanimous voice vote. See Attachment F.

4. Senator Baron moved that the Welfare Committee prepare a position paper for the May meeting that examines the issue of promotion without salary.

   **FS-82-4-2**

   Be it resolved that the Welfare Committee prepare a position paper for the May meeting that examines the issue of promotion without a salary increment.

   The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

VII. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher M. Sieverdes
Secretary of The Faculty Senate

Enclosures

Senators Absent:
None
The Faculty Senate Policy Committee met fifteen times during its 1981-1982 term, added to which were frequent consultations via telephone and memoranda.

During that period the bulk of the Committee's time was taken up by two matters of overwhelming importance to the Senate, the Faculty, and the University—the new Faculty Constitution and the revision of the Faculty Manual. Both matters involved the Committee in continuing the work of the previous Policy Committee and completing it properly within severely limiting deadlines.

In accordance with established policy, the Committee presented its work on the Constitution to the Senate, received Senate recommendations, and returned to the Senate with its subsequent proposals. The final outcome of this process was the approval of the new Constitution by the University Faculty and, finally, by the Board of Trustees.

By direction of President Melsheimer, the Policy Committee also became responsible for reviewing the bulk of the new Faculty Manual as forwarded to it by the Faculty Manual Revision Committee, and for making appropriate recommendations to the Senate. Among recommendations forwarded to the Senate were changes in policy regarding sabbatical leave, graduate study by faculty, the re-definition of Faculty ranks, tenure, and the status of emeritus faculty.

Other matters affecting the status and role of faculty for the foreseeable future which were acted upon by the Policy Committee were: the review of a new University policy on endowed chairs; the final formulation of Faculty Grievance Procedure II; reviews of the policies on the awarding of honorary degrees, the selection of academic administrators, procedures for the recruitment and appointment of faculty; and a recommendation for procedures for electing Faculty Senate alternates. The Committee concluded its labors by presenting for the consideration of the 1982-83 Senate a revision of the policy on the evaluation of academic administrators and a recommendation that the new Senate undertake a thorough study of the procedures whereby faculty are elected or appointed to University commissions, councils, and committees.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger B. Rollin
Chairperson
Faculty Senate Policy Committee
Research Committee Activities

During the 1981-82 academic year the Faculty Senate Research Committee was involved with the following activities:
- Proposed Guidelines for Review of Theses and Dissertations. Reviewed and reported to the Senate. Compromise adopted by the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research.

- Visa status of foreign students. Reviewed and reported to the Senate for information. Situation now satisfactorily resolved.


- Consulting policy. Studied in depth and reported to Senate. Compromise accepted by Administration.

- Faculty Manual. Reviewed sections pertinent to research.
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE (1981-1982)

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

REVIEWED AND MADE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING:


2. The University Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee's January 29, 1982 review of an ad hoc committee's report on student evaluation of teachers

3. The Academic Deans' Council September 14, 1981 recommendations for general education requirements at Clemson

4. The report of the University Ad Hoc Committee to Review Academic Regulations

5. The M W F, T Th schedule pattern and a provision for meeting classes on the hour and half-hour
Welfare Committee Report

During the past year, the Welfare Committee has worked quite closely with Dr. Stassen Thompson, a member of the Governor's committee on Fringe Benefits for State Employees. This committee is charged with studying means by which fringe benefits for employees can be improved through no increase in state spending. By working closely with Dr. Thompson, the faculty at Clemson has a means by which to have its proposals for fringe benefit improvements considered at the state level.
FACULTY SENATE

April 13, 1982

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. Each college is reminded that a new Advisory Committee member should be elected before the April meeting.

2. The Faculty Manual approved by the Senate on March 9, 1982 has been approved by the administration. It has been forwarded to the Board of Trustees for action at their meeting on April 16, 1982, and approval is expected. Two copies of the final draft (coded 3/9) have been placed on reserve at the Library. The finished document in final format should be ready this summer.

   * The 1982-83 Budget is still $2.7M short. Initiatives have been made with the legislature to obtain relief, but no answers obtained yet - may be mid-April. Best projection is that colleges will have same personnel budget as last year, with severe operating budget cuts in equipment, travel, etc.

   * Library Director Joe Boykin reported that their budget cuts will be reflected in severe cuts in periodicals. Lists of seldom used journals proposed to be cut will be circulated to departments for review prior to implementing cuts.

4. President's Council - March 26, 1982
   * The Alumni Fellowships have been increased to 5, and the Edwards Fellowships to 10.

   * A request was made of President Atchley to provide the Council with further information about the Thurmond Center complex as presently envisioned.

   * Five more Alumni Professors are to be selected. Nominations are being solicited from the various colleges. The Deans will forward ten nominations to Provost Maxwell.

   * A new university Scheduling Committee has been proposed by Dr. Maxwell to replace the current Schedule Committee. In addition to reviewing and adjusting class schedule and classroom assignment requests, this committee would be charged with recommending policy related to these matters to the Provost.
   * The Athletic Council voted unanimously to retain fencing as an intercollegiate
     sport with an operating budget comparable to the present, but with no
     athletic grants-in-aid.

   * Women's Field Hockey was recommended to be dropped as an intercollegiate
     sport, but retain it as a club sport if feasible.

   * In response to an inquiry Dean Walter Cox and Mr. Bill McLellan both
     indicated that President Atchley does intend to appoint a committee to
     carry out the University "self-investigation" of the NCAA charges.

7. President Atchley has responded to Senate Resolutions FS-82-3-1 and FS-82-3-2 by
   reiterating his positions that the Office of Admissions and Registration
   will not be moved from Student Affairs at the present time, and that the
   Dean of Admissions and Registration is a "staff position" which is being
   filled by methods appropriate to such positions. In regard to FS-82-3-3,
   he indicated his strong support for all feasible steps to enhance pedes-
   trian safety.

8. Attached tables summarize the Senate activities for the 1981-82 year. The first
   compiles the Resolutions (including a few older ones for which dispositions
   have recently been obtained), and the second lists important Senate positions
   taken by adopting reports, or other methods of expression. Actually, the
   most important products of Senate efforts over the past year fall in the
   latter category - the Faculty Constitution, the Faculty Manual, the
   Academic Regulations Report, etc.

9. In closing my final President's Report, I would like to express my sincere
    thanks for the splendid cooperation I received from all members of the
    Senate, and the long hours of hard work you put in on behalf of the
    faculty this year. I believe this has been a very productive year,
    with many valuable and enduring contributions to the well-being of the
    faculty and the University. On behalf of the faculty, I want to thank
    you for your dedication which made it possible.

10. You are again reminded of our "end of the Senate year party" to be held at the
    conclusion of the April meeting. The site will be the Bayshore Subdivision
    Recreation Area (maps will be provided). It will be completely informal,
    with beer and some chips, etc., to nibble on. New as well as old Senators
    are invited. Spouses are welcome.

   Respectfully Submitted,

Stephen S. Melsheimer

SSM/nhs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ACCEPTED</th>
<th>REJECTED</th>
<th>COMPROMISE</th>
<th>ADOPTED</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-1-1</td>
<td>Abatement of Out-Of-State Tuition</td>
<td>In Part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-2-1</td>
<td>Summer School Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-7-1</td>
<td>Traffic Barricades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-11-2</td>
<td>Faculty Participation in Selection of Academic Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-3-1</td>
<td>Faculty Personal Activity Reporting System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-3-3</td>
<td>Evaluation of Transfer Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-3-4</td>
<td>Additional Summer School Offerings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-3-9</td>
<td>Improved Funding of the Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-3-6</td>
<td>Consulting Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-3-7</td>
<td>Policy and Procedures for Selecting Honorary Degree Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-4-1</td>
<td>Abney Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-5-1</td>
<td>Sympathy for Elizabeth Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-6-1</td>
<td>Standardization of Academic Calendar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-6-2</td>
<td>Deletion of Fall and Summer Graduations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-7-1</td>
<td>Use of Faculty Workload Analysis on Trial Basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-10-1</td>
<td>MWF - TTh Class Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-10-2</td>
<td>Class Meetings on Hour and Half-Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-1-1</td>
<td>Consulting Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-3-1</td>
<td>Selection of Dean of Admissions and Registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-3-2</td>
<td>Relocation of Office of Admissions and Registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-3-3</td>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>DISPOSITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/81</td>
<td>Policy and Procedure for Selecting Honorary Degree Recipients</td>
<td>Not accepted by Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/81</td>
<td>Faculty Participation in the Selection of Academic Administrators</td>
<td>Approved by Board of Trustees in July, 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/81</td>
<td>Faculty Grievance Procedure II</td>
<td>Approved by Board in July, 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/81</td>
<td>Policy on Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships</td>
<td>Approved by Board in July, 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/81</td>
<td>Affirmative Action Policy and Procedure for Recruitment and Appointment of Academic Administrators</td>
<td>Accepted by Administration and Implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/29/81</td>
<td>Academic Regulations Report</td>
<td>Compromise Adopted by Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/81</td>
<td>Graduate Academic Regulations Report</td>
<td>Compromise Adopted by Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/81</td>
<td>Faculty Constitution</td>
<td>Adopted by Faculty, and approved by the Board of Trustees, January, 1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/82</td>
<td>Policy on Private Outside Employment</td>
<td>Compromise Adopted by Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/82</td>
<td>Faculty Manual</td>
<td>Approved by Administration and Sent to The Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/82</td>
<td>Campus Master Plan Report</td>
<td>Submitted to Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13/82</td>
<td>Ad Hoc Committee Report on Graduate Admissions</td>
<td>Accepted by Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Policy Committee met and discussed again the proposed revision of present University policy on the review of department heads set forth in the committee's 9th memorandum to the Senate. Also discussed were the responses to the proposed revision received by the committee from some faculty, department heads, and one dean.

The committee did not reach its usual consensus on the matter but did vote to forward a slightly revised recommendation to the Senate for discussion and action. (That action could be taken at the April 13th meeting or, if the Senate pleases, deferred to a subsequent meeting after the transition from the old Senate to the new has been accomplished.)

A summary of the pros and cons of the issue follows.

CON. The new policy has just been put in place and should be given more of chance before it is revised.

PRO. In at least one college the procedure was tested two years ago and other colleges have tested it this year. It is clear that for some faculty the procedure is awkward, it is in the case of large departments cumbersome, and for both reasons may not yield the kind of information deans need; therefore its improvement should proceed without delay.

CON. The revision imposes a significant burden upon the departmental Advisory Committee (tailoring a review procedure to meet the department's needs) and involves it in with potentially difficult negotiations with the dean.

PRO. The Advisory Committee members are elected to shoulder such responsibilities.

CON. The proposal does not accommodate those smaller departments in which the whole department constitutes the Advisory Committee, nor does it necessarily allow for the entire faculty to address the matter.

PRO. Points well taken—see revision in the third sentence below (beginning "Such evaluations...").

CON. Deans (and some faculty) may object to involving a faculty member from outside the college in such internal matters as the review of a department head's performance (that is, when the Advisory Committee recommends that such an "external interviewer" rather than the dean meet with faculty and solicit their opinions). In addition, this would be a heavy burden upon a non-administrator where the department in question is large.

PRO. What is at issue here is the paramount importance of the dean's receiving information that is as complete, as frank, and as reliable as possible in order for him to make his/her decision—not anyone's comfort or convenience.

CON. Allowing for the possibility that the Provost will be given the authority to determine which procedure a department will use (in cases of disagreement between the department and the dean) and/or to name an "external reviewer" simply invests more power in an already powerful office.

PRO. In the former case the Provost is only being asked to adjudicate a dispute as to procedure, not establish a procedure of his own. In the case of the latter, the academic deans already have been "named" by the Provost and report to him; thus they are technically more subordinate to him than a faculty member from another
CON. Neither the present policy or the proposed revision allows for responses from all faculty under the head's supervision, i.e., non tenure-track faculty.

PRO. A point well taken. In a few departments with considerable numbers of non tenure-track faculty and a large "permanent" faculty, however, the burden imposed upon the interviewer might be considered to be approaching the excessive.

Proposed Revision of the Policy on the Review of Academic Administrators
(Faculty Manual draft 2-12, VI:34)

N.B. Italics indicate changes from draft (2-12). Sentence #3 revised from that set forth in the Policy Committee’s March 9th memorandum.

[3] Before the end of a department head’s fifth year in office, the appropriate dean shall conduct a formal review of that head’s performance. This review shall include evaluations of said performance by the tenured and tenure-track members of the affected department. Such evaluations shall be solicited according to the following procedure: the departmental faculty or, upon its instructions, the departmental faculty Advisory Committee, meeting in the absence of the head, shall recommend to the dean or equivalent supervisor a procedure for obtaining faculty evaluations of the department head's performance in office. Said procedure could include: personal interviews with each tenured and tenure-track faculty member by the dean or by a faculty member from another college appointed by the Provost; a departmentally or collegially developed questionnaire; or any combination of these or other methods developed by the department or its Advisory Committee. Should the department or its faculty Advisory Committee and the dean be unable to agree upon a procedure, the matter shall be resolved by the Provost. At the discretion of the dean, the affected department's faculty Advisory Committee may be enlisted to assist in other ways in the conducting of the formal review. When the review process has been completed, the dean shall make a report to the Provost.

(N.B.#2. Note that sentences 4 and 5 have also been adjusted to accommodate the emended language of sentence 3.)

RATIONALE. While many faculty are on excellent professional terms with their deans, there are now and likely always will be situations in which the dean/faculty member relationship is "delicate." And some faculty simply are made uncomfortable by having to evaluate their heads in one-on-one interviews with the dean of the college. Under such circumstances the presently mandated personal interview between the individual faculty member and the dean may not elicit the very kinds of information the dean seeks. Anonymity is often a better guarantor of frank responses, as the designers of student evaluations of faculty have long recognized. Therefore it is desirable that a more flexible system of faculty evaluation be devised, one which can better suit the evaluation procedures to the affected individuals.

Respectfully submitted for the Policy Committee,

Roger Rollin, Chairperson
This committee was formed as a result of statements by faculty members from several departments in various colleges concerning the admissions policies and practices of the graduate school. These statements included assertions that these policies and practices were not compatible with those of similar institutions, that communications between the graduate school and departments was frequently poor, that the appeals system for those students not meeting normal "automatic" admissions criteria was not satisfactory and that the graduate dean's office did not have a positive approach to recruiting of qualified graduate students.

In response to these assertions, this committee adopted the policy that its primary role would be that of a fact-finding organization, and that it would not attempt to formulate specific recommendations for revisions in University policy. It further agreed that it would not become involved in the question of the visa status for foreign students, a matter which had been considered by the Research Committee and which now appears to be more or less satisfactorily resolved.

The findings summarized in this report are based on a survey of the catalog requirements for graduate admission of a number of Universities and narrative statements from department heads or graduate coordinators of ten departments across the country. The survey data are included as an appendix to this report. The committee also met with Deans Schwartz and Brown and received input and documents from various faculty members and graduate coordinators of several departments at Clemson. The Commission on Higher Education's outside evaluation of graduate programs in physical, mathematical and biological sciences was also reviewed.

The results of the survey indicate that the admission requirements at Clemson are among the most rigorous of the various universities surveyed. Also it should
be noted that for some universities there are discrepancies between catalog and departmental requirements. The appeals system used at Clemson appears to be unique to this university.

The Commission on Higher Education evaluation of graduate programs in the physical sciences, based on a visit to the campus in October 1980, states in item C-8: "The best person to decide admission to a (graduate) program which is outstanding at its university is the chairman of the department. Disciplines differ in what credentials an acceptable candidate must have, and there should rarely, hopefully never, arise a situation in which an admissions recommendation from a good department and a responsible chairman is reversed by the graduate school." From the review of the life sciences programs, page 47: "There is a poor overall atmosphere for research and graduate affairs... The central administration is strongly urged to demonstrate by work and action a firm, more positive, more openly supportive stance in favor of enhanced graduate activities."

Input, largely from one department at Clemson, which has had nearly 100 students who have received Ph.D. degrees, indicated several instances in which students who were acceptable to this department and who on prima facie assessment of their submitted documents indicated that they fulfilled the requirements for admission to the graduate school were subsequently rejected. These rejections were based on at least one instance on a telephone call made by the graduate school to the applicant's department, and in another case by a reinterpretation of the applicant's transcript for the MS degree at Clemson. The latter student is now doing outstanding work for the Ph.D. at another institution.

Further input from the same department indicated that they had in the past admitted students to their doctoral program with GRE scores in the 870 to 980 range who had successfully completed this program. Of six students in this
category, two are now vice-presidents of major corporations, two hold tenured
faculty positions at small universities and two are successfully employed in
research and development in their field.

Other input from various departments has indicated that some departments
and colleges have hesitated to criticize or complain formally regarding graduate
school policies for fear of retribution and one person commented that he found
the appeals system personally degrading for the faculty member involved.

The Ad Hoc Committee met with Deans Schwartz and Brown for approximately
90 minutes on December 14, 1981. Although the Committee Chairman had specifically
stated to Dean Schwartz that the Committee's charge did not include an investigation
of the visa status for foreign students, Mr. Otis Nelson was present at the meeting
in order to discuss this matter. Although the Chairman restated that the visa
question was not part of committee's charge, Mr. Nelson had a prepared statement
and a significant portion of the meeting was spent justifying the visa policy
in force at that time. The general topic of graduate admissions was also discussed,
and Deans Schwartz and Brown stated that in admission practices they did differentiate
between departments and that they did have a bias toward certain programs. It
was further stated that the role of the graduate school was to "see to it that
departments stayed up". It was also stated that personalities played a role
in the appeals process. Some suggestions for changes in policies were made by
various members of the committee, however the responses were largely negative.
It was admitted that in the past applications had been misplaced and that this
was regrettable. Deans Schwartz and Brown gave several examples of recent improve-
ments by the graduate school in handling admissions.

The committee could find no evidence of an imaginative or constructive
effort on the part of the graduate school to make the public aware of the graduate
program at Clemson. Nor was there any evidence that the graduate school was
of assistance to the various departments in the recruiting of qualified graduate
students.
Conclusions and Recommendations

By comparison with other institutions and with the professional performances of marginal students who have completed a Ph.D. program at Clemson, the stated admissions criteria are quite stringent and appear to be administered in a rather inflexible manner. In at least some instances there is bias by the graduate school toward certain programs, and the present appeals program is at best cumbersome and in some cases prejudiced. Several of the committee members who attended the meeting with Deans Schwartz and Brown felt that the graduate school stated role of "seeing to it that departments stayed up" constitutes an insult to the professional qualifications of the faculties of the various departments. It is our opinion that if the faculty of a given department permits the quality of their graduates (MS or Ph.D.) to deteriorate, the outside professional world in that field will quickly and effectively notify the department of its shortcomings. The appropriate college deans and department heads should bear the responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the graduate programs in their areas of expertise.

Also, in these days of fierce competition for graduate students in many fields, the cumbersome practices used by the graduate school, and in particular the appeals process, constitute a hindrance to effective and efficient recruiting.

President Atchley has stated that his goal is to make Clemson a top twenty institution and if this goal is to be reached, strong graduate programs are necessary. To help accomplish this goal the committee makes the following general recommendations regarding graduate admissions policies and practices:

1) The present appeals system should be abolished and this function turned over to the departments.

2) The admissions requirements should be modified to be more competitive with those of other universities.
3) The graduate school should be more supportive of the departments and much more responsive to their needs.

4) The graduate school should realize that due to their proximity to their field, the faculty of a department is a sound judge of the qualifications of a given applicant.

5) The graduate school should be of more assistance to the departments in advertising the graduate program at Clemson and in graduate student recruiting.

6) Applications should be processed sufficiently rapidly, and the departments given sufficient autonomy, to permit competitive recruiting.

John Huffman, Chairman
John Dick
Harold Harris
John Bennett
Michael Vatalaro
Edward Olive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>GRE</th>
<th>GPR</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>TOEFL</th>
<th>GRE</th>
<th>GPR</th>
<th>TOEFL</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 full 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>900 Prov. 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>550 Appeals board for marginal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Departments decide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>900 if GPR &lt; 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not in library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standards set by dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in</td>
<td>library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marginal as &quot;Grad Specials&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not in library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in</td>
<td>library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marginal at dept. option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisc. (Milw.)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>Have provisional admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.5 or 3.0 sr. yr.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>Accept 850 GRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grad. School flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not in library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in</td>
<td>library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not in library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 2.5 MS 2.75 PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in</td>
<td>library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grad. School accepts dept. recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY-Buffalo</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not in library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 2.5 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Tech</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.0 but varies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Accepts 2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1100 No 550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepts 1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss State</td>
<td>800-1000 2.5 last 60 hrs.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Accepts 2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1000 B last 60 hrs.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepts 1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: Yes indicates required, but no criteria stated. A question mark indicates not specified.
April 23, 1982

Professor Eugene Park
111 Crestwood Drive
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

Dear Professor Park:

On behalf of the Faculty of Clemson University, the Faculty Senate wishes to express its appreciation for your 34 years of outstanding service to the University.

The esteem in which you are held by your colleagues is evidenced by the numerous positions of leadership to which you have been chosen, including your election to the Faculty Senate and to its Presidency for the year 1968-69.

We wish you a long and useful retirement.

Sincerely,

Clarence E. Hood
Clarence E. Hood, President
The Faculty Senate