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I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by President Thompson.

II. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the October 21, 1980 meeting were not approved as they have not been distributed. They will be approved at the next meeting.

III. Committee Reports

A. Admissions and Scholarships Committee - Senator Kimbell

1. No formal meeting has been held since the last Senate meeting because the University Committee on Scholastic Regulations is still in the process of reviewing regulations which the Admissions and Scholarship Committee has considered, and no other pressing problems presented themselves.

2. Senator Grubb and Senator Kimbell will meet with Provost Maxwell this Thursday, November 20, 1980, to follow up last year's position paper on student admissions.

3. Time permitting this Thursday, Senator Kimbell will also inquire into the current status of last year's position paper on faculty and student responsibilities in the advising process.

B. Policy Committee - Senator Rollin

1. The Committee has completed the written report already circulated to Senators entitled "Proposed Revision of FS 80-8-2. This will come up for discussion under Old Business. (Attachment A)

2. It is anticipated that the report on "Grievance Procedures I" will be completed at the committee meeting to be held Wednesday, November 19, 1980, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 108 Strode Tower.

3. Negotiations will continue between this Committee and Provost Maxwell concerning departmental governance.

C. Research Committee - Senator Ham

1. The Committee met with Provost Maxwell on October 8, 1980 to discuss the reorganization and objectives of the Office of University Research. Comments and concerns were expressed, but the discussion was necessarily very general since many aspects of OUR are unsettled.

Personal Activity Reports (CUBO 0613) were also discussed. The Committee expressed concern and displeasure and pointed out that OMB provided for a more realistic reporting system for professional employees.

After contacting the Business Office, Provost Maxwell responded by memo that the present reporting system was more expedient and would be retained. Senator Ham has subsequently replied that convenience for the office of Budgets and Planning is not the
primary purpose of the reporting system. An accurate and honest account of employee activities is the purpose and the present system does not provide for this.

2. The Committee will meet soon with Stan Nicholas at his request, as follow up to the meeting with Provost Maxwell concerning the objectives of the Office of University Research.

D. Welfare Committee - Senator Quisenberry

1. There will soon be a joint meeting of the Welfare Committee of Clemson and the University of South Carolina with Mr. Collins, Head of the South Carolina Retirement System, regarding the retirement system.

2. The Committee has been working with Ron Herrin gathering information about medical insurance programs and comparison with other local institutions.

3. The issue of faculty/staff housing is being pursued with Manning Lomax.

4. The University Group Life Insurance Committee should have a report by next month.

5. A question arose as to the source of the recently circulated questionnaire on dental insurance. Senator Coulter clarified that the questionnaire originated in Columbia and was sent to all Blue Cross employees in the State system. Concern focused on the poor quality of the questionnaire and the possibility that this, plus the suddenness of its circulation, would obscure the results and lead to the conclusion that State employees are not interested in dental insurance.

E. Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure Policy - Senator Huffman

The Committee met several times during October and has circulated its report to Senators as "Edited Proposed Revisions to Tenure Policy, Items (2.) and (3.), Pages 34-35, 1976 Faculty Manual." (Attachment B.) The resolution to adopt the report as recommended revision to the Faculty Manual will be brought up under New Business as Resolution FS 80-11-1. Senator Huffman indicated that the revisions were based on study of the AAUP guidelines and faculty manuals of other institutions.

IV. President's Report

A. Referring to the President's Report (Attachment C), President Thompson stated that he will be discussing special scholarships to waive out-of-state tuition (item 3f) with Provost Maxwell this Thursday. He is hopeful about the prospects of this being set up.

B. President Thompson expressed optimism regarding acceptance as it now stands of the Faculty Senate's resolution on Privileges for Retired Faculty, FS 80-2-3.

C. Also reported favorably was the matter of support for operation of the Faculty Senate. The groundwork has been laid to provide fifty percent of the Faculty Senate President's salary, and Provost Maxwell is looking into the possibility of securing funds for part-time secretarial help.
D. Provost Maxwell has sent a memo to the academic deans asking for recommendations on appropriate ways to fill the two vacant Alumni Professorships. (Item 3e)

V. New Business
At the request of President Thompson a motion was made, seconded, and passed, to suspend the rules of the Senate and alter the order of business by placing new business before old business. An out-of-order discussion ensued as to the rationale for this. President Thompson indicated that the main item under new business, Resolution FS 80-11-1, Proposed Revision of the Tenure Policy, is an important one which may require lengthy discussion. It had been the intention of the Senate to discuss and act on this by the November meeting so that any action or recommendation from the Faculty Senate can be forwarded to Provost Maxwell prior to the January meeting of the Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees. This item is on the agenda for that January meeting.

There was discussion about the possibility of delaying the discussion until the Senate's December meeting after a comment by Senator Hester that he had received his copy of the revisions yesterday and had not yet had time to share with his colleagues to receive their input. This concern was strongly repeated by Senator Baron, while Senator Huffman urged consideration of the issue at this meeting so that Senate input would be guaranteed.

To allow for discussion Senator Howard moved that the report containing proposed revisions be accepted as Resolution FS-80-11-1 to recommend to the faculty the indicated revision of the Faculty Manual. The motion was seconded. A motion to table the Resolution and its discussion was made by Senator Hester, seconded by Senator Baron. The motion was defeated.

Senator Huffman spoke on behalf of the resolution, explaining the purposes and advantages of the proposed revisions. Senator Coulter asked Senators Baron and Hester to explain their concerns. Senator Baron expressed that he personally had no objections to the revisions but felt strongly that his faculty colleagues needed time to consider them carefully. Senator Hester stated his own objections were limited to questions about wording but that he felt new faculty may have concerns and therefore have a right to see the report. Both President Thompson and Vice President Coulter responded that Provost Maxwell has stated that present revisions will not affect faculty already employed at Clemson under the provisions of the present Faculty Manual. Several senators expressed doubt about this, and Senator Howard indicated he wanted that statement in writing.

A concern of faculty in Engineering regarding whether instructors should be tenured was raised by Senator Bennett. Discussion followed concerning AAUP guidelines, which indicate that service as an instructor should count toward tenure. Senator Harris asked whether the proposed revisions would mean an instructor could remain in that position only five years unless tenured. After an affirmative response was given, Vice-President Coulter clarified this by stating that an individual instructor who was not promoted or tenured could be reassigned under another title. Various options for this were discussed.

One of the merits of the proposed revisions was pointed out by Senator Rollin, that of the fact that under such a policy, tenure could be achieved much sooner by someone who is of exceptional merit.
Concerned about the ambiguity in wording, Senator Hester moved that the second sentence in Item 3., paragraph 3, on page 1, be changed to read:

"In exceptional cases, tenure may be granted earlier, but not to individuals with less than four (4) years of probationary service at Clemson or elsewhere."

After being seconded, the motion was accepted as a friendly amendment to the document by Senator Huffman.

Senator Quisenberry moved to further amend the same sentence by adding the phrase "...at least one year at Clemson." The motion was seconded. During discussion it was pointed out that this would exclude any exceptions for distinguished professors who might therefore not consider employment at Clemson. Further, it was stated that this need not be included as a safeguard because the document clearly indicates that ..."all grants of tenure (including appointment with immediate tenure) shall be subject to peer review..." by the affected department. The question was called. The motion to limit debate passed and the motion to amend the statement was defeated.

The issue of limited time for discussion by faculty was again raised. It was pointed out that the Senators had been apprised of the process for revision of the tenure policy and its timing, that the committee has met at least four times in the past month and had requested input.

Senator Kline expressed concern over the effects of the proposed revisions on faculty employed at the rank of instructor, as instructors comprise a significant percentage of the faculty in the College of Nursing. A specific concern was that under these provisions, a choice might be forced among three alternatives: promotion, termination, or reassignment under another title, within a five-year period, and that in given cases none of these might be the most effective or appropriate choice. She therefore moved to amend the resolution by deleting the second sentence in Item 2., page one, which reads:

"Instructors not promoted by the end of their fourth year of service shall receive a terminating appointment of one year."

Following a second, brief discussion took place. Senator Hester stated that the Senate needs to consider various effects on a microcosmic as well as macrocosmic level if the revisions are adopted. Senator Huffman reminded the Senators that the lecturer position is an option referred to by AAUP for faculty not fitting another rank.

Senator Snipes stated that, the urgency of Senate action notwithstanding, debate indicated the need for further consideration. He moved to reconsider the motion to table. This was seconded and passed. Thereupon the motion to table Resolution FS 80-11-1 and its discussion, including the motion on the floor by Senator Kline, was made by Senator Baron, seconded by Senator Howard, and passed by hand count, 17-13.

Additional out of order discussion ensued regarding the urgency of a decision on this revision prior to January. Vice President Coulter warned the Senate of his intention to move to take the Resolution from the table and reopen debate at the next meeting. Senator Gray admonished the Senate about assuming a position of "reacting, not acting," and stated he felt
the Senate ought to seize the offensive and call a special session in order to proceed with this important issue. This idea was supported by other Senators. Senators were urged by President Thompson to immediately discuss the proposed revisions of the tenure policy with their faculty colleagues. Hearing no objection from the Advisory Committee, he stated that a special meeting for its review will be called. It was requested by Senator Huffman that this issue of the Senate Special include the text of the revision in its entirety to facilitate review by all faculty. Senator Idol supported the request.

VI. Old Business

A. Senator Bennett inquired as to the status of FS-80-7-1, dealing with the traffic barricades. President Thompson stated he would report on that under Announcements.

B. Senator Rollin proceeded to introduce the report of the Policy Committee on proposed revision of FS 80-8-2, explaining the Committee's position of viewing the revisions as "improvement but not radical change." (Attachment A). He moved the adoption of Resolution FS-80-11-2, that the revised text be recommended to the faculty as a revision to the Faculty Manual, supplanting the present section, "Faculty Participation in the Selection of Academic Administrators," pp. 49-50.

Following a second, it was moved by Senator Hester, and seconded, to amend paragraph 2 on page 3 to read as follows:

"The appointing authority for each search committee shall consider having among its membership representation of minorities and females."

Discussion focused on the intent to retain flexibility of this requirement, especially in the case of very small departments, while complying with legal requirements. The motion passed.

Senator Quisenberry sought clarification regarding the constitution of a committee to select an administrator in a unit such as an Experiment Station. He reflected the concern that such persons might not be fairly represented if members were also elected from the related academic faculty. It was pointed out that the term "affected faculty" refers to the persons directly involved, i.e., those at the Experiment Station. Senator Wainscott questioned the possibility of undue influence exerted on a committee, particularly in a small department, if the appointed members were all outsiders. To this Senator Rollin responded that the majority would still be elected from within the department, and that he views this as an improvement over the present situation in which all selection committee members are appointed.

Senator Snipes called the question. The motion to limit debate passed with no dissent. Resolution FS 80-11-2 was then passed by voice vote as amended:

FS 80-11-2

Be it hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate recommend to the faculty that the text which follows supplant the section in the Faculty Manual entitled "Faculty Participation in the Selection of Academic Administrators" (pp. 49-50).
FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE SELECTION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

When an appointment to an academic administrative position is to be made, a faculty committee, with student representation when appropriate, shall be formed to recommend the selection of the person to fill the position. The search committee will submit a short list of candidates for the position from which the appointment will be made. If an appointment cannot be made from this list, the search committee may make additional nominations. If no other candidates are acceptable to the committee, the matter will be brought to the attention of the Provost, who will consult with the appointing administrator and the search committee with regard to appropriate actions.

For the selection of an academic department head or other academic administrators within a department, a committee shall be formed from the faculty within that college. The majority of the members of this committee shall be chosen by the faculty from within the affected department; the minority may be appointed by the dean of the college. The dean of the college will make the appointment from the list submitted by the search committee, subject to the approval of the Provost and the President of the University.

For the selection of an assistant dean, associate dean, or director within a college, a majority of the members of the committee shall be chosen by the faculty from within that college or other administrative unit; the minority may be appointed by the dean of the college. The dean of the college will make the appointment from the list submitted by the search committee, subject to the approval of the Provost and the President of the University.

For the selection of an academic administrator of an off-campus program, the committee shall represent both the off-campus program and the appropriate on-campus academic areas. The majority of the representatives to this committee shall be chosen by the affected faculty; the minority may be appointed by the dean of the college. The dean of the college will make the appointment from the list submitted by the search committee, subject to the approval of the Provost and the President of the University.

For the selection of the dean of a college, or director of the library, the majority of the representatives to the committee shall be chosen by the faculty from within the affected administrative unit; the minority may be appointed by the Provost. The Provost will make the appointment from the list submitted by the search committee, subject to the approval of the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

For the selection of a Vice Provost or an academic dean, other than a college dean, the Provost, in consultation with the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate, shall appoint the search committee. The Provost will make the appointment from the list submitted by the search committee subject to the approval of the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

For the selection of the Provost, the President, in consultation with the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate, shall appoint the search committee. The President will appoint the Provost from the list submitted by the search committee, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees.

The appointing authority for each search committee shall consider having among its membership representation of minorities and females.

A search committee in any unit which serves students shall have one or more student representatives, the number to be determined by the faculty members of the committee. Where appropriate, both undergraduate majors and graduate students may have representation. Where feasible, student
FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE SELECTION OF
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

When a President of the University is to be selected, the Board of Trustees will recognize the interests of the University Faculty by appointing the President of the Faculty Senate and at least one Professor, elected by the Professors, as full-fledged participants in the search-and-screening process.

- - - - - - - - -

VII. Announcements

A. On January 16, 1981 the Faculty Senate will hold a reception for members of the Board of Trustees from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. in the Alumni Center.

B. FS 80-7-1, regarding the traffic barricades, has been placed on the agenda for this week's Cabinet Meeting.

VIII. Adjournment

Following informal polling of senators as to possible items for a special meeting, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Priscilla M. Kline, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Senators absent:
L. H. Blanton (substitute: A. Hash)
D. L. Cross
S. S. Melsheimer
C. A. Grubb
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Enclosures
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: The Policy Committee
Roger Rollin, Chairman

SUBJECT: Proposed Revision of FS 80-8-2

Attached is a report of the Policy Committee, "Proposed Revision of FS 80-8-2." It is scheduled for discussion and action at the Senate's November 18 meeting. The Committee will move that this report be approved as a recommended revision of the Faculty Manual, specifically the section entitled "Faculty Participation in the Selection of Academic Administrators" (pp. 49-50).

Background. At its August 26 meeting the Senate charged the Policy Committee with reviewing a resolution by Senator Baron, FS 80-8-2 (copy enclosed). During that review the Committee came to concur with Senator Baron that, were the resolution to be approved, it would constitute a revision of the Faculty Manual. Thus, the Committee decided to recast the resolution in its present form as substitute Faculty Manual text.

The Manual stipulates the appointment of search-and-screening committees (herein called "search committees") for academic administrators, and does not refer to student representation. FS 80-8-2 and the revised version of our Committee treat both issues, hence the need for a Manual revision.

Explanation. The Committee assumes that in most cases, the democratic process is the most appropriate method of naming search committee members; it is less practical (if no less appropriate in theory) in the case of searches for the University Provost and the University President--situations where the entire university faculty constitutes "the affected faculty."

At the same time, the recommended revision recognizes that, in order to meet Affirmative Action guidelines or other desiderata, the appropriate administrator must have the opportunity to appoint additional faculty to a search committee--but only in numbers not to exceed or equal the number of elected members.
Finally, the Committee concluded that, since all university units do not have contact with students, it would be inadvisable to stipulate that all search committees have undergraduate and graduate members. The determination of student membership thus must be the responsibility of the faculty members of the committee. Note also that provision is made for the nomination of such student representatives by the appropriate student clubs or other organizations—or, where practicable, by an "assembly" of students (e.g., departmental majors) called together for that purpose.

For further clarification of comments, please contact the Chairperson of the Policy Committee or any member.

Respectfully submitted,

The Policy Committee
Roger Rollin, Chairperson
Myra Armistead
Lloyd Blanton
John Dick
John Huffman
David Snipes
Ellen Schultz
Hugh Webb
George Worm

RR/dh

Enclosure
B. Resolution FS-80-8-2 - Appointments to Selection Committees:

FS-80-8-2

The administration of Clemson University has recognized the faculty's right to participate in the selection of deans, department heads, and other academic administrators by establishing faculty search committees as part of the selection process. However, selection of search committee members by the Administration, rather than by faculty, has on occasion been perceived by some as a means of circumventing the will of the faculty. To faithfully represent the faculty in the selection process, faculty representatives to the selection committee must themselves be chosen by the faculty. The lack of significant student input into the selection process is also of concern to some faculty, students and administrators. Representation of the appropriate student body on the selection committees is thus, also deemed to be necessary. Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED; that the make up of faculty search committees and the procedures for organizing such committees shall be changed. The following modifications shall be incorporated into the existing procedures:

1. Faculty representatives to selection committees shall be chosen by the faculty from within the department, college, or other administrative unit from whence an academic administrator is being selected. The faculty from the affected administrative unit shall establish its own rules for selecting faculty. The dean of the affected college or dean of the university may in addition choose two faculty members, as outside representatives and/or to meet affirmative action requirements.

2. One undergraduate student and one graduate student shall be appointed to each selection committee. Selection of student representatives shall be made by students from within the affected academic unit.

Submitted by W. Baron on 8/21/80
To the Faculty Senate:

In response to a request from the Provost to review our tenure policy, an Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure Policy was appointed by President Thompson. The duties of this committee were the review and possible revision of the present tenure policy described on pages 34 and 35 of the Faculty Manual. It became apparent that consideration of the tenure policy could not be divorced from procedures for the awarding of tenure, which in turn are related to procedures for promotion. Thus, the charge of the committee was expanded to include possible revision of the "Procedures for Appointments and Promotions" described on page 48 of the Faculty Manual.

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee was forwarded to the Policy Committee, and after some revision, the attached report was unanimously approved at the November 12 meeting of that body. The diagram outlining the proposed changes in tenure policy is for your information.

If you have any questions or comments, they may be addressed to the Chairman or any member of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure Policy

J. W. Huffman, Chairman
E. M. Coulter, Ex officio
C. E. Hood
S. S. Melsheimer
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2. Appointments for Which Tenure is Attainable

Faculty with the rank of Assistant Professor or higher and professional librarians are eligible for tenure. Instructors not promoted by the end of their fourth year of service shall receive a terminating appointment of one year.

3. Conditions and Requirements Pertaining to Tenure

Beginning with the rank of full-time Instructor or a higher rank, the probationary period for a faculty member shall not exceed seven (7) years; included within this period is the faculty member's full-time tenured or tenure-track service at other institutions of higher learning. This condition, however, is subject to the provision that, in the case of individuals with more than three (3) years of prior tenured or tenure-track service at another institution(s), a probationary period of up to four (4) years may be mutually agreed to in writing at the time of the initial Clemson appointment, even though the individual's total period of probationary service is thus extended beyond seven years.

All faculty appointments are made on a year-to-year probationary basis until tenure is granted. Each appointment renewal and all grants of tenure (including appointment with immediate tenure) shall be subject to peer review of the individual's qualifications by the affected department, as described under "Procedures for Appointments and Promotions." All grants of tenure are to be approved by the President and tenure notification is to be made in writing according to procedures developed by the President.

Normally the decision to grant tenure will be made during the penultimate year of the probationary period to become effective at the beginning of the next year. In exceptional cases, tenure may be granted earlier, but not to individuals with less than four (4) years of probationary service. Should notice of denial of tenure not be given in advance of the expiration of the final probationary appointment (as provided under "Schedule for Notification of Status"), tenure will become automatic at the end of the probationary period.
Leave time taken which benefits the institution as well as the faculty member may count as probationary period service. Terms of service beginning in a spring semester will be counted as though beginning in the preceding fall semester. Terms beginning later in the academic year will be counted as beginning in the subsequent fall semester. Time spent as Lecturers, Research Associates, visiting or adjunct faculty, or other non-tenure-track positions shall not count toward tenure.
Proposed Revision to Faculty Manual, page 48

Procedures for Appointments and Promotions

Since the faculty of a department or equivalent academic unit are the primary judges of the qualifications of its members, there must be peer evaluation in all recommendations for renewal of appointment, tenure, and promotion. All such recommendations regarding any individual holding faculty rank in a department shall therefore originate with the faculty of that department, including immediate tenure in new appointments. Different departments may establish structures of differing degrees of formality in order to facilitate peer evaluation. Procedures for departmental peer evaluation shall be put in writing and made available to the faculty, the Department Head, the Dean of the College, and the Provost. To the maximum extent possible, the procedures following and criteria used should be explicit and documentation should be comprehensive.

The Department Head shall ensure that any faculty member eligible for renewal of appointment, tenure, or promotion is given an opportunity to be reviewed. The Department Head shall forward the evaluation and recommendation resulting from the departmental peer evaluation process to the Dean of the College. The Department Head shall also make a recommendation to the Dean as to the disposition of the case, and shall communicate this to the faculty members involved in the peer review process. The Department Head shall also inform the affected faculty member of the results of the peer review and of his or her recommendation.

The Dean of the College shall make his or her recommendation to the Provost based on a review of the departmental recommendations and of the candidate's qualifications and shall forward the complete file to the Provost. A college may establish a structure to assist the Dean in this review.

In the case of proposed new appointments of tenure-track faculty, a search committee will be selected and the Department Head will ensure that there is adherence
to all affirmative action guidelines. The credentials of all applicants shall be made available to all of the tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the department, and information and recommendations will be solicited from the faculty as a whole in making the selection. Recommendations by the Department Head to the Dean will specify the nature and extent of faculty participation in the selection process. It will also indicate the degree of support of the faculty for the recommended candidate, and for his or her recommended rank and tenure status.
November 13, 1980

President's Report

1. At the October 23 Cabinet meeting, the Cabinet approved the following:
   a. A recommendation from the Parking and Traffic Committee that additional bicycle racks be positioned in the vicinity of Daniel Hall and a Student Senate Resolution R-80-81-2 recommending that bicycle racks be positioned under cover in various campus locations.
   b. A recommendation of the Director of Housing that effective July 1, 1981, ownership of dogs and cats in University housing will be denied and the following statement will be included in appropriate housing publications and agreements:

   "Pets—ownership of pets (dogs and cats) is not permitted in University housing."

   c. One of the business items was the consideration of the Faculty Senate resolution on Departmental Governance and Dean Maxwell's proposal on Departmental Administration. Dean Maxwell reported that he was working with the Senate on these proposals and felt that an agreement could be reached. This item was tabled at Dean Maxwell's suggestion.

   d. Awarding the title of Emeritus to classified personnel was discussed. The Board of Trustees has done this in the past. It was pointed out that the title would be descriptive of their service to the University and that commencement and faculty meetings would not be appropriate times for awarding this title. President Atchley requested that Dean Maxwell and I review the present policy statement on Emeritus titles.

   e. A proposal to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees to make an exception to the present Patent Policy was discussed. The present policy provides two avenues for patenting University inventions: (1) Research Corporation and (2) a patent attorney employed by the University. I objected to the proposal on the grounds that it had not been considered by the Patent Committee or the Faculty Senate. I requested that I be given time to bring the matter before the Advisory Committee. I did so and the Advisory Committee had no objections to the exception requested.

2. Senator Quisenberry and I met with Nick Lomax to discuss University faculty housing. The Welfare Committee is working on regulations and policies regarding University faculty housing.
3. At the Council of Deans meeting on November 3, the following was discussed or acted upon:

   a. Curricula items (Attachment A) were approved.

   b. It was reported that President Atchley is considering using the Alumni Visiting Professorship for the Energy Center should it be approved.

   c. Dean Maxwell requested that the Deans review their procedures for reporting their faculty workload to be sure that faculty workloads are accurately reported.

   d. Dean Maxwell requested that faculty curriculum committees be in place and functioning by January 1.

   e. The deans strongly recommended that the Alumni Professorship not be placed on a rotating or visiting basis. (I thought this matter had been resolved in June, however, I had to respond to this earlier and reiterate our position.)

   f. Dean Maxwell reported that a new scholarship proposal that would include exemption of out-of-state fees is being drafted. This is in response to FS 80-1-1 which is still in the Board of Trustees' Student Affairs Committee.

   g. Dean Maxwell requested that department heads remind faculty to meet all classes, and plan for coverage when absences are necessary.

4. I met with Dean Maxwell and discussed the status of resolutions that have not been acted upon by the administration. With regard to FS-80-4-3 (Resolution on Turn-In of Grade Record Book and Final Examinations for Faculty Leaving Clemson University Employment), Dean Maxwell supports the resolution, however, he does not have sufficient filing space in his office and proposes instead that record books be deposited with the appropriate dean.

5. I represented the Senate at various functions held on November 9-11 for the Board of Visitors.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
C. Stassen Thompson
President, Faculty Senate

CST/dhh
The following items, approved by the Undergraduate Council on October 10 and the Graduate Council on October 3, are recommended for approval:

I. COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

A. Undergraduate Course Changes:
   Change in Credit Hour Distribution:
   ECE 250 Principles of Digital Computer Systems, 3 cr (2,2)

Credit, Title and Number Change:
   ECE 350 Mini-Micro Computer Programming, 3 cr (2,2). Replaces ECE 353.

Prerequisite Changes:
   ECE 351 Real Time Application of Digital Computer, 3 cr (2,2)
   ECE 425 Microcomputers I, 3 cr (2,2)
   ECE 426 Digital Computer Design, 3 cr (3,0)

Title Change:
   ECE 410/H410 Introduction to Digital Control Systems, 3 cr (3,0)

B. Undergraduate Course Deletion:
   ECE 353 Principles of Software Engineering, 2 cr (2,0)

C. New Graduate Course:
   EN 593 Selected Topics in Engineering Mechanics, 1-6 cr (1-6,0)

D. Graduate Course Changes:
   Prerequisite Changes:
   ECE 625 Microcomputers I, 3 cr (2,2)
   ECE 626 Digital Computer Design, 3 cr (3,0)

Title Change:
   ECE 610 Principles of Software Engineering, 2 cr (2,0)

II. COLLEGE OF FOREST AND RECREATION RESOURCES

A. New Undergraduate Course:
   RPA 401 World Geography of Recreation and Parks, 3 cr (3,0).

B. New Graduate Course:
   RPA 601 World Geography of Recreation and Parks, 3 cr (3,0)

III. COLLEGE OF SCIENCES

A. New Undergraduate Courses:
   Bioch 491/H491 Special Problems in Biochemistry, 1-8 cr (0,3-24)
   Micro 417 Molecular Mechanisms of Carcinogenesis and Aging, 3 cr (3,0)

B. Undergraduate Course Changes:
   Title & Number Change:
   MthSc 425/H425 Orthogonal Functions and Boundary Value Problems, 3 cr (3,0)

Description and Prerequisite Changes:
   MthSc 457 Applied Mathematics I, 3 cr (3,0)
   MthSc 460 Introduction to Numerical Analysis I, 3 cr (3,0)

Prerequisite Change:
   MthSc 461 Introduction to Numerical Analysis II, 3 cr (3,0)

C. Undergraduate Course Deletion:
   MthSc 309/H309 Engineering Mathematics II, 3 cr (3,0)

D. New Graduate Course:
   Micro 617 Molecular Mechanisms of Carcinogenesis and Aging, 3 cr (3,0)
E. The Department of Mathematical Sciences recommends the following changes in curricula:

1. The following language requirements for the B.S. and B.A. programs in Mathematical Sciences:
   
   B.S. Program: Replace two semesters of Modern Languages with two semesters of Foreign Languages in the same language. See attached sheets concerning the placement of languages in the B.S. curriculum.

   B.A. Program: Replace three semesters of Modern Languages with three semesters of Foreign Languages in the same language. See attached sheets concerning the placement of languages in the B.A. curriculum.

2. The following change in the Biology Option:

   Replace Bot 441 Plant Ecology with Biological Science Elective to be chosen from Bot 441, Micro 305 (General Microbiology), Bioch 301 (Molecular Biology), Gen 302 (Genetics).

3. Replace the Mathematical Science Minor as described on Page 133 of the 1980/81 Announcements with:

   A minor concentration in Mathematical Sciences requires MthSc 208, 301 and 9 additional credits in mathematical science courses numbered 300 or higher.

Additions to the Council of Deans' Agenda for Monday, November 3, 1980:

COLLEGE OF SCIENCES

D. New Graduate Course:

MthSc 625 Orthogonal Functions and Boundary Value Problems, 3 cr (3,0)

E. Graduate Course Changes:

MthSc 657 Applied Mathematics I, 3 cr (3,0). Prerequisite and description change.

MthSc 660 Introduction to Numerical Analysis I, 3 cr (3,0). Prerequisite and description change.

MthSc 661 Introduction to Numerical Analysis II, 3 cr (3,0). Prerequisite change.
NORMAL MINIMUM TENURE AND NON-TENURE TRACKS

YEAR
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Hired as Associate Professor
Hired as Assistant Professor
Hired as Instructor

NORMAL YEAR OF REVIEW AND DECISION
NORMAL NOTIFICATION YEAR

TENURE
(MAY BE LESS THAN SEVEN YEARS IF PREVIOUS SERVICE WARRANTS)

TENURE
(MAY BE LESS THAN SEVEN YEARS IF PREVIOUS SERVICE WARRANTS)

LECTURER, VISITING PROFESSOR, ADJUNCT PROFESSOR

= TENURE TRACKS
= TERMINATED
= CHANGE OF STATUS
= PROMOTED
I. Call to Order
President Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m.

II. Special Business
Senator Hester moved to take Resolution FS-80-11-1 from the table. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote with no dissent. This opened discussion of the motion already on the floor made by Senator Kline, that Proposed Revisions to Tenure Policy be amended by deleting the second sentence in section two, page one which reads:

"Instructors not promoted by the end of their fourth year of service shall receive a terminating appointment of one year."

Discussion followed which raised the following issues: whether such a deletion would make instructors eligible for tenure or make them no different from visiting instructors; whether all current faculty would remain under the present policy or a new policy; the effects of retaining the statement in the new policy on instructors who wish to remain at this rank and do not want promotion for various reasons. Senators Hester, Ham and Harris all spoke in favor of the amendment stating concerns over narrowing the options for instructors. Senator Harris cited the numerous functions which instructors fulfill on this campus, the effectiveness of many persons with masters degrees, particularly in service courses, and argued that perhaps a short-sighted view exists if such persons are forced to seek promotion or are terminated. Senator Snipes responded that he was prepared to yield to the logical arguments presented. The question was called. The motion to amend passed by voice vote.

A motion was made by Senator Quisenberry, and seconded, to insert the work instructor in place of assistant professor in line one, section two, page one. Lengthy discussion followed regarding the possible ramifications of this amendment. Senator Hester questioned the logic of this change being necessarily required because of the previous amendment. Senators Melsheimer and Huffman pointed out that this change would still fall within AAUP guidelines although it would be a departure from tradition at Clemson and some other institutions. Further, it would require a decision for tenure or termination at the end of seven years. Several senators questioned the amendment on the basis of previous arguments that many instructors at Clemson perform jobs with substantially different duties than faculty at other ranks and therefore ought not to be considered for traditional academic tenure. While there was disagreement on this issue, Senator Senter reported that he had been approached by four instructors who stated they preferred not to be considered for tenure. Senator Hester provided an example in the field of engineering of the need for persons to teach graphics. Often these persons are retired from a company, teach only graphics, but fulfill a specific need which otherwise might not be met. After inconclusive discussion regarding definition of the word "instructor" the question was called and the motion was defeated by hand-count vote.
Senator Melsheimer moved to amend section three, paragraph one, by inserting Assistant Professor in the place of Instructor. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote with no dissent.

A motion was made by Senator Ham to amend section three, paragraph one, by adding the following to sentence one:

"... up to two years of satisfactory service at the rank of Instructor at Clemson may be included toward this probationary period."

During discussion, Senator Ham and Senator Gray, who seconded it, both agreed to accept deletion of the words "at Clemson" as a friendly amendment. Conflicting arguments were presented and the motion failed.

Senator Howard moved to amend the original document by adding a footnote to the title of section three, as follows:

*Faculty whose contracts were in force prior to (date will be inserted on adoption) may choose to remain under the Tenure Policy in force at the time they were hired.

The motion was seconded by Senator Senter. Senator Huffman expressed willingness to accept this as a friendly amendment. It was remarked by Senator Baron that Provost Maxwell has already indicated this situation described in the motion would prevail. Senator Miller responded, "Provosts come and Provosts go." Senator Howard offered that his intent was to clarify the issue in writing. The question was called with no dissent, the motion was voted upon and passed.

A motion was made by Senator Howard, seconded and failed following conflicting debate, to amend section three, paragraph one, line four by adding:

"... or work experience in the area of expertise for which he or she was hired."

A motion by Senator Ham to change section three, paragraph one, line seven, to read "... from two to seven years...", died for lack of a second.

With the argument of lightening the load for review, Senator Howard moved the substitution of the following statement for sentence one of section three, paragraph two:

"All faculty appointments are made on a three-year probationary basis until tenure is granted."

The motion was seconded. Discussion pointed out that annual review already occurs; the only difference in the proposed revision is the emphasis placed on peer review. Senator Foltz questioned whether three-year contracts could be offered, given fiscal limitations. The need for review annually of any new faculty member was argued by Senator Huffman, in that a faculty member could prove to be unsatisfactory. The question was called; the motion was defeated.

Senator Hester made and subsequently withdrew a motion to delete the parenthetical phrase (including appointment with immediate tenure) from section three, paragraph two, sentence two.
A motion to alter the order of paragraphs one and two in section three was made by Senator Bennett, seconded and defeated. A motion by Senator Miller to delete the first sentence of paragraph three was also defeated. Senator Ham's motion to amend paragraph three, sentence two by deleting at Clemson or elsewhere and adding two years of which must be at Clemson was likewise defeated.

A motion by Senator Hester was passed by a hand-count vote of fourteen to ten which called for insertion of the following statement after the second sentence in paragraph three, section three:

"Those persons holding tenure elsewhere may be considered for immediate tenure at Clemson but this procedure shall not be considered as routine."

Senator Howard's motion was successful to table a motion by Senator Miller to amend the document by inserting into paragraph three, section three the following statement:

"Beginning with the fourth year, each probationary faculty member shall be informed annually of his/her tenure decision status and the reasons for that status. If the status is negative he/she will be given a list of suggested activities for altering the status in future years."

With the argument that credit should not be given for something not done, Senator Bennett moved that sentence two, paragraph four of section three be deleted. Senator Melsheimer pointed out that this is already a practice, the purpose of which is to standardize timing for the review process. Senator Baron called the question and the amendment failed. Senator Ham's motion to amend the same sentence to read, "... beginning by the first day of class of the spring semester," was passed after Senator Snipes called the question.

The senators who drafted the document accepted as a friendly amendment the motion by Senator Baron to add the following sentence just prior to the last sentence in the first paragraph of Procedures for Appointments and Promotions:

"Each department's peer evaluation process shall receive written approval by the faculty, Department Head, Dean of the College, and the Provost."

It was moved by Senator Melsheimer, seconded and passed, to include instructors in paragraph four of the previous section three of the document.

A title change to include the term Tenure within the title of Procedures was moved by Senator Miller, and accepted as a friendly amendment.

Senator Howard moved to substitute the following sentence for sentence one, paragraph one, page one of Procedures:

"Since the faculty of a department or equivalent academic unit are cognizant of the performance of its members, peer evaluation should precede all recommendations for renewal of appointment, tenure, and promotion."
At the suggestion of Senator Huffman the word must was accepted as a friendly amendment in place of the word should. Both Senator Huffman and Melsheimer spoke against the motion, the question was called, and the motion failed.

Senator Worm moved to amend paragraph one by adding a sentence which reads, "Immediate tenure for new appointments must be approved by two-thirds of the tenured faculty in that department." Following discussion of the ramifications of such an amendment, the question was called, and the amendment was defeated.

Senator Howard moved to take from the table Senator Miller’s motion to amend section three by adding the statement regarding handling of notification of tenure decision status. There was conflicting discussion as to the need for this. The question was called, and the amendment failed.

The issue of the document in its entirety was then brought before the Senate and the question was called. Resolution FS-80-11-1 passed, as amended, with one dissenting vote. (See attachment A for revised, amended document.)

III. Adjournment

The appropriate motion was made and seconded, and the special meeting was adjourned at 5:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Priscilla M. Kline

Priscilla M. Kline, Secretary
of the Faculty Senate

Senators absent:
B. R. Smith
D. L. Cross (J. Williams, substitute)
E. M. Coulter
C. A. Grubb
J. L. Idol
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12/15/80
RESOLUTION FS 80-11-1

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO TENURE POLICY, ITEMS (2) AND (3),

PAGES 34-35, 1976 FACULTY MANUAL

2. Appointments for Which Tenure is Attainable

Faculty with the rank of Assistant Professor or higher and professional librarians are eligible for tenure.

3. Conditions and Requirements Pertaining to Tenure*

Beginning with the rank of full-time Assistant Professor or a higher rank, the probationary period for a faculty member shall not exceed seven (7) years; included within this period is the faculty member's full-time tenured or tenure-track service at other institutions of higher learning. This condition, however, is subject to the provision that in the case of individuals with more than three (3) years of prior tenured or tenure-track service at another institution(s), a probationary period of up to four (4) years may be mutually agreed to in writing at the time of the initial Clemson appointment, even though the individual's total period of probationary service is thus extended beyond seven years.

All faculty appointments are made on a year-to-year probationary basis until tenure is granted. Each appointment renewal and all grants of tenure (including appointment with immediate tenure) shall be subject to peer review of the individual's qualifications by the affected department, as described under "Procedures for Appointments and Promotions." All grants of tenure are to be approved by the President and tenure notification is to be made in writing according to procedures developed by the President.

*Faculty whose contracts were in force prior to (insert date of adoption), may choose to remain under the Tenure Policy in force at the time they were hired.
Normally the decision to grant tenure will be made during the penultimate year of the probationary period to become effective at the beginning of the next year. In exceptional cases, tenure may be granted earlier, but not to individuals with less than four (4) years of probationary service at Clemson or elsewhere. Those persons holding tenure elsewhere may be considered for immediate tenure at Clemson but this procedure shall not be considered as routine. Should notice of denial of tenure not be given in advance of the expiration of the final probationary appointment (as provided under "Schedule for Notification of Status"), tenure will become automatic at the end of the probationary period.

Leave time taken which benefits the institution as well as the faculty member may count as probationary period service. Terms of service beginning by the first day of class of the spring semester will be counted as though beginning in the preceding fall semester. Terms beginning later in the academic year will be counted as beginning in the subsequent fall semester. Time spent as Instructors, Lecturers, Research Associates, visiting or adjunct faculty, or other non-tenure-track positions shall not count toward tenure.
Procedures for Appointments, Tenure and Promotions

Since the faculty of a department or equivalent academic unit are the primary judges of the qualifications of its members, there must be peer evaluation in all recommendations for renewal of appointment, tenure, and promotion. All such recommendations regarding any individual holding faculty rank in a department shall, therefore, originate with the faculty of that department, including immediate tenure in new appointments. Different departments may establish structures of differing degrees of formality in order to facilitate peer evaluation. Procedures for departmental peer evaluation shall be put in writing and made available to the faculty, the Department Head, the Dean of the College, and the Provost. Each department's peer evaluation process shall receive written approval by the faculty, the Department Head, the Dean of the College, and the Provost. To the maximum extent possible, the procedures followed and criteria used should be explicit and documentation should be comprehensive.

The Department Head shall ensure that any faculty member eligible for renewal of appointment, tenure, or promotion is given an opportunity to be reviewed. The Department Head shall forward the evaluation and recommendation resulting from the departmental peer evaluation process to the Dean of the College. The Department Head shall also make a recommendation to the Dean as to the disposition of the case, and shall communicate this to the faculty members involved in the peer review process. The Department Head shall also inform the affected faculty member of the results of the peer review and of his or her recommendation.
The Dean of the College shall make his or her recommendation to the Provost based on a review of the departmental recommendations and of the candidate's qualifications and shall forward the complete file to the Provost. A college may establish a structure to assist the Dean in this review.

In the case of proposed new appointments of tenure-track faculty, a search committee will be selected and the Department Head will ensure that there is adherence to all affirmative action guidelines. The credentials of all applicants shall be made available to all of the tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the department, and information and recommendations will be solicited from the faculty as a whole in making the selection. Recommendations by the Department Head to the Dean will specify the nature and extent of faculty participation in the selection process. It will also indicate the degree of support of the faculty for the recommended candidate, and for his or her recommended rank and tenure status.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

December 9, 1980

I. Call to Order
President Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes
Minutes of the October 21, 1980 meeting were approved with one change on page one requested by Provost Maxwell.

III. Committee Reports
A. Admissions and Scholarship - No Report.

B. Policy Committee - Senator Rollin
The completed draft of Grievance Procedure II is being typed and should be distributed to senators shortly. It will be brought before the Senate for action at the January 13, 1981 meeting.

C. Research Committee - No Report

D. Welfare Committee - No Report

IV. President's Report
A. The State Budget and Control Board has approved Faculty Grievance Procedure I with one minor exception regarding severance pay. That item was deemed contrary to State law and was deleted. (Senator Miller requested that the Policy Committee look into alternatives to deletion of this item.) A revised version of Grievance Procedure I will be circulated.

B. President Atchley has referred Resolution FS-80-7-1, regarding traffic barricades, to the outside master-planning committee for consideration.

V. New Business
A. Nomination of Persons holding Named Professorships for Membership on the President's Council, 1981.

President Thompson explained the need for nomination and election of one person holding a named professorship to serve on the President's Council which is anticipated to begin operation in January 1981. Two options were discussed: nominating and electing this professor today, or holding nominations today and electing the professor at the January 13, 1981 meeting.

Senator Young moved that the Senate nominate candidates today and hold the election January 13, 1981. The motion was seconded, the question called, and the motion passed by voice vote. The following persons were nominated:
Dr. Ernest M. Lander, Alumni Professor of History

Dr. Malcolm J. Skove, Alumni Professor of Physics and Astronomy

Dr. Roger B. Rollin, William James Lemon Professor of Literature

Professor Douglas W. Bradbury, Alumni Professor of Mechanical Engineering

Dr. Michael A. Taras, Robert A. Bowen Professor of Forestry

Senator Coulter moved the nominations be closed. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote. President Thompson will ask the Advisory Committee to make recommendations regarding election procedures to be followed at the January meeting.

B. Aspects of Governance in Academic Units and their Structure

President Thompson reviewed his statement which was attached to copies of this document which were circulated to all senators December 3, 1980, as follows: "This document represents a compromise version of the Faculty Senate's report on departmental governance, which was not acceptable to Dean Maxwell in all respects, and Dean Maxwell's report on departmental administration. The report was drafted by myself and Chairperson of the Policy Committee Roger Rollin after discussions with Dean Maxwell and his meeting with the Policy Committee. Dean Maxwell has endorsed the report and stated he would recommend its acceptance to President Atchley."

I ask that you consider the report in total and be prepared to either endorse it or reject it. In the event that we endorse it, this will be the report that goes forward to President Atchley."

President Thompson emphasized and reiterated his request that the Senate consider two things: first, the manner in which the document has evolved with considerable collaboration between faculty and administration which differs from the past; and, second, consideration of the document as a whole so that amendments would not require repetition of the negotiation process. He cited the spirit of cooperation under which he and Provost Maxwell had retrieved the original Faculty Senate document on departmental governance from the Cabinet in order to negotiate, and likelihood of the recurrence of this process if the current document is not approved. If it is approved it would next be presented to the Educational Policy Committee.

Senator Quisenberry moved that the Faculty Senate endorse the document. This was seconded. Senator Bennett questioned the clarity of section 2, paragraph 3, composition and membership of standing advisory committees which "shall be approved by the full-time faculty of the department." He reflected concerns of faculty for departments in which department heads suggest names for a committee and faculty already feel intimidated regarding their choices. Senator Rollin indicated that the intent of the document is that the faculty in any department will determine composition and membership of their advisory committee.
President Thompson stated that no difference in viewpoint exists on this issue between the Senate and Provost Maxwell. Senator Coulter offered the opinion that Provost Maxwell would prefer not having to put everything procedural into written form so as to allow for departmental flexibility, but has clearly indicated he will hold deans and department heads accountable, in the overall situation, for example, if faculty input is not obvious in selection of advisory committees.

A point was raised by Senator Worm that the Senate serves as an advisory body, and as such, should give the best advice possible rather than "rubber-stamping" documents prepared by others. Several senators reacted by pointing out that the document under consideration was jointly derived from the best advice of the Senate and the views of administration, and further that it reflects positive interaction between faculty and administration which they view as a definite improvement.

A lengthy discussion followed with opposing views expressed on the need for protection against oppression on the part of faculty by administration versus the need for trust in continued attempts at cooperation. It was Senator Idol's view that the presented document is good but not good enough, contrasting the Senate's earlier document as one which "included our having a say in what happens to us," with the present one which he feels leaves faculty in a dependent position. He made claim that the principle of government behind it portrays a "plantation mentality," is paternalistic and potentially tyrannical, and therefore may not be to faculty advantage. This view received elaboration by Senator Miller who spoke against endorsement of the document by giving the opinion that it is a "hollow shell" which pays lip service to faculty authority on academic matters but actually provides authority only on administrative levels.

Strong opposition to these views was presented by Vice President Coulter who warned against being paralyzed by cynicism and "what ifs," stating that, "our voice will be heard, and it behooves us to act responsibly." He expressed his belief that the earlier document probably asked "too much, too soon," and reminded the Senate that the purposeful vagueness of the document under discussion allows for differences among colleges and departments which can be reflective of their needs. Nothing in the document prohibits any faculty member from initiating anything, while it allows colleges to write their own by-laws which will serve as guidelines for curriculum procedures. Senator Huffman again emphasized the need for openness to a cooperative relationship between faculty and administration, and spoke in support of the document.

Senator Quisenberry called the question. The motion to limit debate passed by voice vote. The motion that the Senate endorse the document, "Aspects of Governance in Academic Units and their Structures" was passed by a hand-count vote of 20-7. (Attachment A)

Senator Melsheimer asked permission to question several minor points of wording. This was responded to by Senator Coulter. Senator Gray questioned whether or not the omission of a Faculty Senate representative to the University Graduate Curriculum Committee was purposeful. It was clarified by President Thompson that after January, policy matters will be covered by the President's Council instead and therefore no Senate
representation is needed on that committee.

C. Resolution FS-80-12-1

Senator Rollin introduced Resolution FS-80-12-1 and spoke on its behalf. The resolution passed by voice vote.

FS-80-12-1: Resolution on the President's Honors Colloquium

WHEREAS, one of the four priorities presented by the Faculty Senate to Dr. Atchley upon his assumption of the University presidency was the improvement of the intellectual and cultural life of Clemson University;

AND WHEREAS the first "President's Honors Colloquium" will bring to campus four outstanding scholars from the National Humanities Center on January 13-14, 1981;

AND WHEREAS said colloquium represents the kind of improvement of Clemson's intellectual and cultural life recommended by the Faculty Senate;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate commends President Atchley, his associates, and the Honors Council for taking this initiative;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate strongly encourage the participation of all members of the University community in the first "President's Honors Colloquium."

Offered by Roger Rollin

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Priscilla M. Kline
Priscilla M. Kline, Secretary
The Faculty Senate

Senators Absent:
D. L. Cross (J. Williams substituting)
C. H. Hood
L. H. Blanton
E. F. Olive
W. Baron
J. C. Hester
J. A. Kimbell
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ASPECTS OF GOVERNANCE IN ACADEMIC
UNITS AND THEIR STRUCTURES

1. The Purview of Department Faculty

The faculty members who comprise an academic department or equivalent academic unit constitute the primary authority on academic matters, for example, the curriculum and the major program. In such academic matters the influence of the department head and of the dean (if the latter happens to be a member of the department) extends only so far as their status as department faculty.

2. Department Meetings and Committees

The department faculty, formally assembled, establishes the will of the department concerning academic matters. Accordingly, the department head shall conduct a formal meeting of the department faculty at least once in each of the long semesters. Minutes of these meetings will be forwarded to the dean of the college or the equivalent administrator.

Department committees shall be established in compliance with the Faculty Manual and the by-laws of the college.

Each department shall have a standing advisory committee chaired by the department head, the composition and membership of which shall be approved by the full-time faculty of the department. Said committee shall advise the department head on matters brought to it by the head. If approved by the department head and the department faculty, other committees and individual faculty may report directly to the Advisory Committee. The advisory committee shall meet regularly with the head
during the long semesters and the department head shall give an account of the committee's deliberations to the department at regular intervals.

If approved by the department head and department faculty, other standing committees may also be established. Said committees shall forward recommendations to the department head and report to the department faculty at regular intervals. Ad hoc and other committees may be established at the discretion of the department head.

Membership on department committees need not be confined to faculty; student representation should be provided for wherever feasible.

3. College Meetings and Committees

At least once during each long semester, there will be a meeting of the faculty of each college. At these meetings, standing and other committees of the college shall report and recommend action to the college faculty. Any member of the college faculty, however, may raise a question concerning academic matters of the college before the faculty. Where immediate action on such a question is deemed inadvisable, the presiding officer, with the concurrence of the faculty, may refer it to the appropriate college committee.

Recommendations of the college faculty shall be forwarded to the appropriate council, committee, or administrative officer of the University. Minutes of college faculty meetings shall be sent to the Provost and to the President of the University.

Among its standing committees, each college shall have an undergraduate curriculum committee. At the discretion of the college faculty and in accordance with its by-laws, a college may also have a graduate curriculum committee, or the undergraduate curriculum committee may be
responsible for both areas. Each department shall elect a representative(s) to the college curriculum committee(s). The college undergraduate (graduate) curriculum committee shall elect a chairperson, who shall also serve as the college representative to the university undergraduate (graduate) curriculum committee. For those colleges that do not choose to have a separate graduate curriculum committee, the college representative to the university graduate curriculum committee shall be a member of the undergraduate curriculum committee elected by its membership.

In those colleges where the numbers of departments are small (e.g., Nursing, Forest and Recreation Resources), the procedures for establishing the membership of the college curriculum committees shall be determined by the college faculty.

The term of service on college curriculum committees and on the university curriculum committee shall be determined by the college faculty and specified in the by-laws. After approval by the faculty of the college, curricular matters shall be forwarded to the appropriate university curriculum committee (see Appendix).

Where it is deemed advisable, a college faculty shall also establish other standing committees, whose composition and membership shall be determined in accordance with the college by-laws. Said committees shall report to the college faculty at regular intervals. Ad hoc and other committees may be established at the discretion of the dean of the college.

Membership on college committees need not be confined to faculty; college by-laws will provide for student representation wherever feasible.

4. Review of Academic Administrators

Administrative officers of the University serve at the pleasure of their respective superiors. Appointments to administrative positions,
accordingly, do not assure continuance in office for any specific period of time.

In the normal performance of their duties, administrators are subject to evaluations of their performance by their superiors. Such evaluations, however, are incomplete when they do not also involve the faculty most affected by the particular administrator. Therefore, to ensure the adequacy of such evaluations, the performances of department heads, deans, and the Provost will be subject to formal reviews at regular intervals.

Before the end of a department head's fifth year in office, the appropriate dean will conduct a formal review of that head's performance. This review will include interviews and/or other forms of consultation by the dean with each tenured and tenure-track faculty member of the department. The dean of the college may request the assistance of the department's advisory committee in conducting the formal review. At the conclusion of the review process, the dean will make a report to the Provost.

Likewise, the Provost will review the performance of deans, consulting department heads and directors as well as faculty where feasible. In turn, the President of the University will review the performance of the Provost, consulting with the academic deans as part of the process.
APPENDIX

University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

The University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall be advisory to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. It will be comprised of a Vice Provost or other member of the Provost's staff designated by him or her as (non-voting) chairperson plus the respective chairpersons of the undergraduate curriculum committees of the several colleges.

This committee will process all requests for undergraduate curricular changes emanating from the several colleges after favorable action by the faculties thereof and will make recommendations concerning them to the Provost. In doing so, the committee will be guided by all applicable University rules and regulations and by the policies established by the President's Council upon the recommendation of the appropriate commission(s) thereof.

The Provost will take recommendations of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to the Council of Academic Deans for their scrutiny and advice. The Provost will then transmit his or her recommendations to the President for final approval and will inform the President's Council, in summary form, of those curricular changes that the President has approved.

University Graduate Curriculum Committee

The Graduate Curriculum Committee shall be advisory to the Provost and shall be comprised of a Vice Provost or other member of the Provost's staff designated by him or her as (non-voting) chairperson, plus the respective chairpersons of the graduate curriculum committees of the several colleges.
This committee shall process all requests for graduate curricular changes emanating from the several colleges after favorable action by the faculties thereof and make recommendations concerning them to the Provost. In doing so, the committee will be guided by all applicable University rules and regulations and by the policies established by the President's Council upon the recommendation of the appropriate commission(s) thereof.

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will take the recommendations of the Graduate Curriculum Committee to the Council of Academic Deans for their scrutiny and advice. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will then transmit his or her recommendations to the President for final approval and will inform the President's Council, in summary form, of those curricular changes that the President has approved.
I. Call to Order
President Stassen Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes
Minutes of the following meetings were approved as written:
- November 18, 1980
- November 25, 1980, Special Meeting
- December 9, 1980

III. Introductions
President Thompson introduced Senator Merrill C. Palmer, of Mathematical Sciences, who is filling the unexpired term of H. F. Senter, and Ms. Allison Webb, an intern in the Public Relations Office and daughter of Senator Webb. He also acknowledged the presence of a photographer who will take pictures during the meeting for 1981 TAPS.

IV. Committee Reports
A. Admissions and Scholarship - Senator Kimbell
The Committee's deliberations and positions are being presented on a continuing basis to the University Committee on Scholastic Regulations.

The Continuing review of scholastic regulations will constitute the agenda of the Committee's next meeting on Monday, January 19, 1981 at 4:00 p.m. in the Dean's Conference Room, Sirrine Hall.

B. Policy Committee - Senator Rollin
The Committee has not met since the last Senate meeting but has conducted follow-up inquiry regarding the exception to Grievance Procedure I dealing with severance pay as requested by Senator Miller at December's meeting. Conference with Legal Counsel Ben Anderson revealed that the item deleted was indeed in violation with Section 8-11-30 of South Carolina Code of Laws and against state statute since 1942. This is apparently the first time anyone has been aware that the current faculty manual has been in violation of the law. Discussion followed.

Senator Miller requested the Policy Committee to investigate a rumor he has heard that the University is considering a change in existing policy by which the half salary not paid to a faculty member on sabbatical is returned to the faculty member's department. Senator Rollin indicated that the Committee will look into the matter.
C. Research Committee - Senator Ham
No report.

D. Welfare Committee - Senator Melsheimer for Senator Quisenberry
Members of the Welfare Committee will meet with Mr. Purvis Collins in Columbia on Thursday, January 22. The meeting, in conjunction with the Welfare Committee of the University of South Carolina, will focus on the State retirement system. Specific questions regarding this should be forwarded to Committee members prior to that date.

A question arose from Senator Baron as to whether the printed brochure regarding the new State deferred compensation plan adequately explains the limits placed on withdrawal of funds when desired. It was suggested that Senator Baron pursue the issue with Mr. Ron Herrin and, if so indicated, report the outcome in the Senate Special.

V. President's Report (Attachment A)

A. President Thompson referred briefly to Item 4 of his printed report, asking that Senators take note of the newly constituted Committee to Revise the Manual for Faculty Members which has culminated from more than a year's efforts.

B. Reminder was made of the Faculty Senate's reception for members of the Board of Trustees to be held Friday, January 16, from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. in the Alumni Center. College Deans have been invited and all spouses are included.

C. Several senators raised questions about the Minutes of the Faculty Workload Committee which appears as addendum A of the President's Report. Among concerns cited were the following items: unclear definition of terms, sponsored versus unsponsored departmental projects; whether research is considered non-teaching if it directly involves students; whether the effort represents a move toward a point system; why the committee consists of four deans and no faculty while its thrust is to define faculty workload; and why such areas as participation in national or regional professional organizations and editorships of journals were not included. After some discussion, during which President Thompson indicated it was his impression that the major purpose of the committee was to attempt to define means for reporting and measuring faculty workload, it was requested by the Senate that further clarification of the entire report as well as the constitution of the committee be sought. A motion by Senator Snipes requesting changes in the list of faculty duties was withdrawn upon this overall conclusion. President Thompson will pursue the issue and report back.

VI. Old Business

A. Election of a Holder of a Named Professorship to the President's Council.
President Thompson apprized the Senate of the Advisory Committee's recommendations for election procedure, that a simple majority vote would be
be required. If, on the first ballot a simple majority is not received by any candidate, a runoff ballot would be taken of the two candidates receiving the most votes, and the majority vote would prevail.

Senator Rollin requested that his name be withdrawn from the ballot because of the fact that he will become a member of the President's Council by virtue of being Chairman of the Senate Policy Committee. The balloting then took place.

Dr. Malcolm J. Skove, Alumni Professor of Physics and Astronomy, was elected to serve on the President's Council by secret ballot from the nominees listed in the December 9, 1980 Faculty Senate Minutes.

B. Election of Representatives to Commissions

The following Senators were unanimously elected to the designated Commissions upon recommendation by the Advisory Committee and motions from the floor to close the nominations:

Commission on Undergraduate Studies: Senator Alan Grubb
Commission on Graduate Studies and Research: Senator Gordon Gray
Commission on Public Programs: Senator Joe Young

The Advisory Committee had recommended nomination of Senators Clay Hipp and Clarence Hood to serve on the Commission on Faculty Affairs. Senator Bill Baron was nominated from the floor. Results of the secret ballot were as follows:

Commission on Faculty Affairs: Senator Clay Hipp
Senator Clarence Hood

The slate of nominees prepared by the Advisory Committee for faculty representatives to be elected by the Senate to serve on the Commission on Student Affairs, and to be from three different colleges consisted of:

Raymond Sawyer College of Liberal Arts
Richard Saunders College of Liberal Arts
T. Virgil Wilson College of Agricultural Sciences
John Fulton College of Sciences
Lawrence W. Gahan College of Forest & Recreation Resources
Gerald L. Waddle College of Industrial Management and Textile Science
Christopher Alley College of Engineering

From the floor Senator Kline nominated Arlene Privette, of the College of Nursing. To acquaint all Senators with the nominees and reasons for their nomination various Senators spoke on behalf of each candidate. Secret ballot election ensued with the following results:

Arlene Privette College of Nursing
John Fulton College of Sciences
Richard Saunders College of Liberal Arts
C. Faculty Grievance Procedure II

Senator Rollin moved that the Faculty Senate form a Committee of the Whole to discuss the document, Faculty Grievance Procedure II. The stipulation was added that the discussion be limited to twenty minutes, the motion seconded and passed, and discussion was led by Senator Rollin. He cited the consultation which preceded the drafting of the document, its emphasis on informal means of resolving grievances while providing formal means if necessary, and pointed out that the document should be mutually beneficial to faculty and administration. It places the burden of handling grievances on the faculty, calling for intervention by administration only in later stages, while at the same time it is of benefit to faculty in that it opens the door for processing legitimate faculty complaints.

As no questions followed, Senator Melsheimer moved to cease the Committee of the Whole and return to business. The motion was seconded and passed. Senator Coulter moved acceptance by the Faculty Senate of Faculty Grievance Procedure II as proposed by the Policy Committee. The motion was seconded, and passed by voice vote with no dissent. (For approved document see Attachment B). Spontaneous applause followed the decision.

VII. Adjournment

The appropriate motion was made, seconded and passed, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Priscilla M. Kline
Priscilla M. Kline, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Senators Absent:
V. L. Quisenberry
H. M. Harris
D. L. Ham
J. E. Schindler
(Senator from College of Nursing - to be elected)
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Enclosures
President's Report

1. I represented the Faculty Senate at a meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The meeting was held in New Orleans on December 10-12.

2. a. At the Council of Deans Meeting on December 9, a number of curricular items which had been approved by the Undergraduate-Graduate Council were considered and approved. A proposal on cross listing courses was referred back to the Undergraduate Council asking for more information.

   b. Minutes of the Faculty Workload Committee were distributed. See Attachment A.

   c. Also discussed at this meeting was a revised approval form for courses. The new form requires signed approval by the respective chairpersons of the department, college, and university curriculum committees.

3. Senator Quisenberry attended the Cabinet Meeting on December 9. At that meeting alumni professorships, Founders Day, and other items were discussed. There were no action items.

4. Dean Maxwell has appointed a committee to revise the Manual for Faculty Members. Committee members are:

   Dr. Michael W. Jutras, Professor of Agronomy and Soils
   Dr. Stephen S. Melsheimer, Professor of Chemical Engineering
   Dr. Holley H. Ulbrich, Professor of Economics
   Dr. Roger B. Rollin, Lemon Professor of Literature (Chairman)

5. Senator Ellen Schultz has resigned from the Faculty Senate. She will be moving to Chicago in the near future.

6. At the Cabinet Meeting on January 7, a number of proposals for the exchange or purchase of Clemson University land were discussed. None of the proposals were acceptable.
7. The Advisory Committee met on January 8 and discussed procedures for the election of Senators and other representatives to the President's Council and its commissions. The member of the Advisory Committee from your college should have contacted you about this election.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Stassen Thompson
President
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY WORKLOAD COMMITTEE

The first meeting of the committee was held December 9, 1980 in E-106 Martin Hall. Present were G. Tanner, H. Vogel, L. Anderson and A. Schwartz. The committee discussed the means to be used in measuring workload, elements to be considered which are common among colleges and non-teaching elements. The Texas method was examined and the formula used by the College of Agricultural Sciences was distributed.

Measurement of workload - All assigned duties will be expressed in credit hour equivalents.

Elements to be considered in load calculation:
- Lecture hours (grad/undergrad)
- Laboratory, studio, etc.
- Graduate thesis supervision
- Graduate committee chairperson/member
- Undergraduate advising
- University committees
- College committees
- Course development/revision
- Multiple section supervision
- Off-campus instruction
- Direction of independent study
- Graduate/undergraduate mixed instruction
- Seminars (equivalent to labs?)
- "Large" sections
- A/V tutorial instruction for credit
- Assigned administrative duties
- Number of preparations
- Faculty Senate

Non-teaching elements
- Sponsored projects
- Unsponsored departmental projects
- Workshops and short courses (continuing education)
- Budgeted extension projects

The next meeting of the committee will be held Monday, December 15 following the Deans' meeting. At the meeting plan to discuss the parameters to be used for each of the workload elements such as:
- Number of students
- Number of sections
- Multipliers
- Credit hour equivalents
- Etc.
Faculty Grievance Procedure II: A Report of the Policy Committee (12/2/80)

The attached document, "Faculty Grievance Procedure II" (FGP II), will be placed on the agenda for the January meeting of the Senate. At that time the Policy Committee will move that the Senate recommend FGP II to the University Administration as policy, for eventual incorporation in the revised Faculty Manual.

Whereas "Faculty Grievance Procedure I" (FGP I--approved at the September 18 meeting of the Senate) covers complaints arising out of the severance of a faculty member's association with the University, FGP II covers complaints arising out of routine University business. Consequently, FGP II is likely to apply to more faculty more often than FGP I. Bearing directly upon FGP I is Title 8, Chapter 17, Section 20, Code of Laws of South Carolina 1976; FGP II, however, is an "in-house" document and it replaces "Employee Grievance Procedure II," promulgated by the University Administration in the Personnel Director's memorandum of June 6, 1979.

Senators will note that FGP II, first of all, encourages faculty and administrators to resolve their differences informally, at the department level or--failing that--at the college level. The expectation is that most conflict situations can be "defused" and resolved "on the scene."

Formal procedures carry complaints into more removed settings. It will be the responsibility of the Senate's Welfare Committee to review complaints which could not be resolved informally and which have been presented to it in writing. If a complaint is deemed to be grievable, it is forwarded to a faculty grievance board appointed for the purpose, which subsequently passes its recommendation along to the Provost for final disposition. None of these procedures involve adversary relationships directly, for to do so would be to put such matters into the arena of civil law.

It will be clear that central to FGP II--and complicating it--is the issue of what shall be grievable. Here competing principles are involved. On the one hand, the Policy Committee deems it entirely appropriate that professional faculty with legitimate grievances be enabled to have those grievances informally--or if need be, formally--aired and redressed. On the other hand, the Committee recognizes that it is important that the business of the University, at all levels, be conducted with a minimum of interruption due to unscheduled re-evaluations and reviews. FGP II is the Policy Committee's attempt to strike a compromise that will accommodate both of these vital principles so far as is reasonably possible.

Please feel free to request clarifications or to register comments with the Committee Chairperson (602 Strode, Ext. 3030) or with any Policy Committee member.

Respectfully submitted,

The Policy Committee

Myra Armistead
Lloyd Blanton
John Dick
John Huffman

Roger Rollin (Chairperson)
Ellen Schultz
David Snipes
Hugh Webb
George Worm
FACULTY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE II

Coverage

Faculty Grievance Procedure II applies to: teaching, research, and extension faculty, professional librarians, academic administrators, and all other persons holding faculty appointments at Clemson University who have grievances that may not be brought under Faculty Grievance Procedure I.

Informal Grievance Procedure

A faculty member with a complaint shall first meet with his or her immediate supervisor for an informal discussion of the problem. This discussion must take place within ninety (90) days of the problem's occurrence. Both shall meet in good faith and shall make every attempt to resolve the problem in an equitable and professional manner. If, however, the problem cannot be resolved at this level, the faculty member shall meet with the dean of his or her college (or administrator at the equivalent level) for an informal discussion. Again, the resolution of the problem in an equitable and professional manner shall be the primary goal of the persons involved.

Formal Grievance Procedure

A. If the problem cannot be resolved informally, the faculty member may file a grievance petition with the Welfare Committee of the Faculty Senate. This must be done in writing and submitted to the chairperson of the Welfare Committee within thirty (30) days of the faculty member's last interview with the dean (or administrator at the equivalent level) regarding the complaint.

B. A grievance petition may be filed under Grievance Procedure II by any individual holding an appointment at Clemson University classifiable under Coverage (above) who has a complaint that may not be brought under Grievance Procedure I.

Complaints which the Welfare Committee may determine to be formally grievable may involve such actions as:

1. the improper or unfair implementation of departmental, college, or university policies or procedures;
2. the improper or unfair application of professional standards or guidelines;
3. the improper or unfair assignment of professional duties;
4. improper or unfair appraisals of faculty performance;
5. the improper or unfair denial of access to departmental, college, or university resources;
6. inequity in the distribution of salary increments.
The Welfare Committee may determine that alleged actions other than those enumerated above are grievable. The person filing the grievance petition must offer substantiation for his or her complaint.

Normally not grievable shall be complaints arising out of the authorized exercise of their judgments and discretionary powers by faculty members and administrators. Thus, the Welfare Committee would not normally consider grievable recommendations concerning nonrenewal of contract and denial of tenure or promotion so long as relevant policies and procedures had been followed. Likewise, the Welfare Committee would not normally consider grievable complaints arising out of minor disagreements concerning numerical ratings on faculty evaluation forms and concerning salary increments (the determination of what constitutes a "minor disagreement" being at the discretion of the Welfare Committee).

C. Upon receipt of a complaint, the chairperson of the Welfare Committee shall call a special meeting of that committee as expeditiously as possible. The sole purpose of that meeting shall be to determine if the complaint is grievable and thus warrants further review. At this point, should the Welfare Committee require more information, the relevant administrator(s) will, so far as possible, assist in securing the cooperation and attendance of knowledgeable parties and make available documents and other information under their control.

D. If the Welfare Committee determines that the complaint does not warrant further review, within ten (10) calendar days of its final meeting the committee chairperson shall so notify the faculty member in writing and the matter will be closed. All records and documents or copies thereof provided by administrators shall remain confidential and shall be returned by the chairperson of the Welfare Committee to their appropriate sources.

E. If the Welfare Committee determines that the complaint warrants review by a grievance board, the chairperson shall forward the grievance petition and all related documentary evidence to the President of the Faculty Senate within ten (10) calendar days of the committee’s final meeting. The President of the Faculty Senate will appoint three (3) faculty members representing colleges or units other than the college or unit in which the grievance arose to a Grievance Board and shall designate one as Chairperson.

F. The Chairperson of the Grievance Board shall take whatever action is necessary to insure an expeditious, orderly, and equitable review of the grievance. The Grievance Board shall allow the parties to the grievance to present separately to it any facts or other information bearing on the grievance. (These parties shall not meet with the Grievance Board at the same time.) Should the Grievance Board require additional information, the relevant administrator(s) will, so far as possible, assist in securing the cooperation and attendance of knowledgeable parties and make available materials under their control. The Grievance Board shall reach its finding and submit its recommendation and appropriate information along with documents and records provided by administrators to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs as soon as possible, but no later than ten (10) calendar days from the date of the Grievance Board's final meeting.
Upon receipt of the Grievance Board's recommendations, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall review the matter, requesting any participant in the grievance process to provide additional information as needed. The Provost shall render a final decision as soon as possible, but no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the receipt of the Grievance Board's recommendations. The decision of the Provost shall be transmitted in writing to the faculty member, the Grievance Board, and other parties directly concerned.

**Protection of Faculty Members and Others Involved in Grievance Procedures**

Each faculty member and any other person involved in grievance procedures shall be free of any or all restraint, interference, coercion, or reprisal on the part of associates or administrators in filing a grievance, in accompanying a faculty member filing a grievance, in appearing before the Welfare Committee and/or a Grievance Board, or in seeking information in accordance with the procedures described herein.

The above principles apply with equal force after a grievance has been resolved.

Should these principles be violated, the faculty member is strongly urged to bring the facts to the attention of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for appropriate remedial action.
February 17, 1981

I. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by Vice President Coulter, presiding in the absence of President Thompson who is attending a department heads' retreat.

II. Introductions
Vice President Coulter acknowledged the presence of Mr. Jack McKenzie, Internal Reporting, and Mr. Richard Brooks, Tiger editor. He introduced Mr. Oscar Lovelace, Student Body President, and Mr. Reid Tribble, Student Senate President, who were present to report at the invitation of the Admissions and Scholarship Committee.

III. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the January 13, 1981 meeting were approved as written.

IV. Committee Reports
A. Admissions and Scholarship - Senator Kimbell
1. Student Senate President Tribble provided background information, and read to the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate Resolution No. R-80-81-103 "Overbooking for Credit Hours" which was passed on February 16, 1981. (See Attachment I)

Student Body President Lovelace spoke to the issue of the withdrawal policy, citing the lack of evidence that shortening the drop period affects the numbers of students dropping courses in any way. He stated that this resolution was developed after discussion among a widely representative group and is viewed as a constructive solution to the problem.

Debate was limited by Vice President Coulter as this information is being provided as part of the Committee Report. Senator Snipes thanked both gentlemen for their presentations.

2. Senator Kimbell further reported on work of this Committee. David Fleming, the academic schedule coordinator, has presented a proposal for a new final examination schedule. The Committee unanimously recommends the proposal to the Senate. (Attachment II)

In its continuing deliberations on scholastic regulations, the Committee recommended with little reservation that the policy on incomplete grades be strengthened considerably.

The current re-examination policy was discussed at length. Committee reservations about a policy allowing no re-examinations whatsoever are to be conveyed to the University Committee on Scholastic Regulations.

The Committee's next meeting will be at 4:00 p.m., February 23rd (Monday) in the Dean's Conference Room, Sirrine Hall.
B. Policy Committee - Senator Rollin

1. In order to examine the Faculty Constitution as part of the revision of the Faculty Manual, the Committee is meeting weekly on Wednesdays at 4:30 p.m. in Room 108 Strode Tower. Other Senators are encouraged to attend and to make recommendations as it has become obvious major changes in the Constitution are necessary.

2. The Policy Committee has proceeded with the request that it investigate practices regarding return to the department of that half of salary not received by a faculty member on sabbatical leave. As no written policy could be found and it appeared that this practice was based on precedent alone, Provost Maxwell was asked about this. His response, in letter form, was read to the Senate and appears as Attachment III.

The Policy Committee concludes that Provost Maxwell's interpretation of policy is within his rights and is reasonable considering current budgetary restraints. It nonetheless recognizes the potential impact on small departments wherein opportunities for faculty development may be forfeited by some in view of the consequences to others in the department.

3. Senator Hester requested that the Policy Committee address the issue of return of faculty from administrative positions to academic professorial duties and specifically how salary adjustments are to be handled when this occurs. He indicated that no provision for this appears in the present Faculty Manual.

C. Research Committee - Senator Ham

1. The committee met with Mr. Stanley G. Nicholas, Director, Office of University Research (OUR), on February 16, 1981, to discuss the reorganization and direction of OUR. For the first time, OUR now has its own budget and three full time staff members: Mr. S. G. Nicholas, Director, Dr. R. W. Henningson, Associate Director; and Mrs. Chris Thurston, Staff Assistant.

OUR is making a very sincere, active effort to improve and expand services to the faculty. A number of projects are in progress or have been completed. Among these are the following:

   a. Faculty research interest inventory forms being developed.
   b. New, more helpful routing forms nearly completed.
   c. Periodic publication of a research newsletter.
   d. Investigation of the feasibility of subscribing to a computerized system providing information on grant availability.

OUR is attempting to identify situations that have served to inhibit a positive research attitude and, hopefully, find solutions for these. Faculty comments and suggestions are solicited.
2. Senator Worm requested that a centralized file be considered which could contain all records of research, grants, publications, so that unnecessary duplication of reports can be avoided. Senator Ham indicated that the new routing forms are designed to assist with this, as well as stating that the OUR budget should facilitate matters.

D. Welfare Committee - Senator Quisenberry

1. A meeting with Mr. Ron Herrin regarding the University life insurance program has taken place. The next meeting with him will be to discuss other types of insurance. The Committee hopes to have a report regarding overall fringe benefits soon. Some discussion occurred regarding possibilities of changes in state payment into the retirement plan. Senator Hester reported that, upon President Atchley's request on behalf of all State College and University Presidents, the Commission on Higher Education passed a resolution requesting objective evaluation by outside parties of the fringe benefits to state college and university employees.

2. It was requested by Senator Hester that the Welfare Committee investigate the distinction between situations when faculty are considered "State employees" and when they are not. He referred specifically to the current appropriation bill which would provide State employees with a salary increment of 7% with possible 3.5% merit increment.

3. Senator Hester also requested the Welfare Committee to evaluate alternatives to the current parking situation which he described as poorly handled.

E. Ad Hoc Committees

1. Senator Young reminded Senators that the preliminary report regarding master planning for the University is now available in the Library. Representatives from Lockwood Greene Architects & Engineers, Inc., and Edward Pinckney Associates, Incorporated, have completed the data gathering phase of their study and would like input from faculty. This was discussed briefly and Vice-President Coulter indicated they would be asked to make a presentation to Faculty Senators at the April meeting.

2. Ad Hoc Committee for the Purpose of Reviewing the Current Policy and Procedures for Selecting and Awarding Honorary Degrees - Senator Young

It was requested that the report read by Senator Young be attached to the minutes and Senators were told this will be brought up for action at the March meeting. (See Attachment IV)

V. President's Report (Attachment V)

A. Vice President Coulter commented briefly on Item 1, matters which were approved by the Board of Trustees at their January 16 meeting and are now policy. He also indicated that the Senate Advisory Committee will meet at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, February 19, in Room 102A Barre Hall for the purpose of preparing the slate of candidates for Senate Officers.
B. Discussion ensued on several items.

1. The point was raised by Senator Baron and clarified that the new policy is in effect and the officers to be elected by the Senate at the March meeting will be President, Vice-President-Elect, and Secretary.

2. Significant discussion again focused on Item 3, regarding faculty workload. Vice President Coulter offered the opinion that the purpose of the reporting system is for internal research regarding the University as a whole, rather than to look at either individuals or departments, and that its thrust will be used to justify to external bodies why specific resources are necessary, e.g., the budget. The consensus was that concern still exists as to the purpose and usage of such detailed information. Senator Palmer pointed out that it appears obvious no faculty will be employed until workloads are justified by department heads. Therefore, it was requested that President Thompson give a more detailed report at the March Senate meeting.

3. Senator Hester expressed concern with implementation of the recommended policy regarding transfer credits, and the amount of responsibility to be vested in the Admissions Office. It was established that the Admissions and Scholarship Committee already plans to consider the matter further.

VI. Old Business

There was no old business.

VII. New Business

A. Resolution FS 81-2-1: Football Stadium Upper Deck Funding

The proposed resolution was read by Vice President Coulter. Senator Melsheimer moved its adoption by the Senate. The motion was seconded. Debate followed. Senator Hester spoke of setting a dangerous precedent: that of requiring that only the users pay for a facility which can be considered to the good of all. He cited the similarity to what could occur with funding of other facilities such as a performing arts center. Various arguments were put forth dealing with this. After establishing that students who want tickets to games can get them, Senator Howard pointed out that student fees are assessed for other facilities including Fike and the Library, which they may or may not use. It was further pointed out by Senator Hester that students are assessed for all activities by their fees and that it is up to the Board of Trustees to determine how this is distributed.

Senator Young moved to table the motion to allow input from the Athletic Council and/or student groups. Senator Miller seconded the motion, which was then defeated by hand count vote of 17-5.

The question was called, and the resolution was passed by a hand count vote of 12-8.
FOOTBALL STADIUM UPPER DECK FUNDING

WHEREAS the expanded seating capacity of the football stadium has primarily benefited non-student attendees, and

WHEREAS students, even if not attending football games, have been assessed fees for upper deck bond service far in excess of that assessed non-student ticket purchasers, be it therefore

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate supports the effort of student leaders to relieve the student body of this inequitable burden, and be it further

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate calls upon the Administration of Clemson University to devise a funding plan for bond service which assesses only students attending football games and at the same rate as any other ticket purchaser.
B. New Tenure Policy

Discussion focused on several questions arising in regard to tenure. Several Senators expressed concerns about procedures to be followed and ramifications of choices made by current faculty as to which tenure policy they would like applied to them.

VIII. Adjournment

The appropriate motion was made, seconded and passed, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Priscilla M. Kline
Secretary of the Faculty Senate
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Senators absent:
J. W. Foltz
J. W. Dick
H. W. Webb
G. W. Gray
E. F. Olive
S. H. Wainscott
H. M. Harris (M. Wise substituting)
"OVERBOOKING FOR CREDIT HOURS"

WHEREAS overbooking for credit hours is a costly practice,

WHEREAS alleviating overbooking would decrease the number of credit hours dropped by students,

WHEREAS 54 (fifty-four) percent of all students taking over nineteen credits drop at least one credit hour,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Clemson University Student Senate in regular session assembled the following:

1) Effective immediately after semester preregistration all students taking twenty or more credit hours must pay a fine of twenty-five dollars per credit hour dropped at the time the drop is processed in the registrar's office.

2) Students with hardship cases shall be able to make an appeal to the Office of the Provost.

Reid W. Tribble
President of the Student Senate

Copies to:
Dr. Bill Atchley
Dean Walter T. Cox
Dean Susan Delony
Dean David Maxwell
Dr. Stassen Thompson

Dr. Alan Grubb
Dr. Jim Kimble
The Tiger
WSBF
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examination Period</th>
<th>Classes Meeting At</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong>&lt;br&gt;December 8&lt;br&gt;8 - 11 AM</td>
<td>2:30TTH, 1:25M 2:30MTWH, MWTWH, MTWHF, TWTHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4 PM</td>
<td>10:10TWF, TF, MTWF, MTTHF 10:10TWH, WF, TWTHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 - 9:30 PM</td>
<td>All sec ACCT 201 and 202 Rooms to be announced by Department. All Monday night classes meeting after 4:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong>&lt;br&gt;December 9&lt;br&gt;8 - 11 AM</td>
<td>2:30MWH, MTWTH, MW, MTWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4 PM</td>
<td>11:15TF, 1:25W 11:15MTWTH, MTWHF, MTWF, WF, TWTHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 - 9:30 PM</td>
<td>4:40MWH, MW, MTWTH, MTWTHF, TWH All Tuesday night classes meeting after 4:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong>&lt;br&gt;December 10&lt;br&gt;8 - 11 AM</td>
<td>8MTWH, MTH, MTWTHF 8MTWHF, MTWTH, TTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4 PM</td>
<td>10:10MWH, 1:25T 10:10MTWTHF, MW, MWTHF, MTWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 - 9:30 PM</td>
<td>All sec Acct 201 and 202 Rooms to be announced by Department. All Wednesday night classes meeting after 4:40 PM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday</strong>&lt;br&gt;December 11&lt;br&gt;8 - 11 AM</td>
<td>12:20TTH, 1:25F 12:20MW, TW, MWF, MTWHF 12:20MTWTHF, MTWH, TF, MTWTHF, MTWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4 PM</td>
<td>11:15MWTH, MW, MTH, MWF, WTH 11:15MTWTHF, MWTHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 - 9:30 PM</td>
<td>3:35TWF, MTWF All Thursday night classes meeting after 4:40 PM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday</strong>&lt;br&gt;December 12&lt;br&gt;8 - 11 AM</td>
<td>8WF, 12:20M 8MWF, MTWF, TWTHF, MWTHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4 PM</td>
<td>9:05TTH, 12:20F 9:05MTWHF, MTWTH, MTH, TWTHF, TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 - 9:30 PM</td>
<td>All sec Acct 201 and 202 Rooms to be announced by Department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examination Period | Classes Meeting at
---|---
Saturday 8 - 11 AM | 3:35 MTH, 12:20 W
December 15 | 3:35 MW, MTWTHF, MTW
1 - 4 PM | 9:05 MWF, 9:05 MTWTHF, WFT, MW, MF, MWTTHF, MTWF
6:30-9:30 PM | All sec Acct 201 and 202

Rooms to be announced by Department.

1. Examinations in laboratory work, if required, will be held at the last meeting of the laboratory class. Examinations in courses which meet one hour theory, or one hour of theory and two or more hours of laboratory, or no theory and two or more hours of laboratory may be given at the last meeting of the lecture or laboratory class, unless otherwise notified, but not during the regularly scheduled exam week.

2. The regular schedule of classes for the semester will continue through Friday, December 5, 1980.

3. All grades for candidates for graduation are due in the Dean's office NO LATER than 10:00 AM on Monday, December 15, 1980.

4. All other grades are due in the Dean's office NO LATER than 10:00 AM Wednesday, December 17, 1980.

5. If there are any discrepancies in the exam schedule notify David B. Fleming as soon as possible.

* A student with three examinations in a row (no break), or two examinations scheduled at the same time, should contact David B. Fleming, E-3A Martin Hall for assistance as soon as possible and NO LATER than November 24, 1980.
January 20, 1981

Dr. Roger B. Rollin
Department of English
602 Strode Tower
Clemson University

Dear Roger:

In response to your second question (re' sabbatical leaves), funds are not automatically returned to a department when a partial or complete vacancy occurs or is anticipated, whether it occurs (or is anticipated to occur) as a result of a sabbatical leave or for any other reason. Because of our pressing needs and tight budgetary constraints we cannot afford any such policy of automatic retention of funds.

Thus, when a sabbatical leave (or any other partial or complete, temporary or permanent vacancy) is anticipated, the department involved must justify the need for a replacement. This need may well exist and may well require a sum larger than 50% of the salary of the professor who plans to take sabbatical leave. In order to meet needs such as this and others we must require that vacancies be filled only when necessary.

So far as I am aware, the principle indicated is consistent with the policy statement in the Manual for Faculty Members. Perhaps the relevant quotation is "Granting of sabbatical leave is directly dependent on work loads, budget restrictions or limitations, and other conditions that might prevail."

A policy of automatic retention of released funds, without regard to work loads, budget restrictions, etc., would appear to me to be contrary to at least the spirit of the quoted statement and would certainly be subject to other criticisms.

Sincerely,

W. David Maxwell
Provost and Vice President
for Academic Affairs
TO : C. Stassen Thompson, President of the Faculty Senate
FROM : J. L. Young; Chairman, R. J. Calhoun, J. C. Hite, W. F. Steirer
DATE : February 2, 1981
SUBJECT: Report of the Faculty Senate, Ad Hoc Committee for the Purpose of Reviewing the Current Policy and Procedures for Selecting and Awarding Honorary Degrees

The Faculty Senate, Ad Hoc Committee for the Purpose of Reviewing the Current Policy and Procedures for Selecting and Awarding Honorary Degrees met on Friday, January 16 at 12 noon in the Saber Room of the Clemson House. Attending the meeting were J. C. Hite, W. F. Steirer and J. L. Young. Absent from the meeting was R. J. Calhoun who had a conflict and could not attend at that time. He had been previously contacted and reported his feelings to the Chairman of the Committee. Also attending this initial meeting was J. V. Reel, Assistant Provost, who was asked to give background material to the Committee on this important subject.

It was the consensus of the meeting that:

1) the awarding of the honorary degrees is a meaningful and supportive activity of any university community,

2) the criteria for awarding degrees must continue to be broad,

3) since it was the prerogative of the faculty to award all degrees, the Committee should be composed of distinguished Clemson faculty.

It was recommended that the wording for the Policy and Procedures for Selecting Honorary Degree Recipients in the Faculty Manual should be rewritten in the following manner:

Honorary degrees will be conferred in recognition of eminent achievement in scholarship and creativity or of high distinction in public service including meritorious contributions to the University. The awarding of honorary degrees will be recommended as a method by which the University expresses its ideals and recognizes exceptional attainments.

Nominations of candidates for honorary degrees may be made by any interested person to the Provost of the University by submitting in written form the accomplishments of the nominee.
A Selection Committee should be established consisting of six professors holding named chairs and elected (or re-elected) by the Faculty Senate. The committee members shall serve for a period of three years in staggered terms. The six committee members will designate their own Chairman and Secretary. The nominations of candidates will be forwarded by the Provost to the Chairman of the Selection Committee. This Committee will meet and consider nominations at appropriate intervals. They will forward the recommendations to the Provost who will in turn submit them to the President. All candidates selected by the Committee will then be submitted to the Board of Trustees with the President's recommendations indicated. The Selection Committee should also be charged to search and seek out appropriate recipients for honorary degrees, gather the appropriate information, and make nominations through the Provost's Office. The final approval of the candidates for honorary degrees will be made by the membership of the University Board of Trustees.

Consideration for awarding of honorary degrees will be limited to occasions of special significance to the University when the awarding would clearly express the ideals of the University or recognize exceptional attainment.

Attached is a copy of the existing policy for selecting honorary degree recipients.

The Committee adjourned instructing the Chairman to write the report of the Committee and transmit it to the Committee members for comments. This was accomplished during the following week and the final report, is respectfully submitted to the President of the Senate.

sde

cc: R. J. Calhoun
    J. C. Hite
    W. F. Steirer
POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING HONORARY DEGREE RECIPIENTS

Honorary degrees will be conferred in recognition of eminent achievement in scholarship or of high distinction in public service. The awarding of honorary degrees will regarded as a method by which the University expresses its ideals and recognizes exceptional attainments.

Nomination of candidates for honorary degrees may be made by any interested person to the President of the University by submitting in written form the accomplishments of the nominee.

A committee is established consisting of the President of the University who shall serve as Chairperson; the President of the Faculty Senate, who shall serve as Secretary; and the two immediate past presidents of the Faculty Senate, currently in the employ of Clemson University. The Committee shall be subject to the call of the President of the University, and shall submit its recommendations for the awarding of honorary degrees to the Board of Trustees for approval. Consideration for the awarding of honorary degrees will be limited to occasions of special significance to the University, when the awarding would clearly express the ideals of the University or recognize exceptional attainment.
President's Report

1. At the Clemson University Board of Trustees meeting on January 16, the following were approved as policy:
   a. Tenure Policy and Policy and Procedures for Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion;
   b. Faculty Grievance Procedures I and Performance Appraisal;
   c. Aspects of Governance in Academic Units and Their Structures.

2. The Advisory Committee met and discussed Senate allocation on Wednesday, February 4. Allocation was supposed to have been done last year but was apparently overlooked. Upon verification of data on faculty numbers the Advisory Committee will meet again on this matter.

3. I discussed the Senate's concern with the Faculty Workload Committee with Dean Maxwell and Dean Schwartz (committee chairperson). I was given assurances again by Dean Maxwell that this is not to be used to determine faculty workloads. He is opposed to any type of point system. It is, instead, to be used only as a means to provide comparable data for his office. He further stated that he will make sure that everyone involved understands that this is for reporting purposes and not for the purpose of assigning duties. Dean Schwartz stated that he welcomed Senate input, and that he would be happy to meet with any of our committees to discuss this work.

4. Elections are scheduled for our March 10 meeting. The Manual for Faculty Members requires that the Advisory Committee serve as a Nominating Committee and is required to bring to the Senate a slate of candidates (at least two nominations for each office). The Advisory Committee will meet on Thursday, February 19, for this purpose. It has been suggested that each college may wish to hold a caucus prior to the meeting of the Advisory Committee.

5. The end of this Senate year is rapidly approaching. Committee chairpersons should be wrapping up any unfinished work.

6. The President's Council met for the first time on Friday, January 30. There were no business items considered. Each commission chairperson reported the functions of their respective commission. A reception was held for Council members following the meeting. The Council will meet the last Friday of each month at 3 p.m.
7. At the Council of Deans meeting on February 2, the Deans recommended approval of:

a. A proposal on evaluation of transfer credits. I had pointed out at the January 19 meeting that the Committee on Academic Regulations was considering this and would make a recommendation. As I understand the present system, this will be referred to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. I have passed the material along to Senator Kimbell for a recommendation from the Admissions and Scholarship Committee since the Senate needs to respond to this proposal. (See Attachment A.)

b. Form letters for reappointment and notification of nonrenewal of contract were discussed as well as deadline dates. (See Attachment B.)

8. Since our last meeting, I have met with the Committee to Revise the Faculty Manual and the Policy Committee to discuss revision of the Manual. I have requested the Policy Committee to look at the Constitution, especially those sections dealing with the Faculty Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Stassen Thompson
President

CST/dh

Attachments
ATTACHMENT A

POLICY APPROVED BY THE ACADEMIC DEANS
2 FEBRUARY 1981
REGARDING EVALUATION OF TRANSFER CREDIT

A. For the annual evaluation of courses for transfer credit to Clemson University.

1. The academic area in which the course would be taught at Clemson University initially determines both whether or not the course is acceptable and the level at which the course will be transferred.

2. Courses in subject matter areas not taught at Clemson University will be evaluated for non-restricted (non-designated, non-approved, non-selected) elective credit by the college in which the student is majoring.

3. No grade or course with a grade below "C" will be transferred unless the collegiate dean and faculty in the area in which the course would be taught determine that the course is part of a sequence and the student made a "D" in the former course and "C" or higher grade(s) in the subsequent course(s) at the school from which the student is transferring. The dean and faculty may either stipulate that the student may receive credit for the course and have the additional hours to take or may have to repeat the work in which the "D" was awarded.

B. Inasmuch as this policy does not require the change of any academic regulation in the catalogue I recommend the following implementation procedure.

1. At this point, the Admissions and Registration office should send to the collegiate deans copies of the evaluation of equivalencies list applicable to courses in their colleges for which credit is sought. The deans shall initial the acceptable equivalencies, add new equivalencies based upon changes in their curricula, and delete equivalencies that are no longer acceptable. Special instructions should be written on sequential courses. Any courses not considered sequential by the deans would not be marked as such. The deans will return the lists by March 31, 1981, to the Admissions and Registration office for use by the evaluators in assigning transfer credit to new students. For those instances not covered by the list the transcript with appropriate catalogue evidence will be sent by the evaluator to the Dean in whose area the course or courses under question would be taught or in the case of "2" above to the Dean in which...
college the student is applying to study. The Dean will
return the evaluated transcript to the Admissions and
Registration office, which will inform the student of the
decisions. The evaluated course will then be entered on
the list.

2. Beginning in the autumn of 1981, the process of re-certifying
the lists will begin at the close of class in the
fall term and the collegiate deans will return the lists
re-approved to the Admissions and Registration office by
the end of January.

/mp
Dear [Name]:

The Manual for Faculty Members (1976) provides on Page 35 that "Except for faculty members who have tenure status, every person with a teaching, research, or extension appointment will be informed each year in writing of his appointment and of all matters relative to his eligibility for the acquisition of tenure."

In accordance with this provision of the Faculty Manual, I am writing to notify you of your reappointment to your position on the Faculty of the College of [Department] for the academic year 1981-82. This reappointment does not imply any commitment to your continued employment after May 1982.

Currently employed faculty members may be considered for tenure under the tenure policy in effect prior to the Board of Trustees action of January 16, 1981 or under the new policy adopted on that date.

Under the old policy a minimum probationary period of four academic years of full-time service at Clemson University is a prerequisite for tenure and the probationary period may not exceed seven years. Under the new policy credit may be given toward the seven-year probationary period for prior full-time tenure-track service at other institutions.

According to the records in my office, your sixth year of eligible service under the old policy is the academic year 1981-1982. Under the new policy, your sixth year of eligible service is the academic year 1982-1983. While it is possible under the old policy to be awarded tenure after as little as four years' service, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will recommend tenure for faculty members who have completed less than six years of eligible service only in exceptional circumstances.

You must choose to be governed either by the old tenure policy or the new tenure policy and your choice, once made, is irrevocable. Please check one of the boxes below and return to the Dean's office not later than five days after receipt of this letter.

Statement

[ ] I choose to be considered for tenure under the new policy.

[ ] I choose to be considered for tenure under the old policy.

(Signature of Faculty Member)

WDM/Im
2/18/81
ATTACHMENT B

SUGGESTED REAPPOINTMENT FORM LETTERS

(Letter for 12-Month Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor)

Dear __________________________:

The Manual for Faculty Members (1976) provides on Page 35 that "Except for faculty members who have tenure status, every person with a teaching, research, or extension appointment will be informed each year in writing of his appointment and of all matters relative to his eligibility for the acquisition of tenure."

In accordance with this provision of the Faculty Manual, I am writing to notify you of your reappointment to your position on the Faculty of the College of __________________ for the fiscal year 1981-82. This reappointment does not imply any commitment to your continued employment after June 1982.

Currently employed faculty members may be considered for tenure under the tenure policy in effect prior to the Board of Trustees action of January 16, 1981 or under the new policy adopted on that date.

Under the old policy a minimum probationary period of four academic years of full-time service at Clemson University is a prerequisite for tenure and the probationary period may not exceed seven years. Under the new policy credit may be given toward the seven-year probationary period for prior full-time tenure-track service at other institutions.

According to the records in my office, your sixth year of eligible service under the old policy is the academic year 198__-198__. Under the new policy, your sixth year of eligible service is the academic year 198__-198__. While it is possible under the old policy to be awarded tenure after as little as four years' service, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will recommend tenure for faculty members who have completed less than six years of eligible service only in exceptional circumstances.

You must choose to be governed either by the old tenure policy or the new tenure policy and your choice, once made, is irrevocable. Please check one of the boxes below and return to the Dean's office not later than five days after receipt of this letter.

Statement

I choose to be considered for tenure under the _____ new _____ old tenure policy.

(Signature of Faculty Member)

WDM/1m
2/18/81
SUGGESTED REAPPOINTMENT FORM LETTERS

(Letter for 9-Month Instructor)

Dear ____________:

The Manual for Faculty Members (1976) provides on Page 35 that "Except for faculty members who have tenure status, every person with a teaching, research, or extension appointment will be informed each year in writing of his appointment and of all matters relative to his eligibility for the acquisition of tenure."

In accordance with this provision of the Faculty Manual, I am writing to notify you of your reappointment to your position on the Faculty of the College of ______________ for the Academic year 1981-82. This reappointment does not imply any commitment to your continued employment after May 1982.

Tenure is not granted at the rank of Instructor.

(Letter for 12-Month Instructor)

Dear ______________:

The Manual for Faculty Members (1976) provides on Page 35 that "Except for faculty members who have tenure status, every person with a teaching, research, or extension appointment will be informed each year in writing of his appointment and of all matters relative to his eligibility for the acquisition of tenure."

In accordance with this provision of the Faculty Manual, I am writing to notify you of your reappointment to your position on the Faculty of the College of ______________ for the Fiscal year 1981-82. This reappointment does not imply any commitment to your continued employment after June 1982.

Tenure is not granted at the rank of Instructor.

WDN/Im
1/29/81
SUGGESTED NOTIFICATION OF NON-RENEWAL OF A CONTRACT

In accordance with the regulations outlined on Page 35 of the Manual for Faculty Members which state, "Regardless of the stated term or other provisions of any appointments, written notice that a non-tenured appointment is not to be renewed will be given to the faculty member in advance of the expiration of his appointment, as follows:

[Insert in the letter whichever is appropriate-- (1), (2), or (3)]

1) Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least 3 months in advance of its termination;

2) not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least 6 months in advance of its termination;

3) at least 12 months before the expiration of an appointment after 2 or more years of service at the institution.

It is my duty to inform you that your contract will not be renewed after ____________________.

WDN/Im
1/29/81
DEADLINE DATES

March 1 Notice of non-renewal of appointment for those faculty serving their first year at Clemson (suggested form letter attached). (Page 35 - 1976 Manual for Faculty Members)

March 15 Notice to non-tenured professors, associate professors, and assistant professors (not in Visiting or Lecturer status) of terms and conditions of their renewal of appointment (suggested form letter attached).

Notice to Instructors - (suggested form letter attached).

April 4 Recommendations for Tenure due in the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The effective date for Tenure is May 16 for all faculty.

May 18 Recommendations for Promotion due in the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. (Page 47 - 1976 Manual for Faculty Members).

WDM/1m
1/29/81
I. Call to Order
President Stassen Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

II. Special Presentation
At the request of President Thompson, Melvin E. Barnette, Vice President for Business and Finance, provided the Senate with information about the current status of the 1981-82 budget. After reviewing the various steps by which the budget proposal was formulated, and additions and cuts made, he summarized by stating that the present proposal approved by the House Ways and Means Committee of 39.7 million dollars is short of the University's current 1980-81 operating budget by 1.9 million dollars for personnel services and is 1.5 million dollars short of 1980-81 funding for public service activities. In the category of personnel services the proposal falls further short of the University's original 1981-82 budget request of 55 million dollars, which was recommended according to formula by the Commission on Higher Education at 47.9 million dollars.

Vice President Barnette explained that the State Senate has yet to make any decisions about the budget, but feels that any accurate predictions are impossible. He reported efforts by Senator Waddell to fight for improved funding to higher education, and efforts of President Atchley to fight to obtain at least the 750,000 dollars estimated necessary to raise faculty salaries to the level of those at the peer institution, the University of South Carolina.

In response to questions from several senators, Vice President Barnette indicated that the 19 million dollars allocated in South Carolina for desegregation of higher education would not necessarily affect the status of the 1981-82 budget for several reasons. First, the funds were allocated over a five-year span. Second, approximately six million dollars of the amount may be generated through bond funds from buildings at South Carolina State College. Third, it would be possible for some monies to be borrowed from the State reserve fund for a purpose such as this.

Asked whether the budget deficit would have to be entirely made up through personnel cuts, Vice President Barnette indicated that some flexibility in this may eventually be allowed as no final decisions have yet been made. He cited the possibility of some cuts in budget for equipment, but indicated that the least likely source for adjusting budget needs would be increasing student fees. To increase student fees would go against President Atchley's commitment not to do so, and would also require approval by the Ways and Means Committee.

In summary, Vice President Barnette made it clear that while the budget situation appears bleak, there is still hope that budget priorities within the State will be reexamined before any final decisions are made.

III. Introductions
President Thompson introduced Senator M. Nicholson, elected to fill the unexpired term of Senator Schultz from the College of Nursing, and Mr. Dana Hanson, newly elected Editor of the Tiger.
IV. Approval of Minutes

It was pointed out that Attachment A to the President's Report of the February 17, 1981 minutes, Policy Approved by the Academic Deans, 2 February 1981, Regarding Evaluation of Transfer Credit, varied slightly from that attached to the President's Report which was distributed at the February 17 meeting. President Thompson assumed responsibility for not having circulated the appropriate copies originally.

The minutes of the February 17, 1981 meeting were then approved with one minor change in wording on page four requested by Senator Hester.

V. Committee Reports

A. Admissions and Scholarship Committee - Senator Kimbell

The Committee met on February 23, 1981 to consider the administration's "Proposed Evaluation of Transfer Credits" and the Student Senate's Resolution #80-81-103, "Overbooking for Credit Hours."

The Committee is in general agreement with items A.1 and A.2., but item A.3 is different than that referred to us originally. The Committee was in original agreement that no grade below "C" can be transferred where the original document was concerned. The University Ad Hoc Committee on Scholastic Regulations is in unanimous agreement with this position.

The Committee also recommends that the wording "in consultation with the appropriate academic areas" be inserted after the word "deans" in the fourth line of paragraph B.1., Attachment A.

The Committee agrees with the Student Senate's position that overbooking is a costly practice and applauds the interest and concern of that body. However, the Committee has grave reservations about fines serving as an economic deterrent to overbooking. The Committee feels in general that the University Ad Hoc Committee on Scholastic Regulations' recommendation which would limit loads to 19 hours, unless department heads approve otherwise, will serve as an adequate deterrent to overbooking.

B. Policy Committee - Senator Rollin

Senators were reminded of the weekly meetings to prepare revision of the Faculty Constitution. The first revision is approximately half done. Upon completion, the document will be thoroughly reviewed in its entirety before being presented to the faculty.

C. Research Committee - Senator Ham

No report.

D. Welfare Committee - Senator Quisenberry

A letter has been sent to the University Traffic and Parking Committee regarding the parking situation. A letter of inquiry has been sent to Provost Maxwell regarding the status of administrators who return to academic professorial rank.

Senator Hester requested that the Welfare Committee look into the procedure used to file for health insurance benefits. The request was based on a letter he received from a faculty member in the College of Engineering. After brief discussion, Senator Quisenberry indicated that more complete information about problems furnished at the time they are referred to the Welfare Committee would aid the Committee in its pursuit of investigation or solutions.
E. Ad Hoc Committee on Consulting - Senator Baron

The Committee, consisting of Senators Baron, Ham and Harris and Professor E. E. Burch, submitted the following report. Two slight changes in wording were made by Senators Baron and Hester and accepted on behalf of the Committee.

The consulting activities of Clemson faculty serve a variety of beneficial purposes for the student body, the University and the faculty. The experience gained in doing consulting reinforces the faculty members' academic experiences and provides one a better understanding of his profession. This experience is brought into the classroom making the students' studies more relevant and more interesting. Consulting also enhances faculty reputation, making Clemson more competitive in obtaining grants. This involvement with the professional community makes those in practice more aware of the University, our mission as an academic institution and our problems. The involvement of faculty with the professional community also enhances the University's reputation, thus affording our graduates better professional opportunities. Close ties with the professional community can also provide "grass roots" support for the academic areas involved as well as the University as a whole in their dealings with the public and the Legislature. Thus, we believe that the faculty at Clemson University should not only be permitted, but in fact encouraged to do consulting work outside the University as they are at essentially all peer group universities.

We are satisfied that the University policy relating to outside consulting as defined in the Faculty Manual is adequate. The existing policy provides both the flexibility and direction needed for each college to establish its own specific rules in regard to consulting.

The Senate is, however, concerned that this policy is not being administered in an even-handed manner throughout the University. We are concerned that the privileges of consulting are not uniformly available to faculty and in some cases faculty are discouraged from doing same.

Therefore, the Faculty Senate hereby goes on record as supporting existing University policy on consulting as defined in the Faculty Manual and the right of each faculty member in every college to be engaged in consulting. We hereby call on the Dean of Academic Affairs to remind the academic deans of said policy.

We further request that the following rules be adopted to clarify the existing administrative policy regarding consulting:

1. All faculty members shall have the privilege of doing consulting work. It shall be understood that a faculty member may use a reasonable amount of University time to do consulting without taking leave time.

2. All faculty members must recognize that his or her responsibilities to the University must come before any outside work. In all cases, classroom teaching obligations must be satisfied before consulting work can be done.
3. In colleges where conflict of interests are of special concern, the Dean of the College and the faculty from within the college shall establish a committee having faculty and administrative representatives. This committee shall establish rules and procedures for determining when a conflict of interest exists.

VI. President's Report

A. President Thompson reported his follow-up discussion with Provost Maxwell on the Committee on Faculty Workloads. He reiterated that the intent was not to define a minimum or standard workload for faculty but was rather for the purpose of providing a better means of accurately measuring faculty workload, i.e., to give credit for duties performed in addition to traditionally measured teaching and sponsored research. This would include such duties as serving on the Faculty Senate, committees, and unsponsored research. The Provost additionally commented that he could not see this being used as part of the evaluation process.

B. In an effort to clarify any misunderstanding about fringe benefits, President Thompson stated that President Atchley had requested a study be conducted of fringe benefits for persons in higher education. The Commission on Higher Education has approved the request, recommended that the study be done, and has forwarded the matter to the Governor.

C. To questions from Senators Baron and Melsheimer about the status of the Faculty Senate resolution on appointment of faculty to search committees, and the status of the Edwards Endowment Fund, President Thompson responded that he had no new information about either subject.

VII. Old Business

A. Report of the Faculty Senate, Ad Hoc Committee for the Purpose of Reviewing the Current Policy and Procedures for Selecting and Awarding Honorary Degrees.

Senator Coulter moved that the Senate go into Executive Session for ten minutes to discuss the committee report. The motion was seconded and passed by hand count. Upon resumption of regular session, it was moved by Senator Coulter and seconded, that the policy recommended by the committee be adopted as written.

Senator Young moved to amend the motion by changing the wording in lines 1-2 of paragraph three to read "...the recommendations on all nominees...." The motion was seconded. Following clarification as to the number of Alumni Professors at Clemson University, Senator Baron moved to amend the amendment to read "... the Alumni Professors...." This motion was seconded and passed.

Senator Baron moved to amend by adding "... and the Committee's recommendation..." in line 11 of paragraph three. This motion was seconded and passed. Senator Young's motion to amend the proposed policy passed as subsequently amended along with necessary word changes to correspond with intent of the amendments.

The revised policy was adopted by voice vote by the Faculty Senate with no dissent, as a change in the Faculty Manual to be submitted to the Board of Trustees at their next meeting. (Attachment A).
VIII. New Business

A. Resolution FS-81-3-1: Passed.
Adoption was moved by Senator Ham and seconded. Following brief
discussion Senator Snipes called the question. The following
resolution passed by voice vote with no dissent.

FACULTY PERSONAL ACTIVITY REPORTING SYSTEM
Whereas the current policy at Clemson University required
that faculty funded from multiple sources sign biweekly
Personnal Activity Reports (CUBO 613), and
Whereas this policy exceeds the requirements of the Federal
Office of Management and Budget, and
Whereas these reports seldom can accurately reflect an honest
and accurate account of faculty activities and may cause
faculty members to perjure themselves, be it therefore
Resolved that the Faculty Senate requests the Administration
to:
(1) Seek immediate release of Clemson University and other
universities from the OMB requirement through petition
of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation and
other methods, and
(2) Immediately alter the personal activity reporting system
of affected faculty to the minimum requirements of OMB,
which is an annual report under the Monitored Workload
System or a semi-annual report under the Personnel
Activity Report System.

B. Resolution FS-81-3-2: Referred to Committee
Senator Worm introduced this resolution dealing with protection
of faculty who participate in promotion and tenure decisions.
Senator Rollin expressed the desire for further study of the
issue with input from legal counsel. It was moved by Senator
Huffman and seconded that the Resolution be referred to the
Welfare Committee for investigation. During discussion, Senator
Howard urged consideration immediately because faculty are already
dealing with the issues involved in promotion and tenure with
peer review and need protection now. Senator Coulter called the
question. The motion to refer the Resolution to the Welfare
Committee passed. (Attachment B).

C. Resolution FS-81-3-3: Passed.
The following resolution was introduced by Senator Coulter,
seconded, and passed by voice vote:
Whereas the Faculty Senate disagrees with the third item of the
Report on the Policy Approved by the Academic Deans, 2 February
1981, Regarding Evaluation of Transfer Credit as relating to the
transfer of grades;
Therefore be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate endorses the
position taken by the Senate Admissions and Scholarship Committee
that no grade below a "C" be transferred from any other institution.
Be it further resolved that the President of the Faculty Senate communicate this to the Undergraduate Commission at his earliest convenience.

D. Resolution FS-81-3-4: Passed.

The following resolution was introduced by Senator Kimbell who moved its adoption. This was seconded. Discussion clarified that the resolution refers only to "additional" summer school offerings. Senator Hester moved to amend the resolution by adding the phrase "...for the current upcoming summer sessions." This was accepted by Senator Kimbell as a friendly amendment to his original motion. The resolution passed as follows:

Whereas, the Clemson student body is desirous of a greater offering of curriculum requirements in summer school; and

Whereas, the Clemson faculty is desirous of a greater summer school offering for economic reasons; and

Whereas, the Clemson physical facilities are not being fully utilized during the summer months,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate of Clemson urges the Provost of Clemson to immediately implement additional summer school offerings on a departmental break-even basis for the current upcoming summer session.

E. Resolution FS-81-3-5: Passed.

Adoption of a resolution urging improved funding of the Library was moved by Senator Idol and seconded. A motion to delete "...the Commission on Higher Education..." as the focus of the request was made by Senator Snipes, seconded and passed.

The amended resolution passed as follows:

Whereas the most vital research facility for both students and the faculty is the Library;

Whereas the Robert Muldrow Cooper Library for several years has not been given the recommended percentage (6%) of the total operating budget for Clemson University;

Whereas holdings in both periodicals and books have rarely kept pace with currently authorized programs of study and research;

Whereas the staff of professional librarians has not been adequately enlarged as the services of the Library have grown;

Whereas both present and future generations of student and faculty will suffer inconveniences in study and research; be it therefore resolved that

(1) The Faculty Senate stands firmly and unanimously behind President Atchley's request for supplemental funding for the Library, and

(2) The Faculty Senate urges the administration to find the means to provide sufficient staffing and holdings to meet the standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries.
F. Resolution FS-81-3-6: Passed.

Senator Baron moved adoption of the following:

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Consulting and that the report be forwarded to the Provost for further action.

The resolution passed. (Report: Item V. E.)

G. Election of Senate Officers for 1981-82

Secret ballot election was conducted for the offices of President and Vice President-President-Elect. The position of Secretary was filled by acclamation. The results were as follows:

President: Senator Steve S. Melsheimer
Vice President-President-Elect: Senator Clarence E. Hood
Secretary: Senator John L. Idol

H. There was clarification regarding policy for election of senators. It was moved by Senator Melsheimer, seconded and passed that those senators elected to fill a vacancy in an unexpired term who serve less than one and one-half years shall be eligible for reelection. Other senators are not eligible to succeed themselves.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Priscilla M. Kline

Priscilla M. Kline, Secretary
The Faculty Senate

Senator Absent: D. P. Miller

PMK/1m

Attachments
Policy and Procedures for Selecting Honorary Degree Recipients

Approved by Faculty Senate 3/10/81

Honorary degrees will be conferred in recognition of eminent achievement in scholarship and creativity or of high distinction in public service including meritorious contributions to the University. The awarding of honorary degrees will be recommended as a method by which the University expresses its ideals and recognizes exceptional attainments.

Nominations of candidates for honorary degrees may be made by any interested person to the Provost of the University by submitting in written form the accomplishments of the nominee.

A Selection Committee should be established consisting of the alumni professors. The Committee members will designate their own Chairman and Secretary. The nominations of candidates will be forwarded by the Provost to the chairman of the Selection Committee. This committee will meet and consider nominations at appropriate intervals. They will forward the recommendations on all nominees to the Provost who will in turn submit them to the President. These recommendations will then be submitted to the Board of Trustees with the President's recommendations and the Committee's recommendations indicated. The Selection Committee should also be charged to search and seek out appropriate recipients for honorary degrees, gather the appropriate information, and make nominations through the Provost's Office. The final approval of the candidates for honorary degrees will be made by the membership of the University Board of Trustees.

Consideration for awarding of honorary degrees will be limited to occasions of special significance to the University when the awarding would clearly express the ideals of the University or recognize exceptional attainment.
Whereas faculty members face greater exposure to litigation because of the increased involvement in tenure and promotion decisions and
Whereas this liability is not covered by current faculty liability insurance policies,
Therefore, be it resolved, that a clear statement of the liability which faculty assume when participating in promotion and tenure decisions be prepared and distributed to all faculty.
Also, be it resolved, that the University seek methods of insuring faculty who participate in promotion and tenure decisions.
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SPECIAL MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

April 1, 1981

Senate Chamber

I. Call to Order

President Stassen Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

II. Old Business

The revised version of Faculty Grievance Procedure II was presented as a report from the Policy Committee by the Chairperson, Senator Rollin, with unanimous endorsement by the Committee. Senator Rollin expressed the Committee's view of the revised proposal as being in accord with the spirit and intent of the original draft of Faculty Grievance Procedure II, and then proceeded to move that the Faculty Senate endorse the revised draft and forward it to the Administration for further action. Senator Coulter seconded the motion.

A number of advantages of the proposal were pointed out by Senator Rollin. These included the fact that the procedure should allow for orderly, expeditious handling of a variety of grievances, that an individual may go directly to the Provost and avoid involving excessive numbers of other people particularly when sensitive issues are being handled, and finally, that one established Grievance Board per year would allow for continuity while eliminating the necessity of setting up a new Board for each complaint as is the current process.

The issue of establishing minority representation on the Grievance Board was raised by Senator Schindler who pointed out that no explicit provision has been made for this in the procedure for election. While grievances actually involving alleged discrimination would be processed under Grievance Procedure I rather than Grievance Procedure II, reasonable representation of minorities on the Board might be difficult to achieve. The consensus during discussion was that the Senate will operate in such a way as to consider this when electing the Grievance Board and alternates. During discussion clarification was offered regarding the types of complaints which would be appropriately grievable under Grievance Procedures I and II. Senators Melsheimer and Rollin indicated that introductory statements to be included in the revised Faculty Manual should help to clarify this for all faculty. In cases where a faculty member is unclear as to which procedure to follow, the Provost will advise the individual or may seek the advice of legal counsel.

Senator Kimbell asked whether the procedure will be reviewed by the University Affirmative Action Officer, to which Senator Rollin replied that matters subject to legal question had been reviewed by Mr. Ben Anderson as an inherent part of the draft process.

Senator Harris sought and was given validation that the alternates would indeed serve as members of the Grievance Board in such cases as one which involved a faculty member from the same department as one of the regular Board members.

The question was called by Senator Wainscott. The motion to limit debate passed. The original motion then passed by voice vote with no dissent.

(Attachment A)
III. Announcements

President Thompson announced that immediately following the April 7 Senate meeting, he will host an informal gathering at Camp Hope for all Senators. He requested that Advisory Committee members contact all newly elected Senators to inform them of the meeting date and to extend the invitation to the gathering to them as well.

IV. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Priscilla M. Kline

Priscilla M. Kline, Secretary of the Faculty Senate
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Senators absent:
J. W. Foltz
J. W. Dick
V. L. Quisenberry
J. N. Williams
J. L. Young
H. W. Webb
L. H. Blanton
W. Baron
J. E. Bennett
G. E. Howard
M. A. Nicholson
D. S. Snipes
J. W. Huffman
D. P. Miller

Enclosure
March 26, 1981

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Faculty Senate
FROM: The Policy Committee
SUBJECT: Attached Report

President Thompson has requested the Policy Committee to present the attached report at the special Senate meeting to be held on Wednesday, April 1, at 3:30 p.m.

The report consists of a revised version of "Faculty Grievance Procedure II" approved by the Senate on 13 January 1981. The revision is the result of discussions by President Thompson with Provost Maxwell, consultations with the chairperson of the Policy Committee, and a review by the Policy Committee. The Policy Committee recommends this revised version of Faculty Grievance Procedure II to the Senate for its approval.
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Attachment
Covered

Faculty Grievance Procedure II applies to teaching, research, and extension faculty, librarians, academic administrators, and all other persons holding faculty appointments at Clemson University who have grievances that may not be brought under Faculty Grievance Procedure I.

Stages of the Grievance Procedure

1. A faculty member with a grievance shall first meet with his or her immediate supervisor for an informal discussion of the problem. This discussion must take place within ninety (90) calendar days of the problem's occurrence. Both shall meet in good faith and shall make every attempt to resolve the problem in an equitable and professional manner.

2. If the problem cannot be resolved at the level of the academic department or its equivalent unit, the faculty member shall meet with the dean of his or her college (or administrator at the equivalent level) for an informal discussion of the problem. The faculty member must request this interview within fifteen (15) calendar days of the discussion of the problem with his or her immediate supervisor. The dean (or administrator at the equivalent level) shall arrange for a meeting with the faculty member within fifteen (15) calendar days upon receiving the interview request. Again, the resolution of the problem in an equitable and professional manner shall be the primary goal of the persons involved.

3. If the problem cannot be resolved at the college level, the faculty member has two options. He or she may petition the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs to review the matter and render a decision regarding it. Alternatively, if the faculty member so requests (or if the Provost, with the faculty member's consent, chooses to do so) the Provost will refer the matter directly to the Grievance Board of the Faculty Senate for its recommendation prior to making the decision. This petition must be in writing and must be received by the Provost within fifteen (15) calendar days of the faculty member's interview with his or her dean regarding the problem.

   a. If the grievance is not considered by the Grievance Board, the Provost shall review the matter and request any persons involved to provide additional information as needed. As soon as possible, but no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the receipt of the petition, the Provost shall render a final decision. That decision shall be transmitted in writing to the petitioner and to other parties immediately concerned in the matter.

   b. If the faculty member requests that the matter be referred to the Grievance Board or if the Provost (with the faculty member's consent) elects to do so on his own volition, the Provost will immediately send the petition to the chairperson of the Grievance Board who shall call a meeting to review the matter as soon as possible, but within no more than thirty (30) calendar days.
The Grievance Board, consisting of three Faculty Senators and two alternates, elected annually by the Senate, and chaired by one of the former appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate, shall initiate an expeditious, orderly, and equitable review of the matter. The Board shall allow the parties to the matter to present separately to it any facts or other information bearing on the matter. (These parties shall not meet with the Board at the same time.) Should the Board require additional information, it shall request such information from the Provost. The Grievance Board shall reach its finding and submit its recommendation to the Provost, along with any appropriate information, documents, and records provided by administrators as soon as possible, but no later than ten (10) calendar days after the Board's final meeting on the matter.

4. Upon receipt of the Grievance Board's recommendations, the Provost shall review the matter, requesting any persons involved in the matter to provide additional information as needed. The Provost shall render a final decision as soon as possible, but no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the receipt of the Grievance Board's recommendation. The decision of the Provost shall be transmitted in writing to the faculty member, the Grievance Board, and other parties directly concerned.

Delineation of Grievable and Nongrievable Matters

Matters which are grievable include such actions as:

1. the improper or unfair (to the complainant) implementation of departmental, college, or university policies or procedures;

2. the improper or unfair (to the complainant) application of professional standards or guidelines;

3. the improper or unfair (to the complainant) assignment of professional duties by an administrator;

4. improper or unfair appraisals (by an administrator) of the complainant's performance;

5. the improper or unfair denial (by an administrator) of the complainant's access to departmental, college, or university resources;

6. inequity in the determination (by an administrator) of the complainant's salary increment.

The Provost in consultation with the Grievance Board may determine that actions other than those enumerated above are grievable. The faculty member filing the petition has the burden of proof in establishing the validity of his or her grievance.
Normally not grievable shall be complaints arising out of the authorized exercise of their judgments and discretionary powers by faculty members and administrators. Thus, not normally grievable would be recommendations concerning nonrenewal of contract and denial of promotion or tenure, so long as the appropriate policies and procedures had been adhered to. Likewise, minor complaints are not normally grievable. The determination of what constitutes a "minor complaint" is at the discretion of the Grievance Board, if the matter is referred to it, or at the discretion of the Provost.

Protection of the Faculty Members and Others Involved in Grievance Procedures

Each faculty member and any other person involved in grievance procedures shall be free of any or all restraint, interference, coercion, or reprisal on the part of associates or administrators in filing a grievance, in accompanying a faculty member filing a grievance, in appearing before the Faculty Senate Grievance Board or the Provost, or in seeking information in accordance with the procedures described herein. These principles apply with equal force after a grievance has been resolved. Should these principles be violated, the faculty member should bring the facts to the attention of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for appropriate remedial action.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

April 7, 1981
Senate Chamber

I. Call to Order

President Stassen Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. Committee Reports

A. Senator Kimbell said that the Admissions and Scholarship Committee had no report to make and added that all charges given to the Committee had been completed.

B. Senator Rollin reported that the revised Faculty Grievance Procedure II had been reviewed and that the Policy Committee was continuing to work on a revised draft of the Faculty Constitution. He expressed thanks to members of the Policy Committee for their hard work and cooperative spirit.

C. Senator Ham said that the Research Committee had no report.

D. Senator Quisenberry, reporting for the Welfare Committee, said that University Legal Counselor Ben Anderson had assured the Welfare Committee that liability insurance was in force to cover decisions by faculty members on questions of tenure and promotion. He next reported that the Welfare Committee had had a joint meeting with the Welfare Committee of the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina. Finally, he reported that the Welfare Committee had met with John Gentry to discuss a proposed amendment to the retirement system policy. (See Attachment A for the full report submitted by Senator Quisenberry.)

E. There were no reports from Ad Hoc Committees or University Councils.

III. Outgoing President's Report

President Thompson, thanking fellow senators for their willingness to work together, said that he especially appreciated the help he had received from Vice President Coulter, who stood in for President Thompson ably and effectively during the latter's illness.

As part of his final report to the Senate, President Thompson distributed a chart and commented on the status of resolutions passed by the Senate during his tenure. (See Attachment B.)

He said that three goals of the Senate had met with different degrees of success. The first, increased faculty participation on the governance of Clemson, had considerable success, the most obvious sign of progress being the establishment of University Councils on all essential matters of interest. The second, improved levels of compensation for faculty, remained the top priority of President Atchley. He noted that current budgetary restrictions would make adequate pay a very difficult matter. The third, improved intellectual and cultural activities for the campus, had gotten off to a good start with the President's Honors Colloquium.

He ended his report by observing that the steps taken by the current Senate to insure faculty governance was a landmark action.
IV. **Incoming President's Report**

Assuming his office, Senator Melsheimer greeted the new senators and yielded the floor to Senator Ham, who reported that a parting gift for Senator Thompson would be presented at a reception later in the day.

President Melsheimer asked members of the Senate to indicate what committee and council assignments they would prefer for the coming session and reported on some of the items covered in a meeting of the Council of Deans: (A) The number of class days in the Spring semester; (B) Summer School enrollment; (C) Statements made concerning cases of faculty members whose contracts are not renewed.

He also distributed a brief written report. (See Attachment C.)

V. **Old Business**

No old business came before the body.

VI. **New Business**

Before the introduction of Faculty Senate Resolution FS 81-4-1, Senator Kimbell moved that the body go into executive session. His motion was seconded and passed.

Senator Ham then moved that the executive session be ended and this motion succeeded. Senator Miller questioned the wording of the proposed resolution. Subsequent discussion and action led to the omission of the third paragraph of the original draft: "And whereas the designation 'Abney Chair of Free Enterprise' implies that Clemson University does take 'an official position on disputed questions of scholarship,' and thus would be in violation of University policy."

Senator Rollin then moved that the amended resolution be accepted by the Senate. Following a brief discussion, the Senate voted to accept the Resolution 15-8. (See Attachment D.)

VII. **Adjournment**

The Senate adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John L. Idol, Jr., Secretary

The Faculty Senate
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Senators Absent:
H. Harris
C. Hood
L. Blanton
E. Olive
1. The Welfare Committee met on April 2 with Mr. Ben Anderson and Mr. John Newton to discuss the issue of faculty liability in cases involving service on promotion and tenure committees.

Mr. Anderson stated that faculty have little to be concerned about in such matters unless someone's Civil Rights have been violated. Courts in the past have chosen not to get involved in purely academic matters. However, the potential for Civil Rights suits always exists. A faculty member should exercise extreme care in making sure he/she has not discriminated against any individual protected by various Civil Rights laws. Mr. Anderson did point out that most law suits are against the University and not against individual faculty members.

The University does have a general tort liability policy which covers employees performing official duties. An attorney can be appointed by the Attorney General to represent a faculty member in any such legal actions.

Faculty who are concerned about liability insurance coverage and related matters are encouraged to contact Mr. Newton to discuss their individual needs.

2. The Welfare committees from Clemson and USC met on Jan. 22, 1981, with Mr. Purvis Collins, Director of the South Carolina Retirement System. A copy of the minutes of that meeting, as taken by a USC faculty member, are attached.

I have sent Mr. Collins a letter in which I thanked him for the meeting. In addition I encouraged him to continue to work to provide members with more updated information about their retirement program.

The Committee also requested that Mr. Collins work to develop a plan by which the interest earned by the individual on his contribution (currently 4%) could be tied to the interest earned by the Retirement System on its total investment (currently 8%). We suggested that the rate of interest earned by the individual be set at 1% less than that earned by the System.

3. The Committee met with Mr. John Gentry on March 26 to discuss the "Simpson Amendment". A copy of this Amendment is attached.

Individual faculty members who support this Amendment are encouraged to write their state senators and representatives and express their support.
Minutes of the Faculty Welfare Committee Meeting

January 22, 1981

The Faculty Welfare Committee met jointly with the Faculty Welfare Committee of Clemson University at 2:15 PM on Thursday 22 January 1981 in Room A of the U.S.C. Faculty House. USC Committee members present were Professors Baldwin, Edwards, Freeman, Ingle, McFadden, and Rood. Also in attendance, beginning at 3:00, was Mr. Purvis Collins, Director of the South Carolina Retirement System (SCRS).

The Clemson and USC Committees met jointly for 45 minutes before Mr. Collins' arrival, in order to discuss mutual concerns to be presented to Mr. Collins. The questions brought up when Mr. Collins arrived included the following:

(1) How can we get a better mechanism for reporting to members? In particular Professor Freeman asked Mr. Collins why members were not better informed as to how the SCRS works, including information about what portfolio holdings the system has, how these investments perform, and what the System's expense ratio is in relation to the portfolio holdings.

Mr. Collins replied that all of this information is available to any member upon request, but that, since the SCRS operates out of the State of South Carolina's General Fund, it simply doesn't have enough money to print and distribute copies of its annual financial report to the 800 employers in the System, let alone to the individual members. The report is included, however, in the State Budget and Control Board's annual report.

As for annual reports to individual members regarding their own status, Mr. Collins told the Committees that the SCRS is presently automating its system in order to update the reporting procedure. Toward this end, there are currently 12 employees who are "plugging in" each member's individual record.

(2) What is the current financial status of the SCRS? Mr. Collins told the Committees that the System's assets currently stand at $2 billion, and that the net return for the last fiscal year was 8%. 
(3) Is a 4% dividend to members who withdraw their holdings actually realistic in light of this 8% return? Mr. Collins said that the SCRS does not invest its own money; this is left up to the State Treasurer, who is, in turn, restricted by law to investing these monies in either rated corporate bonds or government-guaranteed securities. As a result of this separation, the performance of the SCRS portfolio is not directly related to member benefits.

As for the specific interest rate of 4%, Mr. Collins reminded those present that "the SCRS does not exist for the purpose of paying competitive interest rates to employees who leave the system." He also reminded them that the state legislature and State Budget and Control Board were charged with the responsibility of setting these interest rates, having paid none at all up until 1969, at which time the rate was 2%. (The present 4% rate began in 1973 or 1974.)

(4) If the investments are so restricted, why then were bonds initially floated to start up the retirement system in 1945? Mr. Collins replied that none had been, to his knowledge. Instead, the SCRS simply started off with a debt incurred by benefits paid to all employees at that time. That debt was amortized, and the actuaries - using the present benefit structure and a 7% assumed interest rate and a 6% salary-increase rate - predict that this initial debt will be cleared in 26 years. However, Mr. Collins also pointed out that currently .3% of the System's total investments are in old municipal bonds. The SCRS is no longer investing in these, though.

(5) As a rule university professors traditionally move from one institution to another; therefore why can't we have a more portable retirement system, so we don't get penalized for leaving this System? Mr. Collins again pointed out that the state legislature was responsible for determining such things. He agreed, though, that the System does not treat non-career employees "fairly"; this is because it is designed for the career employees, instead.

The SCRS, however, is "portable" and flexible for incoming employees: a
new member may pay 10% of his current salary for each year of other service he wants to apply towards S.C. retirement. Also, those who withdraw their benefits when they leave state service and then later return to service may pay that amount plus 4% interest back into the system. These policies actually cost the System.

What was the Simpson Amendment, proposed in the S.C. Legislature, and what is its status? This bill would have provided monthly payments for life to the survivor of a state employee with only 15 years of service. (Currently this benefit is available only to survivors of either 30-year employees or 20-year employees, aged 60 or above.) It is estimated that this proposal would cost $1.8 million the first year alone. The bill did not pass.

While Mr. Purvis indicated that he was receptive to such a plan, that it would cost $1 million plus; and that the legislature was obligated to fund the cost via increased rates if it wanted to offer the benefit.

Could the SCRS, then, not stand such a substantial increase in benefits? Mr. Collins said that the System possibly could stand it, but that it wouldn't be wise in light of the very expensive cost-of-living increases which are compounded annually at the rate of 4%. (If funded actuarially, this would amount to 38% to 40% of the System's total earnings.) Only 5% of payroll goes towards this expense; at the current rate, those monies will be depleted completely by 1992. Instead Mr. Collins said that it is hoped that the mortgage on the system's initial debt (see Question #4, above) will be reduced sufficiently by 1985 so that more money can be re-directed towards these cost-of-living increases.

Of particular interest to university professors is the manner in which the SCRS determines a member's annual salary: if a professor is on a 9-month contract for instance, is his income from teaching at one or both sessions of summer school also figured in? Mr. Collins replied affirmatively that the SCRS always confers with the employer to ascertain such factors in a member's recent history before
determining specific benefit levels. He said summer school income would be included as part of annual salary where there was a history of summer teaching though no binding contract for future teaching existed.

(9) What exactly is the "Systems Update," and could a brief financial statement be included in at least one issue per year? Mr. Collins explained that this is a relatively new SCTS newsletter, published twice a year: once at the end of the legislative session in the summer and again at the beginning of the calendar year. A new issue has just been printed and will be distributed in a week or so to employers, who should, in turn, distribute them to individual members. As far as Mr. Collins knows, there would be no problem with including a financial statement in the next newsletter.
A BILL


Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina:

SECTION 1. Section 9-1-1660 of the 1976 Code, as last amended by Section 33, Part II, of Act 614 of 1978, is further amended by adding:

"(3) The person nominated by a member to receive the full amount of his accumulated contributions in the event of his death before retirement may, if the member dies in service after the accumulation of fifteen years of creditable service, elect to receive in lieu of such accumulated contributions an allowance for life in the same amount as if the deceased member had retired at the time of his death and had named such person as beneficiary under an election of Option 2 of Section 9-1-1620. In the event the surviving designated beneficiary elects to receive an allowance for life under this subsection, the beneficiary shall become ineligible to be paid a preretirement death benefit under Section 9-1-1770. The administration of the Retirement System may transfer from the Group Life Insurance Account to the Retirement System..."
System Account a sum equivalent to the amount forfeited under the preretirement death benefit program by the selection of a survivor allowance."

SECTION 2. Section 9-9-100 of the 1976 Code, as last amended by Section 33, Part II, of Act 614 of 1978, is further amended by adding:

"(5) The person nominated by a member to receive the full amount of his accumulated contributions in the event of his death before retirement may, if the member dies in service after the accumulation of fifteen years of creditable service, elect to receive in lieu of such accumulated contributions an allowance for life in the same amount as if the deceased member had retired at the time of his death and had named such person as beneficiary under an election of Option 1 of Section 9-9-70. In the event the surviving designated beneficiary elects to receive an allowance for life under this subsection, the beneficiary shall become ineligible to be paid a preretirement death benefit under subsection (4) of this section. The administration of the Retirement System may transfer from the Group Life Insurance Account to the Retirement System Account a sum equivalent to the amount forfeited under the preretirement death benefit program by the selection of a survivor allowance."

SECTION 3. Section 9-11-130 of the 1976 Code, as last amended by Section 33, Part II, of Act 614 of 1978, is further amended by adding:

"(4) The person nominated by a member to receive the full
amount of his contributions in the event of his death before
retirement may, if the member dies in service after the accumulation
of fifteen years of creditable service, elect to receive in lieu of
such accumulated contributions an allowance for life in the same
amount as if the deceased member had retired at the time of his
death and had named such person as beneficiary under an election
of Option 1 of Section 9-11-150. In the event the surviving
designated beneficiary elects to receive an allowance for life
under this subsection, the beneficiary shall become ineligible
to be paid a preretirement death benefit under Section 9-1-120.

The administration of the Retirement System may transfer from
the Group Life Insurance Account to the Retirement System Account
a sum equivalent to the amount forfeited under the preretirement
death benefit program by the selection of a survivor allowance."

SECTION 4. This act shall take effect upon approval by the Governor.
### FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

**1980-1981**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>Compromise Version Adopted</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-1-1</td>
<td>Resolution on Abatements of Out-of-State Tuition on Equal Basis to Recipients of Athletic and Academic Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-2-1</td>
<td>Resolution on Summer School Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-2-2</td>
<td>Resolution on Summer School Study Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-2-3</td>
<td>Resolution on Privileges for Retired Clemson Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-4-1</td>
<td>Resolution on Endowed Professorships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-4-3</td>
<td>Resolution on Turn-In of Grade Record Book and Final Examinations for Faculty Leaving Clemson University Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-5-1</td>
<td>Resolution on Graduate Student Dormitory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-7-1</td>
<td>Resolution on Traffic Barricades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-8-1</td>
<td>Resolution on Revision of the Faculty Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-8-3</td>
<td>Resolution on Constitutional Change for Election of Officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-9-1</td>
<td>Resolution on Faculty Grievance Procedure I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-9-2</td>
<td>Resolution on Faculty Evaluation Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-9-3</td>
<td>Resolution on Departmental Governance of Clemson University: A Report of the Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>See 12-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-11-1</td>
<td>Proposed Revisions to Tenure Policy and Procedures for Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-11-2</td>
<td>Resolution on Faculty Participation in the Selection of Academic Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-12-1</td>
<td>Resolution on President's Honors Colloquium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-12-2</td>
<td>Resolution on Endorsement of Aspects of Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-1-1</td>
<td>Faculty Grievance Procedure II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Compromise Version Adopted</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-3-1</td>
<td>Resolution on Faculty Personal Activity Reporting System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-3-3</td>
<td>Resolution on Evaluation of Transfer Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-3-4</td>
<td>Resolution on Implementation of Additional Summer School Offerings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-3-5</td>
<td>Resolution Urging Improved Funding of the Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-3-6</td>
<td>Resolution on Consulting Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-3-7</td>
<td>Resolution on Policy and Procedures for Selecting Honorary Degree Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY SENATE

INCOMING PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. The Faculty Senate Advisory Committee will meet Tuesday, April 14, 1981 at 3:30 p.m. in Room 120, Riggs Hall. The main items of business will be the approval of the 1981-1982 Senate meeting schedule, appointment of the Senate standing committees for 1981-1982, and selection of a slate of nominees for Senate positions on various University Councils, Commissions, and Committees.

2. A list of the various positions on University Councils, Commissions, and Committees to be filled by Senate election at the May meeting will be available today. Please indicate your preference for University committee service, and a second choice, if any. Also, please indicate your order of preference for Senate standing committee service. Turn this information in to me today, if possible, but in no event later than Friday, April 10, 1981.

3. The May Senate meeting is scheduled for May 5, 1981, subject to Advisory Committee approval. A complete schedule will be mailed to you shortly.

4. The Senate roster, including committee assignments, will be mailed out shortly after the Advisory Committee meeting. I would like for all standing committees to schedule a meeting prior to the May Senate meeting, and formulate an agenda of major objectives for the year.

5. Items from Council of Deans Meeting (4/6/81)
   *Went on record as favoring 45 class days per semester.
   *Discussed Instructional Workload Analysis Draft - Dr. Maxwell reiterated that the primary goal is the development of better information for him for use in resource allocation. Place on agenda for continued discussion at next meeting.
   *Summer School - consensus was that pre-registration offered opportunity to add courses or schedules where numbers justified, and that this would be done where possible.
   *Dr. Maxwell advised the Deans that individuals turned down for tenure or promotion could and should be given the reasons for the University action if requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen S. Melsheimer
President
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WHEREAS the Manual for Faculty Members of Clemson University states that "A university is a center of learning...where teacher-scholars gather to seek, teach, and disseminate knowledge for its own sake rather than for any immediate political, social, or economic goal (p.33, emphasis added);

AND WHEREAS the Statement of Purpose of the August, 1971 Clemson University Self-Study Report asserts that:
Clemson University in its institutional role recognizes that free inquiry is essential to intellectual progress, that open competition among a variety of skills and viewpoints is the surest safeguard of truth. The University does not take an official position on disputed questions of scholarship, or political questions, or on matters of public policy (p. 1-5, emphasis added);

AND WHEREAS public statements by University and Abney Foundation officials indicate that the role of the recipient of The Abney Chair of Free Enterprise will be to further certain "political, social, and economic goal(s)," and thus would also be in violation of University policy;

AND WHEREAS the Manual for Faculty Members (p. 33) maintains that "faculty members have academic freedom to pursue knowledge without fear of pressure from sources inside or outside the institution," public statements by University and Foundation officials raise a question as to whether all candidates for The Abney Chair of Free Enterprise and its eventual holder will enjoy such freedom;

AND WHEREAS Clemson University is an institution supported by all the citizens of the state of South Carolina, with varying political, social, and economic views and goals, and thus the designation of a chair at Clemson University to foster one particular view and goal would be contrary to the nature and functions of state-supported institutions of higher learning;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Clemson University Faculty Senate instructs the President of the Faculty Senate to forward this resolution to the President of the University along with a request that President Atchley meet with the President of the Faculty Senate and an ad hoc committee appointed by the latter for the purpose of discussing ways and means of insuring that the Abney Foundation endowment will not compromise—nor appear to compromise—University policy and the nature and functions of Clemson as a state-supported institution.