MINUTES

of the

FACULTY SENATE

of

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

November 1979 through April 1980
1. **Call to Order**
   The meeting was called to order by President Fleming at 3:32 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes**
   The Minutes for October 16, 1979 were approved as written.

3. **Introduction of Special Guests**
   President Fleming introduced the new editor of *The Tiger*, Mr. Charles Bolchoz; Mrs. Beulah Cheney, Editor of University Publications, Professor Wayne Ogle who was substituting for Professor Mazur, and Professor Steirer, former President of the Faculty Senate. President Fleming was asked who would write the new short version of the Faculty Senate Minutes - Mrs. Cheney's office or the Senate Secretary. Dr. Fleming indicated that the effort would be coordinated.

4. **Special Presentation: Ad Hoc Committee to Review the University Council Concept and Proposal - Senator Coulter.**
   Senator Coulter asked for unanimous consent to suspend the rules so that the Senate could hear the committee's report and discuss it thoroughly before taking action under Old Business. He also asked the Senate to go into Executive Session in order to have a free discussion of certain controversial aspects of the proposal, leading to a clear consensus. (The Executive session began at 3:43 p.m. and ended at 4:28 p.m.)

5. **Committee Reports**
   (A) **Admissions and Scholarship Committee: Senator Grubb**
   
   The Admissions and Scholarship Committee met Tuesday, November 6.

   The Committee discussed the recent postponement of the proposed shortening of the drop-period. We were disappointed and displeased to learn of this latest, last-minute postponement of the question. This is an issue on which the Faculty Senate has expressed itself on numerous occasions in the past several years; it is a change which the Undergraduate Council also recently overwhelmingly supported. Moreover, we feel that the Faculty Senate has more than adequately justified the proposed change on solid academic grounds—or would have had the proposal been forwarded, as expected, to the Council of Deans. We therefore direct the President of the Faculty Senate to express to the President of the University and the Vice President for Academic Affairs our displeasure both with the decision to postpone the matter and the fact that it was done without consulting the faculty. We would also say that we do not understand the reason for this postponement, feeling that the matter has been frequently and publicly aired over the past several years and that this matter, a question of ongoing academic standards, need not have been delayed by proposed changes in the University's administrative structure. We also wish to indicate that we intend to pursue a more academically responsible system.
The Committee also agreed to discuss the matter of grade inflation this spring. In the meantime Bob Mazur (Hort.) and Herman Senter (Sciences) are studying the present Grade Distribution Report with a view to making recommendations for its refinement and improvement.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of the admissions policy and proposed changes in it. At this time we have nothing to report, but we will have more definite proposals later, hopefully by January.

The next meeting of the committee will be Tuesday, December 4, at 3:30 p.m. in 411 of Strode Tower. The main item on the agenda will be the admissions policy.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed)
Alan Grubb, Chairman

(B) Policy Committee: Senator West

POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT - November 20

The Faculty Senate Policy Committee met on October 30, 1979. The Committee reviewed the October 16 Faculty Senate Policy Committee Report and the minutes of the October Faculty Senate. In reviewing the Committee Report the following actions were taken:

1. To delete recommendation la thereby retaining the position titles "Adjunct Professor" and "Adjunct Associate Professor."

2. To present to the Faculty Senate a resolution on Adjunct Faculty that addresses the use of other titles to designate "Adjunct Faculty."

3. To develop a resolution on Instructor Tenure that would address recommendations 2a and 2b, and present the resolution to the Faculty Senate at the November meeting.

The Policy Committee received information concerning H-2680, a bill to allow state universities exemptions from the current state laws governing employee evaluation and tenure. The committee reviewed communications from President Atchley's office to other state universities, and to the presiding officer of the South Carolina Senate committee. The committee recommends that the Clemson University Faculty Senate go on record as supporting H-2680, with amendments that would allow ALL faculty of state universities to be exempt from the current law governing state employee tenure.

The committee must point out that in the process of moving from the current law and relevant Attorney General's opinions, to any revision of that law, that there may be faculty that could question if they are not already tenured. How the University is to address that problem is not clear at this time.

Respectfully,

(Signed)
W. E. West, Chairman
Senator West reported that the question of faculty tenure under the recent acts of the legislature with regard to state employees is still unclear.

(C) Research Committee: No Report

(D) Welfare Committee: No Report

(E) Other Ad Hoc Committees:

Ad Hoc Committee on University Research and Research Funding:

The following people have been appointed to serve on this committee:

- R. Abramovitch (Department Head) - Sciences
- J. Bennett - Engineering
- S. Buckner - Education
- D. Ham (Faculty Senate) - F&R
- S. Hays (Department Head) - Agriculture
- P. Kline (Faculty Senate) - Nursing
- A. McCracken - Office of Grants Mgn.
- K. McDowell Chairman - Sciences
- G. Means - Architecture
- W. Owens - Liberal Arts
- P. Woodside - TM & TS

The committee met on Monday, October 29, and prepared a preliminary charge to the committee to be submitted to Dr. Atchley prior to a meeting with him on October 30.

The committee met with President Atchley, Dean Hurst, and Dr. Horace Fleming on October 30 to discuss the charge to the committee. The President expressed support for the committee.

The committee has begun to gather relevant data. In a memorandum dated November 2 the Engineering faculty were asked to respond to Dr. Bennett concerning the preliminary charge. In a memorandum dated November 9 the Sciences faculty were asked to respond to Dr. McDowell. Considerable input from the faculty has been achieved from these requests. On November 13 and 14 the committee chairman and Mr. McCracken attended the grantsmanship conference sponsored by the College of Agriculture. Here again considerable input from the faculty has been achieved.

The committee held a second meeting on November 16. Plans were laid to begin a series of interviews with key administrative personnel.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed)

Keith McDowell, Chairman
Charge to Committee

1. To review the University's organization, procedures and philosophy for the carrying out of academic research.

2. To locate and define problem areas in the university research effort; in particular, such areas as the administration and securing of proposals, grants and contracts, our image at the funding agencies, matching funds, adequacies of support facilities and personnel, maintenance of facilities, the number and quality of graduate students, distribution of faculty effort, evaluation of faculty research efforts, accountability for research effort and money spent, and administrative managerial styles and practices.

3. To develop a comprehensive plan which permits faculty to maximize their research efforts.

Senator McDowell added that there was some confusion about whether the final report from the new committee would go through the Faculty Senate or not. He assured the Senate that they would receive the report. After meeting with President Atchley, Senator McDowell feels that the committee will have real significance. He has met with faculty groups in Agriculture and Engineering and hopes to meet soon with relevant administration officials in order to prepare a better report.

Senator Worm asked if the committee was going to address the role of the Research Council. Senator McDowell answered that they could. They would also address the question of a possible Vice President for Research, which is clouded in vagueness at the present time.

Senator Thompson made a brief report on the faculty-administration trip to Hobcaw Plantation. The highlight seemed to be an arranged meeting between personnel at the Station and the administrators. Most of the issues discussed were unique to the Plantation.

Senator Kimbell reported for the Ad Hoc Committee on Advisement. Their report has been held up by the need to tabulate data from a recent questionnaire. Since the results are now in, a report should be issued by the committee to the Senate by December.

(F) University Councils and Committees:

Senator West reported for the Search Committee on the Selection of a Vice President and Provost. They have had several meetings on nominations; the job description is now available (see attachment A); they have received several nominations and applications already and solicit more; and they have scheduled the deadline for applications to be January 7, 1980 and hope for a recommendation by March.

Senator Rollin urged the Committee to keep the Senate informed as to criteria for selection, job descriptions and method of selection.
Senator West agreed to do so, but noted that agreements have only recently been reached, so there has been little to report on thus far. Senator Worm noted that, for the present, it appeared that the job description is essentially that of the job now done by Dean Hurst plus the added duty of "Acting President" or Provost.

Senator Rollin noted that the job description seemed to be shrouded in the same intentional "creative ambiguity" as that of the proposed University Council. Senator Worm said that as far as he was concerned, the job was simply that of an ordinary Vice President, not a "Senior Vice President." President Fleming cautioned that any senator could talk to the committee, but, at present, it was not a Senate matter. The discussion ended.

Senator Baron reported that the Undergraduate Council had accepted the motion on "Reexamination for Deficient G.P.R." from the Student Senate - (See Attachment B). It was noted that the Council of Deans have also agreed to this by a 5/4 vote.

Senator Howard announced that the Fine Arts Committee will meet on November 29 to discuss future arts programs. Proposed events were solicited from interested parties.

6. President's Report:

President's Report - November 20, 1979

1. On Thursday, November 15, the Cabinet voted to adopt a progressive discipline policy, which will apply to all classified and unclassified employees of the University, excluding faculty. I voted alone against the policy on grounds that its long range consequences for faculty are insufficiently understood.

2. The Vending Machine Committee reports $78,794 available as of June 30, 1979. However, $50,000 of this amount already has been approved for student organizations during 1979-80. Estimated revenue in 1979-80 is in the range of $25-27,000.

3. President Atchley has determined that the surplus funds accumulated through the group life insurance program offered on campus by Prudential Life Insurance Company will be held on account until next year, to provide a cushion against any increases in premiums. A resolution on this matter will be forthcoming during this meeting.

4. The Cabinet has approved establishment of a University Committee on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, to consist of students, staff and faculty. The purposes of the committee will be to "gather information about drinking practices and attitudes on the campus and about existing programs and needs in this area, to disseminate information about alcohol, alcohol use and alcohol misuse and to encourage the University community to focus on the issue of alcohol and to stimulate new education and communication efforts."

5. President Atchley has directed each college to formulate their mission statement and forward it to him for review and consolidation
into a University mission statement. These materials should be forwarded to him within the week.

6. The Advisory Committee met Thursday, November 15.
   a. The Committee heard a presentation by faculty of the Media Center relative to their termination and the discontinuance, as of September 1, 1980, of the entire Media Center staff and facilities.
   b. The Committee voted to recommend that the meeting time December 11 be altered in order to accommodate final examinations ordinarily in progress during the 1-4 p.m. hours. The Committee recommends that the meeting commence at 4:15 p.m. rather than the usual 3:30 p.m. time.
   c. Because the inauguration ceremonies for President Atchley have been scheduled for the week of April 15 (April 15 being our normal meeting date) and because the festivities will commence early in the week, the Committee voted to recommend that we meet on April 8 rather than April 15, at the same time (3:30 p.m.) in the Senate Chambers.

7. Professor Charles Coolidge, Chairman of the University of South Carolina Faculty Senate, has invited Dean Hurst and me to meet with him and the USC Provost in January to discuss mutual interests and concerns of our respective faculties. I will advise you of our specific plans as they develop further.

8. The proposals of the Student Senate and Faculty Senate on "Reexamination for Deficient Grade-Point Ratio" were endorsed by the Council of Deans at their meeting on Monday, November 19.

9. Professor J. E. Clark has been appointed to chair the University Self-Study. Professor F. L. Day will serve as editor and secretary to the Self-Study Committee.

10. I will attend the Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in Atlanta, December 10-12. Vice President Thompson, therefore, will preside at our December 11 meeting of the Senate.

7. Old Business:

Dr. Coulter moved the acceptance of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the new University Governance. The motion was seconded. Dr. Coulter then proposed an additional specific recommendation under title III to wit: "The President of the Faculty Senate and the President of the Student Body should continue to be permanent members of the President's Cabinet whatever new form of governance should emerge." President Fleming expressed support for the amendment. The question was called and the amendment was passed.

Senator Rollin asked about the role of the proposed Council in policy making. The answer was that the description, as yet, is too vague to tell.

Senator Turnipseed moved to delete title I, "Understandings and Impressions." Senator Coulter argued that it was necessary in order to explain the thinking behind the recommendations in Titles II and III. The question was called and the motion was defeated.
Senator Kelly proposed that the first recommendation in Title III be amended by deleting all after "Senate from the Senate ...." and adding, "from faculty nominated by the Senate." She explained that this would enable good people not in the Senate to be selected by the Senate from areas under-represented in the Senate. Senators Snipes and Coulter endorsed the amendment. The question was called and the motion passed.

This led to a confusing attempt to bring Title II in conformity with the preceding amendment. The upshot was an amendment by Senator Worm to Title II changing the description of faculty members of the Council to read "Faculty representatives elected by the Faculty Senate." The question was called and the motion passed.

The motion to approve the committee report as amended (See Attachment C) was called and the motion to adopt the committee report passed.

Senator Baron moved to reconsider Resolution 79-9-2, previously tabled. The motion was defeated.

8. New Business:

Senator Baron introduced Resolution 79-11-1 and moved its adoption:

Faculty Senate Resolution 79-11-1
SUBJECT: Surplus group life insurance funds

Whereas, the Clemson University life insurance group has amassed a surplus of funds;

Whereas, this surplus was created by the policyholders of the insurance program;

Whereas, there has been no contribution of funds to the insurance program by the University;

Whereas, representatives of the group life insurance committee advised faculty and staff that the disposition of surplus funds would be decided upon by the policyholders;

Whereas, the decision as to the handling of said funds reflects not at all on the academic nor administrative responsibilities of the University; and

Whereas, the administration of the University has arbitrarily made the decision to have said surplus funds left on deposit with the Prudential Insurance Company;

Whereas, the fact that the administration made such a decision reflects a lack of respect by the administration as to the ability of the faculty and staff of the University to manage their own affairs; therefore be it

Resolved, that the University administration immediately rescind its order to the University group life insurance committee to leave surplus funds on deposit with the Prudential Insurance Company; and be it further

Resolved, that the University administration immediately order the insurance committee to call a meeting of the policyholders for the explicit purpose of deciding how the surplus funds shall be used.
Senator Baron noted that this decision should rightfully be made by the policyholders. Senator Coulter noted that the policyholders were promised the rights to dividends when they purchased the insurance. Senator Worm moved to delete the last "Whereas clause" of the resolution. Senator Baron defended it on the grounds that President Atchley was fully aware of faculty sentiment when he made his decision, and that he should be reminded that his behavior continues past practices. Senator Turnipseed asked President Fleming for his description of the Cabinet action at issue. President Fleming's response was that the Cabinet probably misunderstood their responsibilities here and that the issue was one of rate stabilization versus dividends. The question on the amendment to strike was called and the amendment was defeated.

Senator Kelly moved to strike the word "continued" in the same clause. The question was called and the motion passed.

The resolution as amended, was then called, and it passed.

Senator Baron then introduced and moved Resolution 79-11-2:

Resolution on Financial Support for Faculty Senate Officers

Whereas, the demands of the office of Faculty Senate President impinge on the time which that individual would usually spend with job-related responsibilities;

Whereas, the time demands of the office of Faculty Senate President are continuous throughout the 12 months of the year;

Whereas, the business of the Faculty Senate often requires secretarial assistance beyond that normally available in the various administrative units of the University;

Whereas, office supplies, copying costs, telephone and travel expenses of the Faculty Senate and its officers are currently provided by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs;

Whereas, the current arrangements for meeting the needs of the Faculty Senate and its officers for secretarial assistance and supplies are generously, though charitably, provided and represent an imposition on the staff time and budget of the Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs, be it therefore

Resolved that designated funds be appropriated in the budget of the Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs for support of

1. Fifty percent of the salary and fringe benefits of the President of the Faculty Senate for the 12 month calendar year.

2. The salary and fringe benefits of a part-time secretary to work exclusively with Faculty Senate business or 50% of the salary and fringe benefits of a full-time secretary, half of whose time would be available for Faculty Senate business be provided. In addition, a separate budget item should be included in the budget of the Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs for use in providing materials, supplies, copying, telephone and travel funds for Faculty Senate officers or their representatives. Be it further
Resolved that a study of the time demands of Faculty Senate Business placed on the Vice President and Secretary be conducted to determine if a reduction in the teaching loads and/or work responsibilities of these individuals is required. In addition, determination of the need for office space for the Faculty Senate officers and/or staff should be made.

Senator Worm asked for an explanation. Senator Baron noted the unpaid summer activities of the President and the need for more help in a growing series of "tasks" being laid on Faculty Senate Presidents. Senator Coulter noted the need for more help for Senate Secretaries. Senator Edie cautioned against creating more bureaucracy. The question was called and the resolution passed.

Senator Bursey introduced and moved the adoption of FS 79-11-3:

Resolution on the Towing of Student Automobiles for Athletic Event Parking

Whereas, attending to the needs of the students living on-campus at Clemson University must include the provision of adequate space for parking personal motor vehicles;

Whereas, the towing of student motor vehicles from parking spaces around Frank Howard Field and Littlejohn Coliseum to provide parking space for non-students attending football and basketball games imposes unwarranted inconvenience, stress and expense on the student, be it therefore

Resolved that the practice of towing student motor vehicles from spaces utilized by non-students attending athletic events cease immediately and alternative parking arrangements for the student living on-campus or the visitor to an athletic event be found.

Senator Bursey noted that, whereas the resolution does not presume to say what should be done, it does call attention to a deplorable situation. Senator Howard noted that students who are forced to move their cars have no legal place to put them and often get tickets for parking where they do. Senator Komo asked if the problem was with commuting or on-campus cars. Senator Bursey said the issue was on-campus cars. Senator Kimbell noted that on-campus parking was an incentive for on-campus living, and it should not be arbitrarily taken away.

Senator Worm suggested that this was essentially a student matter and wondered if the Student Senate shouldn't handle it. Senator Bursey noted the need to show solidarity with the students on this issue. The resolution was called and passed.

President Fleming moved the passage of item 6-B and 6-C in the President's report. The question was called and the items were passed.

Senator West introduced Resolution FS-79-11-4 and moved its adoption:
Resolution:

Whereas, the faculty of Clemson University consists of the President of the University; the deans and directors of the colleges and schools; professional librarians; the teaching, research, and extension faculty with the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor; and

Whereas, there does exist other faculty titles such as Visiting Lecturer, Research Associate, and

Whereas, the variety of titles generates misuse of the various titles, therefore be it

Resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that the University Faculty Manual be rewritten to define faculty positions that are temporary or short term as Lecturer, Research Associate or Visiting with appropriate faculty title.

Senator West noted that if this had been in the Faculty Manual, the Media Center problem now extant would not have happened - a proposition which produced a mixed response. Noting that, in any case, this was the way to get the Faculty Manual rewritten, the question was called and the resolution passed unanimously.

Senator West then introduced and moved the adoption of FS-79-11-5:

Resolution:

Whereas, the Clemson University Faculty Manual does describe the Faculty appointed as Adjunct Faculty, and numerous persons have been appointed Adjunct Faculty, and

Whereas, there does exist confusion among the faculty as to the method of nominating for appointment as Adjunct Faculty, the requirements for appointment to different Adjunct Faculty titles, and the current listing of Adjunct Faculty,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the University develop guidelines for nominations, appointments, and communication procedures concerning Adjunct Faculty appointments; and be it

Further Resolved that the Faculty Senate advise Dean Hurst that the use of the title "Lecturer" not be used as an "Adjunct Faculty" title.

Senator West explained that this would eliminate the confusing use of the term "lecturer." Senator Worm wondered who would define "adjunct faculty." President Fleming noted that the purpose of the resolution was to point out the problem, and the "definers" would be addressed later. The question was called and the resolution passed.

Senator West introduced and moved the adoption of FS-79-11-6:

Whereas the present tenure policy relegates certain individuals to second-class faculty citizenship, for they are "permanent" but non-tenure-track professionals, but they are not "special appointments", and

Whereas the present policy is not in the best interests of individual instructors as it may (and has) served to impede such individuals' professional careers, and
Whereas the present policy is not in the best interests of the University because it allows decision-making to be indefinitely postponed and can encourage the retention of less professionally qualified and successful faculty,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Faculty Manual be amended as follows:

(Page 34, #2) Faculty with the rank of instructor or higher and professional librarians are eligible for tenure.

(Page 35, Section 3) Delete the parenthetical phrase "(including not more than two years spent at the rank of Instructor)" and the phrase (line 5) "and above the rank of Instructor"; and amend the phrase (line 7) from "Assistant Professor or above to read "Instructor or above."

(Page 47) After "Bases for Appointments and Promotions," insert: The faculty ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor and Professional Librarian are regular, full-time appointments, and only appointees to these ranks become eligible for tenure and promotion.

(Page 48) Before "Personnel Evaluation Program" insert: Bases for Special Appointments. Special appointments are made under the following classifications: military personnel, research associates, consultants, lecturers, adjunct professors, visiting professors, and retired faculty reappointed under special conditions. These appointments carry with them the implications of short term associations with the University and of functions more limited than those of regular faculty.

A general and spirited debate ensued, during which the following observations were made:

* Because they can't be promoted to Assistant Professor, some instructors are forever denied tenure.

* Under the resolution, unless a title is "qualified" by such labels as "adjunct", "visiting" or "temporary," any position would now be eligible for tenure consideration.

* The resolution would bring Clemson in line with other major institutions in this regard.

* Temporary people who are presently employed could be harmed by this because it would force their firing rather than admit them to a "tenure-track."

* The issue boils down to deciding whether one commits himself to a job or a career.

* Rank is important.

After that last revelation, the question was called and the resolution was defeated.
9. **Announcements:**

President Fleming announced that printed announcements concerning (1) the plan for the allocation of Peach Bowl tickets, and (2) the University policy on International Education were available for distribution to the Senate.

10. **Adjournment:**

The Senate adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Edwin M. Coulter
Secretary

**Members Absent:**

Gray
Mazur (substitute present)
Burt
Senter

EMC/Im

Enclosures
Job Description
for
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Clemson University

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs is the Vice President and chief academic officer of the University and is responsible to the President for all academic programs and personnel. The Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs:

1. Serves as the Vice President and acts for the President in the absence of the President.

2. Acts as the dean of the faculty and presides over all general faculty meetings.

3. Acts as the administrative representative in dealing with matters affecting and associated with the Faculty Senate and its operations.

4. Serves as the line administrative supervisor for the Academic Deans and, therefore, is responsible for the administration of the entire teaching, research, extension and regulatory programs at the University.

5. Establishes and approves in consultation with academic deans all budgets for the academic operations of the university, approves all faculty positions serving the academic area, promotions, tenure and sabbatical leaves.

6. Represents the University in presenting new programs to the Commission on Higher Education, the State Budget and Control Board and other entities as so designated by the President.

7. Participates in the formulation of University policies and long range planning and carries out those policies applying to the academic area.

8. Chairs the Council of Academic Deans.

9. Serves as a member of the President's Cabinet

10. Recommends to the Educational Council actions approved by the Undergraduate Council, the Graduate Council, and the Council of Academic Deans relative to courses and programs.

12. Serves as ex-officio Secretary of the Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees.

13. Allocates Alumni funds that have been designated for the academic area.


15. Serves as Clemson's representative on the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs for the S. C. Commission on Higher Education.

This job description was developed by the Search Committee for Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Clemson University and approved by Dr. Bill L. Atchley, President of Clemson University on November 9, 1979.
"REEXAMINATION FOR DEFICIENT G.P.R."

WHEREAS, a student has had time throughout previous semesters to bring up his/her GPR,

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

That the Clemson University Student Senate strongly support the Faculty Senate's resolution abolishing the practice of reexamination for deficient grade point ratio (as described in paragraphs 4 through 6 of page 52 of Clemson University Announcements 1979/1980)

JILL ANDERSON  
Student Senate President

Copies to:  
Dr. Bill L. Atchley  
Dean Walter T. Cox  
Dean George E. Coakley  
Dean Susan G. Delony  

The Tiger  
WSBF  
Dr. Horace Fleming  
Dean Victor Hurst  
Dr. Jerome V. Reel
November 21, 1979

Dr. Bill L. Atchley, President
Clemson University
201 Sikes Hall
Campus

Dear President Atchley:

The Faculty Senate is grateful to you for sharing your time with Senators Coulter, Quisenberry and Snipes on the occasion of your discussion with them of the proposed University Council system. After due consideration of their report, the Faculty Senate is pleased to respond to your request of October 12, 1979, for input by making the suggestions contained in the accompanying report.

Sincerely,

Horace W. Fleming, Jr.
President, Faculty Senate

HWFJr/1m
I. Understanding and Impressions

In addition to the information provided in the Presidential memo of October 12, 1979, the Faculty Senate understands:

A. that after the creation of the proposed University Council and its supporting commissions, the normal day-to-day operations of the university among faculty, department heads and deans will remain relatively unchanged;

B. that the University Council will be an advisory council for purposes of campus-community-wide input, that it will not constitute a continuing policy-recommending board, and that it will meet approximately once a month or on the call of the President;

C. that the major locus of new kinds of integrative activity will be in the second-tier Commissions of the Council system, that they will be few in number (4 or 5), and that they will be made up of different mixtures of representatives from relevant interest areas served by them.

D. that the precise nature, role and organizational structure of the Commissions will be determined after the Council has been created; and

E. that some of the administrators on the Council will be ex-officio members who will provide administrative expertise, but who will not have the power to recommend policies.
II. Recommendations

In accordance with the impressions and understandings cited, the Faculty Senate makes the following suggestions as to the make-up of the University Council:

President
Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost)
Vice President for Student Affairs
Vice President for Business and Finance
*Vice President for Development
Dean of Graduate Studies and University Research
*Dean of Admissions and Registration
*Director, University Relations
A Department Head (see Item III)
President of the Faculty Senate
President of the Student Body
President of the Senate
**Dean of A
**Dean of B
**Dean of C
***Faculty representative elected by the Faculty Senate
***Faculty representative elected by the Faculty Senate
***Faculty representative elected by the Faculty Senate
***Faculty representative elected by the Faculty Senate
***Faculty representative elected by the Faculty Senate

*Ex-officio--non-voting member.

**Rotating terms to be decided by the President.

***One-year terms, renewable.
III. Specific Recommendations

In accordance with the structure cited, the Faculty Senate notes the following specific recommendations:

1. All faculty members of the Council should be elected by the Senate from faculty nominated by The Faculty Senate.

2. All faculty members should serve one-year terms, but these terms should be renewable at the convenience of the member and of the Senate.

3. A department head should be included on the Council. He could be appointed by the President for a term defined by the President.

4. The administrators designated by one asterisk (*) should not be in a position to vote on any policy recommendations from the Council.

5. The President of The Faculty Senate and The President of the Student Body should continue to be permanent members of The President’s Cabinet, whatever new form of governance should emerge.
1. **Call to Order**  
The meeting was called to order by Vice President Thompson at 4:18 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes**  
The Minutes for November 20, 1979 were approved as written.

3. **Committee Reports**  
   (A) **Admissions and Scholarship - Senator Grubb**  
   The Committee met Tuesday, December 4, and completed drafting its recommendations of a revision in the University's admissions policy. These recommendations will be presented to the Faculty Senate at its next meeting.

   The next meeting of the committee will be January 8, 1980, in Strode 411 at 3:30 p.m.

   Respectfully submitted,

   (Signed)

   Alan Grubb, Chairman

   (B) **Policy - Senator West - No Report**

   (C) **Research - Senator Smith**  
   Senator Smith noted that his committee was continuing its work on the revision of the University copyright policy. The committee will meet next on Wednesday, January 9, 1980 in the P&AS Building.

   (D) **Welfare - Senator Baron - No Report**

   (E) **Ad Hoc Committees: No Reports**

   (F) **University Committees: No Reports**

4. **President's Report:**  
1. In an effort to finally clarify the issue of disposition of the surplus group life insurance funds, a meeting was held Friday, December 7 in President Atchley's office. Those present were President Atchley, Vice President Barnette, Messrs. Trescott Hinton and Ron Herrin, Dean Sam Willis and me. I will report the outcome to you at our Tuesday meeting.

2. On Monday, December 3, the Educational Council met and considered, among other items, the joint resolution of the Student Senate and Faculty Senate calling for rescission of the regulation on page 52 of the 1979-1980 Undergraduate Announcements which requires re-examinations for graduating seniors with deficient grade-point ratios.
The resolution was tabled after a lively and probing discussion. The Council expressed a desire to have the entire set of scholastic regulations (pages 42-52) reviewed and revised as necessary, encompassing other recommendations which we and others have made on various of these regulations. I voted against tabling the resolution, pointing out that action on these regulations has not been forthcoming on previous occasions when requested by the Faculty Senate. I do believe, however, that such a comprehensive review which takes into account our previous recommendations is the preferable way of proceeding. Dean Hurst will consult with us on alternatives for constituting the review committee.

3. A copy of FS 79-3-11 has been forwarded to Vice President Barnette for comment. The cover letter is appended to this report.

4. On November 28, the Department of University Relations produced the first issue of the Senate Special, a copy of which is appended. Unfortunately, it now appears that, because of limitations on University Relations (loss of some staff through attrition and cessation of CETA funding for other staff) coupled with other higher priority work in progress, the specials which had been planned may not materialize. This first "sample" issue clearly demonstrates the utility of the concept, and I know you share my disappointment over this development. I will speak further with President Atchley about the matter, just as I have spoken with Dean Hurst and Vice President Nicholas. I hope some way can be found to make the necessary resources and staff available for this project. It is the foundation for the improved system of internal university communications which we so sorely need.

5. On November 19, 1979, the Council of Deans proposed that sums of $5000 each be set aside as awards to graduate students to be known as "Alumni Graduate Fellows." The Council hope that these awards will be supplemented by teaching or research assistantships funded by the college in which the student is enrolled and, further, that they will recognize and attract to our graduate programs truly superior students. The awards would be made to students working for either the masters or doctoral degree. Specific criteria for these awards will be determined and mutually agreed upon by the Council of Deans and the Graduate Council. The awards will be made for one fiscal year with the opportunity for reapplication by those already holding the awards.

6. The Faculty Senate reception in honor of the Board of Trustees will be held on Friday, January 25, 1980 at the Alumni Center. Vice-President Thompson, who has arranged the reception, will provide details during the meeting. (The Board will meet on campus January 25-26.)

7. On Thursday, December 5, a meeting was held on campus with students, administrators and a representative of the local cable TV franchise in attendance to explore a proposal for campus acquisition of this service. I represented the faculty at the meeting. The meeting amounted to little more than a familiarization with the service available and expression of the desire by students to have the University subscribe, either in selected locations or campus-wide (including service to individual rooms). I will keep you advised of substantive developments in this matter.
8. President Atchley was very appreciative of the time and effort expended by the Faculty Senate in commenting on his proposal for the University Council. After he has had an opportunity to consider these, he will give us some indication of how acceptable they are. He has stated that they will be helpful and are by no means extraordinary in nature.

9. Primarily because of the limited opportunity he has had to review the resolutions passed at our last meeting, Dean Hurst cannot yet respond to them. We will have some response, however, very shortly.

10. The Advisory Committee has not met since our last regular Senate meeting, there being no business to come before that body.

11. On Friday, November 30, the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina approved a resolution asking that college and university faculty be exempted from state grievance procedures. A related story from the Columbia State is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Horace W. Fleming, Jr.
President, Faculty Senate

Vice-President Thompson called attention to item one, noting that President Fleming has additional information which appears in a letter to the Senate which Senator Thompson then distributed (See Attachment A).

Senator Baron objected to part of President Fleming's letter because it did not empower policyholders to make the final decision. Vice-President Thompson explained that the Ad Hoc Committee on Insurance will be reactivated and recharged with resolving this question. They will call a policyholder's meeting for the purpose of discussing what they want done with the funds in question. The results of the discussion will then be turned over to the President's Cabinet for a final decision.

Item two was amended to read as it does in these Minutes.

With regard to item four, Mrs. Beulah Cheney announced that the Senate Special publication is now in limbo but it may be reinstated. The problem relates to personnel deficiencies and the increased workload of university publications. She described the rather large effort necessary to produce the Senate Special but indicated that she had "positive vibes" as to the future of the publication. She hopes to continue to monitor Senate meetings to that end.

Senator Grubb inquired whether the old Newsletter had been terminated. Mrs. Cheney replied that it had, at least in theory, but "we must await events." The new Newsletter will be different, with wider kinds of information, and it will contain no more minutes.
Senator Rollin requested the "senate scribe" to prepare and distribute a document similar to the Senate Special. Secretary Coulter respectfully declined due to lack of funds, but promised to work with Mrs. Cheney to get something out for this month - at least to the Senators, who could distribute it to their colleagues as they see fit.

Mrs. Cheney was commended for her efforts thusfar by the Senate.

Vice President Thompson announced that the Board of Trustees Meeting with the Senate will be similar to last year's meeting, which prompted Senator Young to suggest that Senate spouses also be invited. The suggestion was endorsed by several Senators. Senator Thompson noted a possible problem with funding but took the matter under consideration. Senator Worm suggested a better "labeling system" of participants next time and was promised the same.

5. Old Business: None

6. New Business:

Senator Howard inquired as to why he had received a copy of the non-faculty employees new graduated discipline policy. Several theories were advanced, but no answer to the mystery of distribution or intent (veiled or otherwise) was determined. The issue was consigned to the realm of administrative inscrutability where it will presumably rest.

Vice President Thompson then convened the Committee of the Whole to discuss two salutary letters - one to the Clemson Football Squad and the other to the Soccer Squad. A spirited debate ensued concerning the suitability of such letters and the propriety of singling out these two activities for meritorious recognition when equal achievements have been registered by many groups within the university community. Other extraneous issues entered the discussion which added little to the resolution of the question of the letters themselves.

After reconvening the Senate and hearing a motion to adopt and send the letters, Senator Snipes moved to amend both letters by striking the second paragraph of each "because it was incorrect." Before this could be discussed, Senator Baron moved to table both letters. The motion lost. A brief discussion ensued about Snipes' motion to amend. The question called and the motion was approved. The amended letters (Attachments B and C) were approved by the Senate to be sent by President Fleming at his earliest convenience.

7. Announcements:

Senator Howard announced that he was taking a semester's Sabbatical leave and would be represented next semester by Dr. Jack Stevenson.

8. Adjournment: The Senate adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Edwin M. Coulter, Secretary

Members Absent:
Dick, Quisenberry, Blanton, Edie, Rouse, Fleming,
Burt, and Schindler
December 5, 1979

Mr. Melvin E. Barnette, Vice President for Business and Finance
206 Sikes Hall
Clemson University
Campus

Dear Mr. Barnette:

At the November 20, 1979 meeting of the Faculty Senate, the attached resolution was passed. I am forwarding it to you for whatever response you may wish to provide us.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to receiving any comments you have or suggestions on the matter prior to any further discussion by the Faculty Senate.

Sincerely,

Horace W. Fleming, President of the Faculty Senate

xcc: Faculty Senate
Robert L. Fuzy, President of the Student Body
Jeffrey M. Anderson, President of the Student Senate
Victor Hurst, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the University

Resolution 79-11-3 was attached to this letter to Mr. Barnette (See p. 9 of the November 20 Faculty Senate Minutes)
USC Faculty Wants Out

By WARREN McINNIS
Staff Writer

University of South Carolina faculty members Friday approved a resolution asking that they be removed from the authority of the State Personnel Division.

The university has been in a stew ever since two opinions from the State Attorney General's Office said faculty members have the right to go right to the State Grievance Committee over job matters. The opinions were given in August 1978 and August 1979.

The opinions give the state grievance committee authority over university faculty and administrative decisions such as promotion or dismissal rather than leaving such matters up to the university, a practice of peer

From Under State Personnel

judgement which is traditional in the academic world.

Under the opinions, a faculty member disgruntled with USC's final word on an employment decision could carry the matter to the State Grievance Committee designed to handle complaints from most state employees.

The resolution urges university officials to "take immediate action to forestall all efforts by the Budget and Control Board and the State Personnel Division to encompass faculty."

It also urges that necessary steps be taken "to protect the traditional status, rights and responsibilities of faculty in regard to the governance of the university as provided for by historical precedent, action of the board of trustees and state and federal law.”

There is a bill proposing that faculty members at state institutions of higher learning be exempted from the state grievance committee coverage which was passed in the House and is pending in the Senate.

Some state employees are already exempt from state grievance committee coverage such as employees of the General Assembly and certain gubernatorial employees.

Although the resolution was passed in a voice vote, some faculty members said the university's grievance procedure should be improved before deciding to keep employment decisions solely in the hands of the university.

President James B. Holderman told the faculty that the "delegation of authority within the university is a conventional one which reflects the traditional model of the university as a largely self-governing institution of higher learning."

Holderman also said the state attorney general's office disregards powers given to the university board of trustees by previous legislation.

USC Provost Francis T. Borkowski said, "In comparison to many colleges and universities, the University of South Carolina is in an enviable position. There is a well established pattern of faculty participation at the university through a variety of organizational mechanisms in most of the basic areas of institutional policy. Faculty participation in governance at the university is definitely not a fiction."

He said faculty members' being covered by the State Grievance Committee is "an anathema to the traditional rights and responsibilities of academic institutions."

Dr. Perry Ashley, chairman of the USC faculty advisory committee, said there is an ad hoc committee studying possible alterations to USC's own grievance system.

Among those speaking in favor of the resolution was Dr. M.G. Abernathy who said, "Tenure and promotion call to the university through a variety of organizational mechanisms in most of the basic areas of institutional policy. Faculty participation in governance at the university is definitely not a fiction."

He added maybe there are aspects of the state grievance committee that "we shouldn't give up if we don't have something acceptable in its place."

Dr. Rufus Fellers of the college of engineering said that under the state grievance committee, tenure "will no longer exist and those who don't have it will never get it." He added that putting faculty members under the state grievance committee would put the university "on the path to oblivion."
The Faculty Senate Nov. 20 recommended major changes in the makeup of a new University Council which has been proposed to replace the existing Educational Council. The action followed a 45-minute closed discussion about the proposed council's purpose and authority.

The recommendations were developed by an ad hoc committee, chaired by Senate Secretary Ed Coulter and appointed in response to President Bill Atchley's request for suggestions about his plans to restructure the current council. That request came in an Oct. 12 memorandum which was circulated among campus administrators, the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate and the Graduate Student Association.

In the Faculty Senate version the council would consist of the president; the vice presidents for academic affairs, business and finance, and development; the dean of graduate studies and university research; the dean of admissions and registration; the director of university relations; a department head; the president of the Faculty Senate, Student Body and Student Senate; three college deans; and six faculty representatives.

The Senate version also excludes four members originally proposed: the vice president for executive affairs, a University librarian, a staff member appointed by the president for a three-year term; and the president of the Graduate Student Association.

The Senate proposes that all faculty representatives be elected by the Faculty Senate. In the original proposal the six faculty members would consist of three senators appointed by the president of the Faculty Senate and three faculty members appointed by the president upon recommendation by the dean of a college.

In contrast to the original proposal, the Senate recommends the vice president for development and the director of university relations be ex-officio, non-voting members. The president's memorandum did not designate any members as ex-officio, non-voting members.

Also, the Senate proposes that deans would serve rotating terms decided by the president, and the faculty members would serve one-year renewable terms.

To a list of "specifics" supporting its proposal on makeup, the Senate added a recommendation that the president of the Faculty Senate and the president of the Student Body continue as permanent members of the President's Cabinet, whatever new form of governance should emerge.

The Senate prefaced its recommendations with a statement of "understanding and impressions" based on the ad hoc committee's conversations with President Atchley.

The statement notes that:
- the creation of the council and its supporting commissions would not change normal day-to-day operations among faculty, department heads and deans.
- the council will meet monthly or on call to advise and offer campus-wide input, but will not constitute a continuing policy-recommending body.
- major "integrative activity" will be in a second-tier group of four or five council commissions made up of representatives from relevant interest areas.
- the precise nature, role and structure of commissions will be determined after the council has been created.
- some of the administrators on the council will provide administrative expertise, but will not have the power to recommend policies.

In other business, Senate President Horace Fleming in his report called attention to the Cabinet's approval of a
progressive discipline policy which will apply to all classified and unclassified employees, excluding faculty. Calling it "potentially insidious," he said he alone voted against the policy on the ground that its long-range consequences for faculty are insufficiently understood.

Admissions and Scholarship Committee chairman Alan Grubb said the committee had asked President Fleming to express to President Atchley and Dean Hurst the committee's displeasure at the postponement of plans to shorten the drop period from eight to six weeks, and at the fact the postponement was approved without consulting the faculty.

Policy Committee chairman Bill West reported on state bill H-2680, which will allow state universities exceptions from current state laws governing employee evaluation and tenure. He said the committee felt the Faculty Senate should support the bill, but that further discussions will be held with Vice President and Legal Counsel Joseph McDevitt.

In a progress report of the ad hoc committee on University research and research funding, Chairman Keith McDowell said a meeting with President Atchley indicated the committee's role will be a significant one. Answering questions from senators, he said the committee might discuss the role of the Research Council and the question of a possible vice president for research. He said the Senate would review the committee's final report.

Senator West said the search committee on the selection of a vice president and provost had completed a job description, received several nominations and solicited more, set Jan. 7 as the deadline for applications and hoped for a recommendation by March.

Other Action and Reports

In other action, the Senate:

-- refused to move from the table a resolution recommending changes in commencement exercises.
-- passed a resolution expressing displeasure with a cabinet decision to leave surplus group life insurance funds on deposit and asking it to rescind its order. The resolution would require the University group life committee to call a policyholders' meeting to decide how surplus funds are used.
-- passed a resolution to provide financial support for Faculty Senate officers. It would provide 50 percent of the salary and fringe benefits of the president for 12 months, salary and fringe benefits for a part-time secretary or 50 percent of a full-time secretary, and funds for materials, supplies, copying, telephone and travel for Senate officers or representatives. The resolution calls for a study of time demands that Senate business places on the vice president and secretary to determine if reduced teaching loads or work responsibility is needed. The resolution also calls for a study of the need for office space for Senate officers and staff.
-- passed a resolution to halt the practice of towing student vehicles from spaces used by persons attending athletic events and to ask that alternative parking arrangements be found for either on-campus students or athletic event visitors.
-- passed unanimously a resolution asking that the Faculty Manual be rewritten to define temporary or short-term faculty positions such as "Lecturer," "Research Associates," "Visiting Professor," "Visiting Associate Professor," and so forth.
-- passed a resolution asking the administration to develop guidelines for nominations, appointments and communication procedures concerning adjunct faculty appointments and that the Senate advise Dean Victor Hurst that the use of the title "Lecturer" not be used as an "Adjunct Faculty" title.
-- defeated a resolution to amend several pages of the Faculty Manual so that any position not qualified by the terms "Adjunct," "Visiting," or "Temporary" would be eligible for tenure consideration.
-- accepted the Advisory Committee's recommendations that the Dec. 11 meeting be held at 4:15 p.m. instead of 3:30 p.m. to accommodate the exam schedule and that the Senate meet April 8 instead of April 15 to avoid conflict with inauguration events.
Memorandum

TO: The Faculty Senate
FROM: H. W. Fleming
RE: Cabinet Decision on Surplus Group Life Insurance Funds

On Friday, December 7, President Atchley rescinded the decision of the Cabinet to keep surplus group life insurance funds on interest-earning account with Prudential. He further has instructed the Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee to call a meeting soon of all policy holders at which time a report on the program and past performance will be presented and comments received. Then the Committee will be expected to make another recommendation to the Cabinet on disposition of the current surplus.

President Atchley also recognizes the need for re-charging the Committee, which he will consider doing shortly. I will keep you informed of any developments along these lines and will be happy to pass along any comments you may have.
December 11, 1979

To the 1979 Tiger Football Squad:

The Faculty Senate congratulates you and your coaches for the outstanding record you have compiled in competition this fall. We also congratulate you on receiving the bid to compete in the Peach Bowl in Atlanta on December 31.

Best wishes as you look forward to the game with Baylor in the Peach Bowl.

Sincerely,

Horace W. Fleming, President
For the Faculty Senate

HWF/1m
December 11, 1979

To the 1979 Tiger Soccer Squad:

The Faculty Senate congratulates you and your coaches for the outstanding record you have compiled in competition this fall. We also congratulate you on being runners-up for the NCAA Division I Championship.

Congratulations on an outstanding season.

Sincerely,

Horace W. Fleming, President
For the Faculty Senate

HWF/1m
1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by President Fleming at 3:30 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The Minutes for December 11, 1979 were approved as written.

3. Dr. John L. Stevenson was introduced to the Senate as a replacement for Senator Gordon E. Howard who will be on leave during the spring semester.

4. Jim Barnhill, a member of the State Employee Association Committee reviewing the proposed state law to exempt non-classified state employees from the state grievance procedures, was introduced to the Senate. Prof. Barnhill requested feedback from Senators relative to the position of the Senate. He stated that as he understood it, the bill as presently stated would remove all non-classified employees from state grievance procedures and if passed it would mean that the only avenue for pursuing an employee grievance would then be the University President with the next step being the Board of Trustees and then the courts. The present position of the Employee's Association is against passage of the bill, reasoning "why give up an existing avenue for clearing a grievance for something less?" It was their feeling that the issue of evaluation and tenure is not at stake.

Senator West was asked to state the feeling of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee on this matter. The Policy Committee took a position for the bill feeling that evaluation of employees at the end of six months with the possibility of tenure being achieved at that time was objectionable. The Committee also expressed concern regarding the evaluation of employees.

Senator Grubb asked if the Policy Committee had addressed the issue of faculty grievance procedures and tenure. Senator West replied that the Committee felt satisfied with the present grievance procedures. (See Attachment A).

Prof. Barnhill then stated that the bill as presently stated called for the exemption of all non-classified employees from these procedures and if passed in this form some state employees such as Tech. employees would be left with no grievance procedure; therefore, groups other than faculty were concerned.

The question was then raised if the bill stated "all non-classified employees" or faculty. President Fleming pointed out that it says "faculty."

After discussion regarding the amount of information available to the
Senate for making a decision, Senator Quisenberry moved that the Senate adopt the position as stated by Senator West. The motion was seconded and after a restatement of Senator West's position, was carried by voice vote.

5. Committee Reports

(A) Admissions and Scholarship - Senator Grubb (See Attachment B)

Admissions and Scholarship Committee

We deliver today our report on the revision of the University's Admissions Policy. We hope that the Senators will examine this report closely and discuss its contents with their faculty as we would like to seek the Senate's disposition at our next meeting.

Our next meeting will be February 5 at 3:35 in Room 411 of Strode Tower. At that time we will take up the matter of grade inflation and begin a thorough review of the University's academic policies and regulations.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Grubb, Chairman (Signed)

A motion was made to accept the report and it passed by voice vote.

(B) Policy Committee - Senator West

The Policy Committee met at 3:00 p.m. on January 15, 1980 and considered the following items:

1. Agreement on November 1979 recommendation concerning H-2680, a bill to allow state universities exemption from the current laws governing employee evaluation and tenure.

2. Rewrite of Faculty Manual

   a. Three persons to meeting in Tennessee
      1. Faculty Senator by Advisory Committee.
      2. Jerry Reel
      3. Strong consideration of non-Senator faculty (could be suggested by Faculty Senate Advisory Committee)

   b. Time line
      1. Three months - not feasible
      2. Suggest three faculty members be employed by the University during the summer to provide draft.
      3. Secretarial support
      4. Problem with reorganization of University governance and new Vice President for Academic Affairs

   c. Insist on procedures that have the Senate as a review agency with rights of approval.

A motion was made to accept the report. After considerable discussion related to who should attend the meeting in Tennessee, the motion was
carried by voice vote.

(C) Research Committee - No report
President Fleming asked Senator McDowell as a member of the Committee if the revision of the copyright policy was now available. Senator McDowell replying that it was; President Fleming then asked that it be made available to the Senate.

(D) Welfare Committee - Senator Baron - No report.
Senator Baron was asked by President Fleming if the Committee is presently considering a survey of fringe benefits at "comparable institutions" and the "Emeriti benefits question." The response was "no" to the former and "yes" to the latter.

(E) Ad Hoc Committees:
Joint Faculty Senate-Student Senate Committee on Advising - Senator Kimbell
Senator Kimbell reported that this committee was meeting with the Faculty Committee on Advising to prepare a joint report and that the report was not complete at this time.

Ad Hoc Committee on University Research and Research Funding - Senator McDowell
Senator McDowell reported that their committee was meeting with deans and other concerned parties and would have a report in March.

(F) University Committees:
Sub-Committee on Use of Fike Field House - Senator Bursey
Senator Bursey asked for input from the Faculty Senate to this committee.
Senator Worm responded that faculty in his college would like to have the use of Fike without the fee requirement. Senator Bursey stated that at present the fee system was used to control the use of the facilities and that without such fees there would be overcrowding. Senator Edie then stated that previously there was no fee and overcrowding was not a problem at that time. It was his understanding the fee was to "up the financial input." Senator West commented that the fees were instituted at the time of the opening of the new facilities and were to cover the use of various items identified as "linen."

6. President's Report - Dr. Horace W. Fleming - See attached.
President Fleming called the attention of the Senate to several items. Item 4 in the report relates to a summary of previous business. The cooperation of the Senate was asked in preparing this summary. Item 6 relates to the Board of Trustees meeting on January 25-26. President Fleming stated that at this meeting President Atchley would be presenting his reorganization plan for University governance.

There followed a discussion of item 3c. Senator Baron raised the
question of just who is being punished by this action, commenting that it would not be those who have caused the problem as, presumably they have left the University.

Several Senators questioned the legality of turning over grade books to department heads.

Senator Lambert commented that it was interesting to see that in item 3a the Deans had already acted on an item that had just come before the Graduate Council. Apparently the change will go into effect regardless of the Graduate Council action.

A motion was made to adopt the President's Report as presented and was passed by voice vote.

7. Old Business

A. President Fleming requested the guidance of the Senate on their wish to have representation at hearings on the proposed legislation related to exemption of non-classified employees from state grievance procedures. A discussion followed relative to the amount of information that would be available on the status of the bill and the necessity of input as faculty will be expected to be guided by the results. It was the feeling of the Senate that there should be some representation of this body.

B. Senator Grubb requested that the Senate consider a request by the College of Liberal Arts to have a suggestion made to President Atchley for a replacement for President Fleming on the Search Committee for the new Provost and Academic Vice President. President Fleming withdrew from the Committee leaving the college without direct representation. After discussion, Senator Grubb moved that the Senate recommend to the President that a Committee member from the College of Liberal Arts be chosen to represent that college during the final screening process. The motion failed on a voice vote.

8. New Business

A. Senator Grubb introduced FS 80-1-1: Resolution on Athletic and Academic Scholarships - Abatement of Out-of-State Tuition on Equal Basis (see attached).

The resolution requests the administration to abate out-of-state tuition charges for academic and athletic scholarship recipients on an equal basis. It was moved and seconded to accept the resolution.

Several points were clarified during an ensuing discussion.
1. The abatement was intended for recipients of scholarships of $250 or more.
2. "Equal basis" refers to the amounts of the scholarships and not the numbers of such scholarships.

Senator Young moved to amend the resolution by striking the 2nd and 4th paragraphs and "as well; and" from the third. After discussion the vote on the amendment was taken by hand count; 10 in favor and 15 opposed. The motion lost.

The question was called on the resolution and the motion to accept was carried by voice vote.
B. Senator Rollin introduced to the Senate a report from Dr. Barbara Raetsch, President of Clemson Chapter of AAUP on the recently completed Department Head Survey (See Attachment C). The AAUP Chapter requested the Senate to review and respond to their resolution 11-7-79 attached to the report and which pertains to the University's department head system.

A motion was made and seconded that the Senate direct the Policy Committee to take their request under consideration and report back to the Senate. The motion was carried by voice vote.

C. Senator Worm introduced a memo from Dr. E. Earl Burch, Professor of Industrial Management to President Fleming (See Attachment D). The memo and three attachments concern faculty parking during athletic events. President Fleming responded that he would ask that the matter be placed on the agenda of the next President's Cabinet Meeting.

A discussion followed regarding the present status of parking regulations at the University. Senator West called to the attention of the Senate that several parking spaces at the Clemson House had been marked as reserved seemingly in violation of the present policy.

D. Senator Baron introduced a resolution from the floor which referred to item 3c of the President's Report. The resolution states:

"Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate goes on record as opposing Dean Cox's proposal to require faculty members to turn in their final exams and grade book to their department heads before they can receive their last pay check."

It was moved and seconded that the resolution be accepted. After a brief discussion the motion carried by voice vote.

E. Senator West moved that the Senate accept as a recommendation to President Atchley section two of the Policy Committee report. This section relates to the attendance at a meeting in Tennessee on rewriting Faculty Manuals and the procedures to be followed in the process of the rewriting of the Clemson Faculty Manual. (See attached Committee report). The motion was seconded and following a brief discussion was passed by voice vote.

9. Announcements:

a. College Bowl - President Fleming urged faculty support for the Clemson College Bowl Program noting that the first round of individual eliminations will be held January 22 and the second round on January 29. College Bowl coordinators would like faculty to attend their competition and volunteer to serve as judges. For more information, faculty should contact Mr. Kirk Van Doren at Ext. 2461.
10. Adjournment: The Senate adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Mary Ann Kelly, Acting Secretary

Members Absent:

Turnipseed, Smith, Thompson, Coulter, Burt, Senter.

MAK/1m

Enclosures
ATTACHMENT A

Position of the Faculty Senate on Exemption of Faculty from Coverage by the State Grievance Procedures

1. The retention of the current grievance procedure at the state level while establishing or maintaining University evaluation, tenure, and grievance procedures would provide the most satisfactory means for providing faculty evaluation and tenure, and provisions for grievance. However, if a choice must be made between either that of retaining the current legislated grievance procedure and the current Attorney General's interpretation of the law governing employee evaluation and tenure, or that of having no state grievance procedure, relying only on University grievance procedures while being allowed to establish unique university evaluation and tenure procedures, we would prefer the second alternative and are quite prepared to give up the state grievance procedure.
Attachment B

Admissions and Scholarship Committee Report on the
Revision of the University's Admissions Policy

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Office of Admissions and Registration henceforth come administratively under the Vice-President of Academic Affairs, to whom the Dean of Admissions and Registration would be responsible.

2. That a University-wide Committee on Undergraduate Admissions be created to advise and assist the Dean of Admissions on matters of policy; that this committee be composed of representatives of each college.

3. That the present University Admissions Policy be revised as follows:

   A. That a firm deadline on applications, January 1, be set and, except for the Early Admissions procedure, admissions decisions be made only after that date.

   B. That the admissions procedure and application for housing be separated.

   C. That the admission of transfer students and the question of transfer credits be thoroughly reviewed by the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions.

   D. That where enrollment in certain disciplines is limited, those colleges be allowed to require interviews of prospective students, subject to the approval of the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions.

   E. That requirements not actually taken into consideration (e.g. letters of recommendation) be eliminated from the description in the University Bulletin of the admissions procedure.

   F. That two College Board Achievement Tests be required of applicants.
Report on the Revision of the University's Admissions Policy

We have been asked to evaluate the University's Admissions Policy and make recommendations for its improvement. After considerable study and discussion, we are proposing several changes which are in line with policies commonly followed by the better schools of the tri-state area.

We add in support of these recommendations the three attachments at the end of our report. This data, in view of what we have been told would be the effect of limiting enrollment or about the substantial improvement in the qualifications of incoming freshmen, indicates the work left to be done and the need of an effective, competitive admissions policy. (Attachments 1 and 2)

1. That the Office of Admissions and Registration henceforth be placed administratively under the Vice-President and Dean of Academic Affairs.

We make this proposal for several reasons. First, because admissions and registration are primarily academic matters which ought therefore to come under the authority of the Vice-President of Academic Affairs. We realize that both admissions and continuing enrollment involve other matters, among them housing, but the academic side is—and ought to be—paramount. There is criticism presently about the admissions procedure stemming from the apparent role that housing plays in the admissions process. Some of this criticism is doubtless misinformed or even misdirected, but it seems imperative to us to separate clearly housing from admissions. Moving Admissions to Academic Affairs, where it logically belongs, would remedy the confusion in the public's mind about Clemson's admissions policy and establish the correct relationship between admissions and student affairs.

2. That a University-wide Committee on Undergraduate Admissions be created to advise and assist the Office of Admissions in matters of policy. This committee would be composed of representatives of each college. The present running of the Office of Admissions would not be changed by this committee whose sole function would be to advise the Dean of Admissions on matters pertaining to policy and not the day-to-day administration of the Office of Admissions or the selection of applicants. This committee would periodically review Clemson's admissions policy in an effort to maintain the University's high academic standards and competitiveness and to evaluate the effectiveness of its policy in achieving those goals.

We feel that there is presently an inadequate communication between the Admissions Office and the faculty. Too often Admissions has been seen as an autonomous body entirely divorced from, even indifferent to, faculty views and, alas, inscrutable to the "layman." This has resulted, unfortunately and unnecessarily, in considerable confusion among faculty and the public about admissions procedures. The creation of a University-wide committee would improve this situation, establishing a communications link between the colleges and Admissions; it would at the same time apprise Admissions of faculty views concerning admissions requirements.

3. Recommendations for a revised Admissions Policy.

We find that the University's present admissions policy, as it appears in the Bulletin, is no longer adequate or accurate: it is unclear on many points and does not reflect the procedures that are actually employed by the University in the admissions process; it does not separate clearly the housing question
from the admissions procedure; and the deadline for applications, although unclear as presently stated, is far too early and thus prevents a truly competitive situation.

In the following draft of the Admissions Policy we therefore recommend the following changes:

A. That a firm, formal deadline for applications of January 1 be set and, except for the Early Admissions procedure, admissions decisions not be made before that date. This recommendation is in line with the policy of peer institutions (Attachment 3) and would establish a more uniform procedure and a more competitive selection.

B. That the admissions policy no longer be subordinated to, or connected with, the application for housing. In view of the present and foreseeable dormitory situation at Clemson, the original motive for tying admissions to housing has disappeared. However we believe that admissions is a separate matter and ought to be handled separately.

C. That the admission of transfer students be thoroughly reviewed. There seems to be a problem concerning the matter of transfer credits not only in the admissions procedure but as fulfillment of requirements for graduation. We recommend that these matters be thoroughly reviewed by the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and that there be faculty oversight in this area.

D. That in some instances, where enrollment in certain disciplines is limited, those colleges be allowed to require interviews of prospective students, subject to the approval of the University Committee on Undergraduate Admissions. The purpose of this is to evaluate more effectively a student's promise in his prospective field. Such a requirement would be in addition to the University-wide requirements and in no way implies college autonomy in the selection of applicants or in the establishment of standards of admission.

E. That superfluous requirements be removed from the admissions procedure. We recommend that those requirements that are not actually taken into consideration—specifically the letters of recommendation—be eliminated from the description of policy.

F. That two College Board Achievement Tests be required. We have added as a part of the application process the submission of the results of two (2) College Board Achievement Tests. Presently these are strongly advised but not required. These would be used for placement purposes and would not figure into the admissions decision, which would be determined (as it is now) on the basis of Predicted Grade Point Ratio according to the formula of $45/55$ between S.A.T. scores and high school class rank.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Grubb, Chairman
Admissions and Scholarship Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Clemson University</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Georgia Tech.</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*University of Maryland</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Duke University</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Univ. of North Carolina</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*North Carolina State Univ.</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Wake Forest University</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Georgia</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*University of Virginia</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* ACC School
Attachment 2


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution (S.C. Schools)</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist College at Charleston</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict College</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Citadel</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coker College</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia College</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converse College</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erskine College</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman University</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone College</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry College</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. C. State College</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of S. C.</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop College</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wofford College</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNC</td>
<td>VPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cut Off Date</strong></td>
<td>Must Apply by Feb. 1</td>
<td>Must Apply by Jan 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Record</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Lang</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tests</strong></td>
<td>APT recommended</td>
<td>APT recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>SAT required</td>
<td>SAT required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Admission</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Policy Statement

As a land-grant university, Clemson recognizes a responsibility to provide opportunities for higher education to a broad spectrum of young men and women who have demonstrated potential for making significant contributions to society and to the people of South Carolina. As a publicly-supported institution, Clemson also recognizes its responsibility to concentrate instructional expenditures on those students whose record of achievement, competitively examined, indicates the greatest likelihood of success in university-level studies. A record of satisfactory academic achievement and of aptitude for academic pursuits therefore constitutes the most important consideration in evaluating candidates for admission.

Requirements for Admission

Beginning Freshmen. To receive consideration for admission to Clemson the applicant must present a transcript of his high school record and have an official copy of his Scholastic Aptitude Test scores sent directly from the College Entrance Examination Board Office in Princeton, New Jersey. The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions considers each applicant individually; its decision is based on the examination scores along with the student's academic preparation and rank in class. The applicant's acceptance will be confirmed upon presentation of a final high school transcript indicating a continuation of progress and graduation.

The following general requirements are set forth for the guidance of students looking toward college admission.

1. High School Record. The applicant must be a graduate, or the equivalent, of an accredited high school or preparatory school, with graduation based on no fewer than sixteen entrance units. The applicant must have a standing in class acceptable to the Committee on Admission. Minimum credit must be presented as specified in the following table; otherwise a student may be admitted only at the discretion of the Dean of the College to which he or she has applied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Minimum Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective (General)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the electives, no more than four units of vocational subjects can be accepted. One-half credit in advanced algebra, trigonometry, solid geometry or higher mathematics is recommended.

2. College Entrance Examination Board Test. All candidates for admission from secondary school are required to take the Scholastic Aptitude Test of the College Entrance Examination Board and two College Board Achievement Tests, as follows: English Composition and Mathematics (Level I or Level II). Achievement Tests in a third or other subjects are optional as the curriculum dictates but highly recommended. The December test administration is recom-
mended. Applicants must register at least THREE WEEKS before the testing data by mailing a registration form and a fee to a College Board Office. The examination will be given in test centers distributed throughout the United States and overseas. Both descriptive information about the test and registration blanks are available without cost to applicants. Requests should be addressed to either of the Board's Offices.

Scores will be of value to the University for counseling purposes as well as selection. Applicants who have taken College Board Tests should request the Board to send a record of the results to the Office of Admissions.

3. Admissions into Limited Enrollment Disciplines. Where limited enrollment occurs, colleges may require interviews of prospective students. These interviews are held to determine a prospective student's interest, motivation, general background, and indicated ability. The results of these interviews are sent to the Admissions Office and will affect the final selection of the student as determined by the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and with the recommendation of the college concerned. The requirement for an interview may be waived by the college when such an interview presents significant difficulties for the prospective student.

4. Early Admission. Students with superior high school records may qualify for early admission to Clemson University. To apply for early admission the student must possess superior high school records and have College Board scores of 1100 or more. Further information can be obtained from the Office of Admissions.

Transfer Candidates. Entrance examinations are required of transfer students. Details regarding these requirements are outlined above and in the subsection entitled College Entrance Examination Board Test.

All transfer applicants must have an original transcript of their records sent to Clemson directly from each college or university attended. Also, unless so stated on the transcript, the candidate will need to present statements of honorable dismissal and of eligibility to return to the institution last attended.

Applicants meeting the requirements outlined above will be considered carefully with regard to the quality of their credentials. If accepted, work completed at other institutions with a grade of C or higher may be evaluated for transfer in terms of equivalent courses in the Clemson curriculum of one's choice.

Application Forms and Dates. Forms to be used in applying for admission to the University may be obtained by writing to the Office of Admissions, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina 29631. Applicants for admission must submit a non-refundable fee of $15 with their applications. This fee is not applicable toward tuition and/or other University fees.
Applications should be submitted no later than January 1. Applications received after this date cannot be assured of consideration. Students with honor grades in secondary school may qualify for early decision on the basis of a three-year record. Information on the University's Early Decision plan may be obtained from the Office of Admissions. Regular admission decisions will normally be made after the seventh semester grades and the prescribed tests scores are received. Applicants from other colleges or universities will not be offered admission until official transcripts of all previous course work are received by the Office of Admissions.

Applicants who are offered admission must accept or reject the offer by the College Board Candidates Reply Date (May 1), or within two weeks of the date of the admission letter, whichever is later. Space in the entering class can be held only for those applicants who return a check payable to Clemson University in the amount of $100 with the acceptance form. The $100 amount constitutes the first payment toward room rental and tuition charges, and is non-refundable after May 1 unless the applicant is unable to enroll for reasons beyond his control.

The Mathematics sequence must include the equivalent of 1/2 unit of trigonometry either as a separate course or in combination with other mathematics in an integrated mathematics sequence.

- Plane Geometry, or Plane and Solid Geometry combined.

* Applicants are urged to include Chemistry, Physics or Biology in their science preparation.

& Addresses of the College Board Offices: Box 592, Princeton, New Jersey 08540, or Box 1025, Berkeley, California 94701. Testing dates may be obtained from them.
1. Representative Ed Simpson has filed a bill to amend the State Retirement Law to provide for a prorated pre-retirement death benefit for beneficiaries/survivors of employees who have accumulated 15 years of service to the state. The entire Pickens County delegation have pledged their support to the enactment of this measure.

2. The Education Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees met on campus Friday, January 11 to consider ways they might more effectively serve the academic function in the future. Their discussions are continuing, and I will inform you of any contemplated changes in this committee's role, as appropriate.

3. At the December 17, 1979 meeting of the Council of Academic Deans, the following actions were taken.

   a. The Council unanimously approved a proposal that "effective August 15, 1980, a grade of D in a graduate course will produce a grade report and transcript reflecting no credit which will imply no quality points. That is, the grades of D and F will lead to the same result." It was determined further that this policy "would apply to all 600, 700 and 800 level courses; therefore, it would apply to an undergraduate student taking a graduate course, but would not apply to a graduate student taking an undergraduate course."

   b. The Council unanimously approved a proposal that "no grades of D will be accepted for transfer under any circumstances."

   c. The Council heard a proposal from Dean H. M. Cox that faculty members in the future be required to turn in their final exams and grade books to their department heads before they can receive their last pay check of any given semester. Dean Cox pointed out that problems occur when faculty members fail to leave their grades with their department heads before leaving campus at the end of a semester since students then do not have access to their grades. The legality of such a requirement was discussed, and it was decided that the matter should be referred to the University Legal Counsel in January or February for an opinion.
4. We are rapidly approaching the end of this Senate and academic year, and it is important that we begin to think of how we can complete all pending business, especially those items which have been acted on by the Faculty Senate but not responded to definitively by the administrative officers of the University. I have spoken with Dean Hurst about this matter generally and indicated to him that I want to submit a memorandum to him by February 1, 1980 listing these items for him and requesting final decisions on each. I need your help in this regard. I want to request that each of you—in committee and individually—give this your careful consideration and list for me any items which you believe may have escaped our attention this year or in previous years. I need this information by January 25. I have compiled a rather lengthy list of my own from previous review of Senate minutes and documents. Once I have drafted our memorandum, I will meet with the Senate Advisory Committee to review it and receive further suggestions for revision and update.

5. The Advisory Committee met on Thursday, January 10, 1980.

a. The Committee decided that spouses/escorts of invitees to the January 25 reception for the Board of Trustees should be invited to attend that reception as guests of the Faculty Senate. This matter will be raised for discussion during the meeting.

b. The Committee was briefed on the background of FS 80-1-1, and it was determined that the resolution should be brought before the Faculty Senate rather than be pursued through administrative channels.

c. The Committee requested guidance from the Policy Committee on how we should proceed within the University toward revision of the Faculty Manual.

d. The Committee received information supplied by Senator Dick on payment by some companies and public agencies of employees' FICA tax (Social Security tax). Copies of Senator Dick's materials have been made available for your review.

6. The Board of Trustees will meet on campus January 25-26, 1980.

7. On January 3-4, 1980, Stassen Thompson, Dean Hurst, Vice President Nicholas, Dean Schwartz, Dr. Godley and I toured
the Coastal and Edisto Experiment Stations. Vice President Thompson will report on our tour during the meeting.

8. The Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee met recently to consider calling a public meeting of subscribers/policyholders. Action including the writing of a new charge for the Committee will be forthcoming shortly.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

H. W. Fleming
Resolution on Abatements of Out-of-State Tuition on Equal Basis to Recipients of Athletic and Academic Scholarships

WHEREAS, R531 and S452 enacted by the General Assembly of South Carolina in 1978 provide in part that

the governing boards of state colleges and universities are authorized to adopt policies for the abatement of any part or all of the out-of-state rates for students who are recipients of scholarship aid.

WHEREAS, such abatements already are allowed by Clemson University for recipients of all athletic scholarships;

WHEREAS, such abatements also are allowed by the University of South Carolina and by Winthrop College to recipients of academic scholarships as well; and

WHEREAS, equity requires similar treatment by Clemson University of recipients of athletic and academic scholarships;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests that the governing board of Clemson University authorize equal abatements of out-of-state tuition for students who are recipients of academic scholarships.
December 13, 1979

Dr. Horace Fleming
Political Science Department
401 Strode Tower

Dear President Fleming:

Please find enclosed a "News" bulletin from the Southeastern Poultry and Egg Association that was received by me through my department head, Dr. B. D. Barnett.

The item of interest appears on page 2 (backside) of the bulletin. My department head has asked me to bring this matter (employer pays all FICA) to the attention of the Faculty Senate.

Would it be possible for you to forward this information to the appropriate Faculty Senate Committee for their consideration and investigation?

Thank you for your time and I would appreciate your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

John W. Dick
Associate Professor
Faculty Senator-Agriculture

JWD/rkb
Enclosure
Companies Pay FICA for Employees While Saving Money

The City of New York is now paying all of its employees' FICA tax (Social Security). The city says this tactic will save $26 million in fiscal '81. Last year Texas began paying state workers' share of FICA taxes with similar results.

The technique saves money for small private companies as well. While the amount saved per employee is small, it reflects a considerable benefit overall. More and more companies are finding that they can, in effect, raise worker take-home pay while reducing their overall payroll costs. The Craven County Hospital, North Carolina, for example, granted its 850 employees an average 8% wage increase, yet expects to save approximately $50,000 this year as a result.

How are these companies, states, etc., doing this? By using a perfectly legal procedure that any organization paying Social Security taxes can install. The Social Security Act allows the employer to pay the employee's share of FICA tax as well as the company's share. The Act further states that the worker's share of FICA, if paid by the employer, is not subject to tax, i.e., no FICA tax on the FICA tax. (Chapter 21, Internal Revenue Code-Federal Insurance Contributions Act, Section 3121(a)6, Revenue Ruling 74-75.)

While the payment of the worker's share of FICA is not FICA taxable, it is income taxable. The employer, therefore, must add the FICA tax to the employee's salary for computation of W-2 earnings.

AN ILLUSTRATION OF POSSIBLE SAVINGS

Let's look at the following example: Suppose an employee is earning $10,000 a year and due for a $600 raise, and further the employee is currently paying a $600 a year in FICA taxes, with the company matching that amount. Under this example both the employee and employer must pay in additional $36.30 in FICA taxes with the raise. Instead of this traditional method, let's see what happens when the employer pays the employee's present share of FICA taxes-the present $600. Since there is no additional FICA tax on the FICA payment, the raise now costs the employer only $600. Not the $600 plus $36.30 in additional FICA tax. The employee takes home the full $600 before income tax instead of $563.70, a combined total saving of 12%. With higher salaries and larger raises, the savings can be even greater. Moreover, the amounts saved will increase greatly through 1987 as increases in the Social Security tax rate and in the worker salary base, mandated by law in '77, take effect. In '79 the employer and the employee each pays 6.13% of the wages in FICA tax, by '87 the rate will have climbed to 7.15%. But even more dramatic is that the tax this year is paid only on the first $22,900 of salary, but by 1987 the base will have risen to $42,600.

MAJOR ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

To recap the advantages, an employer can: pay raises using this technique and save; extend larger pay increases than the voluntary wage guideline of 7%; through savings generated, add to worker's nontaxable or tax-deferred fringe benefits such as retirement plans; save federal and state unemployment insurance taxes, as IRC Section 3306 (b)(6) exempts from unemployment insurance tax any employer payments of the worker's Social Security tax as long as there is no tax deduction from wages; and realize a further saving because FICA is not required to be withheld from wages paid on a sick pay plan.

There are, however, some minor disadvantages that should be looked at. These would include: the employee Social Security account will not be credited with the additional compensation; it may cause a reduction in certain other worker benefits that are based on W-2 earnings (the formulas can be adjusted to restore the usually small drop); it requires changes in the payroll procedure, e.g., new methods of computing taxes—FICA base salary and W-2 base salary; and employees must be prepared to accept what might appear to them at first to be no increase in salary. This last problem can be overcome by using personalized letters of explanation showing a "before" and "after" paycheck display for each employee. This will prove a legitimate improvement of the employee compensation package.

These disadvantages are minor when compared to benefits for both employer and employee. For each employer under FICA base, this technique can save up to $172 in FICA taxes in '79 only, with the savings raising in future years, along with all other benefits.

Provided Courtesy of "Small Business Report"
WHEREAS, R531 and S452 (1978) provide in part that

the governing boards of state colleges and universities are authorized to adopt policies for the abatement of any part or all of the out-of-state rates for students who are recipients of scholarship aid.

WHEREAS, such abatements are provided by Clemson University for all athletic scholarships;

WHEREAS, such abatements are also provided by the University of South Carolina for holders of academic scholarships as well; and

WHEREAS, Equity would seem to require similar treatment by Clemson University of holders/recipients of athletic and academic scholarships;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests that the governing board of Clemson University provide for equal abatements of the out-of-state rates for students who are recipients of athletic and academic scholarship aid.
Resolved,

That the Clemson University faculty shares the concern of the University administration for stability, continuity, humane order, and efficiency in the governance of the academic departments;

That because department heads are the administrators with whom faculty are most immediately in contact, professionalism and collegiality require that faculty be substantially involved in the operation of the headship system, including the continuance of department heads in office;

That in the expressed view of numerous faculty, the present headship system tends to foster authoritarian more than collegial governance, impede rather than facilitate communication among faculty and administration at all levels, discourage rather than encourage cooperation and innovation, and render faculty vulnerable to retaliation without adequate recourse—all of which depress rather than sustain and elevate faculty morale and performance;

That a significant portion of the faculty holds that the headship system merits re-evaluation and reformation;

Therefore, we, the faculty members of the Clemson University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, respectfully propose that President Atchley and the Faculty Senate consider means by which the department headship system and possible alterations of that system can be studied, evaluated, and submitted to faculty and administrators for their recommendations.

---

\( a \) The AAUP-sponsored questionnaire, "A Survey of Faculty Opinion Regarding the Department-Headship System at Clemson University" (April 1979), was completed and returned by 329 respondents. Copies of the questionnaire and the tabulation report are appended to this resolution.

\( b \) Questions \#1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 are especially pertinent, with percentages of respondents ranging from 51-57% in clear support of the details of this clause.

\( c \) Of the respondents, 212 (64.4%) favored significant modification of the present system. Fifty-eight (58) favored one 4-6-year term; sixty-nine (69), a renewable 4-6-year term; and eighty-five (85), periodic votes of confidence.
A Survey of Faculty Opinion Regarding the Department-Headship System at Clemson University

The Clemson chapter of the American Association of University Professors is undertaking a study of the department-headship system as it currently functions within most colleges of the University. Vital to that study is obtaining faculty perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the present system and opinions concerning possible improvements or alternatives to that system. Would you then, as a service to the University, and ultimately to yourself as a faculty member, take a few moments to fill out the questionnaire below by circling the number which most closely approximates your view. Additional comments are welcome in the space provided or on additional sheets. Please send completed questionnaire to E. M. Lander, Jr., 126 Hardin Hall, no later than April 14.

Very Strongly Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Very Strongly
Disagree Disagree
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. The Clemson department-headship system encourages an open exchange of information between faculty and head.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Comment:

2. The Clemson department-headship system encourages just and equitable treatment of faculty by the head.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Comment:

3. The Clemson department-headship system encourages participation of faculty members with decision making on the department level.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Comment:

4. The Clemson department-headship system is conductive to high morale among the faculty.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Comment:

5. I value the inherent stability of the present department-headship system over the "new-blood" vitality that might develop from a revolving or changing system.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Comment:
6. The Clemson department headship system encourages conformity and safety at the expense of creative or innovative administrative decisions.
   Comment:
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. A department head should be accountable to the faculty as well as to the dean.
   Comment:
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. The Clemson department-headship system facilitates smoothness and efficiency of operations of the colleges.
   Comment:
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. The present department-headship system in which the head is chosen by the dean in consultation with the faculty and serves "at the pleasure of the dean" is the most appropriate system for Clemson at this time.
   Comment:
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. If you disagree with the statement in No. 9, check your preference first for:
    (a) head _____, or chairperson ____. Then check your preference among b, c, d.
    (b) head/chairperson system featuring renewable 4-6 year terms ____. 
    (c) head/chairperson system featuring one 4-6 year term, renewable only under special circumstances ____. 
    (d) head/chairperson system featuring indefinite terms subject to periodic "votes of confidence" by the faculty ____. 
    Comment:

Please designate your position:

Teaching faculty _____  Teaching-Research _____
Research " _____  Extension-Research _____
Extension " _____  Administration _____
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach/Res</td>
<td>46/17%</td>
<td>42/15%</td>
<td>54/19%</td>
<td>28/10%</td>
<td>62/22%</td>
<td>28/10%</td>
<td>18/6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext/Res</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>6/21</td>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>8/29</td>
<td>5/18</td>
<td>4/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>2/20</td>
<td>3/30</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>3/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/Res</td>
<td>54/20%</td>
<td>35/13%</td>
<td>52/19%</td>
<td>52/19%</td>
<td>45/16%</td>
<td>22/8%</td>
<td>15/5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>5/50</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>3/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/Res</td>
<td>55/20%</td>
<td>47/17%</td>
<td>55/20%</td>
<td>31/11%</td>
<td>50/18%</td>
<td>22/8%</td>
<td>14/5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>2/20</td>
<td>3/30</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>3/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/Res</td>
<td>66/25%</td>
<td>32/12%</td>
<td>53/19%</td>
<td>49/18%</td>
<td>42/15%</td>
<td>21/8%</td>
<td>11/4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>3/30</td>
<td>2/20</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>3/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/Res</td>
<td>54/20%</td>
<td>35/13%</td>
<td>52/19%</td>
<td>39/14%</td>
<td>34/12%</td>
<td>26/9%</td>
<td>34/12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext/Res</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>4/14</td>
<td>4/14</td>
<td>5/18</td>
<td>5/18</td>
<td>7/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td>2/22</td>
<td>4/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/Res</td>
<td>23/8%</td>
<td>23/8%</td>
<td>43/15%</td>
<td>59/21%</td>
<td>46/16%</td>
<td>48/17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2/22</td>
<td>2/22</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/Res</td>
<td>4/1%</td>
<td>2/1%</td>
<td>6/2%</td>
<td>11/4%</td>
<td>50/18%</td>
<td>54/19%</td>
<td>155/55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext/Res</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>3/30</td>
<td>8/28</td>
<td>6/25</td>
<td>7/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2/20</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>3/30</td>
<td>4/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/Res</td>
<td>20/7%</td>
<td>15/5%</td>
<td>31/11%</td>
<td>63/23%</td>
<td>35/31%</td>
<td>25/5%</td>
<td>24/5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext/Res</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>6/21</td>
<td>9/31</td>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>6/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>4/40</td>
<td>3/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/Res</td>
<td>75/27%</td>
<td>32/11%</td>
<td>77/27%</td>
<td>25/5%</td>
<td>30/11%</td>
<td>16/6%</td>
<td>25/5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>2/20</td>
<td>4/40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **Group:** Teach/Res, Ext/Res, Admin
- **Response %:** 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
## Mean Responses to Questions 1 - 9 by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM TO: Mr. J. W. Pace, Chairman  
Traffic and Parking Committee

FROM: E. Earl Burch, Professor of Industrial Management

DATE: November 6, 1979

On November 3, 1979 at approximately 9:45 a.m. I attempted to park in the parking lot next to Sirrine Hall. I had been asked by my department head to be available from 10:00-11:00 to talk with parents as part of Parents Day at the University. I was informed that I could not park in the lot because it was reserved for Gold Card IPTAY members. Since all parking places along the street were filled, it was suggested that I find someplace to park by pulling over the curb and parking on the grass (which I understand is generally illegal). After checking with some of my colleagues I find that I am not the only one who has had such an experience.

It is rather astounding to me that a University faculty member fulfilling his assigned duties is not allowed to park in a faculty parking lot. I would like for your committee to look into the matter and more specifically I would like answers to the following questions:

1. Is this University policy? If so, I would like to have it in written form.

2. Is it legal for state owned property to be sold (or rented) to individuals based on their tax-deductible contributions to a private organization, which I have been previously informed that IPTAY is? If so, I would be interested in which state laws or statutes allow such a transaction. Perhaps, the University legal counsel, Admiral McDevitt, could respond to this question.

3. Even if it is legal, is it right that a University faculty member or staff member should be denied the right to park in his normal parking lot when fulfilling his assigned responsibilities at the University? As an aside, is it right even if the faculty member only wishes to use the facilities simply to study or do research? The present policy seems to indicate disturbing administrative priorities assigned to IPTAY members versus faculty members and athletic activities versus academic activities.

4. Has your Committee previously taken a position on this issue? If so, what was the position and what were the consequences? If not, do you feel that it is a legitimate issue?

Although the present home football schedule is complete and the problem may not surface again until next year, I think now is the time to address the issue. I look forward to hearing from your committee.

cc: Horace Fleming, Faculty Senate
    George H. Wora, Faculty Senate
STUDENT AFFAIRS AND TRAFFIC

MINUTES OF THE CLEMSON UNIVERSITY TRAFFIC AND PARKING COMMITTEE

November 29, 1979

Present: Mr. Archie I. Barron  Mr. Archie I. Barron
Ms. Michelle Hopkins  Radm. Joseph B. McDevitt
Chief Jack Ferguson  Mr. John W. Pace
Mr. Stephen Jansen  Dr. Robert W. Rouse
Mr. G. L. Jones  Dr. Donald B. Stafford

Absent: Dr. J. L. Strom, Dr. Betty P. Watkins

1. The Chairman called the meeting to order and asked for corrections to the minutes of the October 25, 1979 meeting. There were no corrections and the minutes stand approved as written.

2. The next order of business was that of new business, including the following:

   a. Student Senate Resolution No. R-79-80-31, "Pay Incentives," was discussed by the Committee. The Resolution requested that a 20% decrease in the amount of a parking fine be allowed the student, if the student paid the fine within 10 working days after receiving the bill. (A copy of the Resolution is on file in the Student Affairs and Traffic Office). During the discussion, the Committee was advised that in order for students to receive a decrease in the amount of a parking fine for early payment, the computer program which was designed to handle the graduated fine system would have to be completely redesigned.

   Committee Action: After a short discussion, a motion was made and passed by a unanimous vote to recommend the resolution not be approved.

   b. Student Senate Resolution No. R-79-80-6, "East Campus Parking," was next discussed by the Committee. In the Resolution, the Student Senate requested the timed parking on the circular drive on East campus be changed to unlimited parking from 5:00 pm to 7:00 am Monday through Sunday. (A copy of the Resolution is on file in the Student Affairs and Traffic Office).

   Committee Action: After a long discussion, a motion was made to recommend the Resolution be approved on a trial basis for the Spring Semester. The vote was a tie vote and the motion failed to pass.

   c. Student Senate Resolution No. R-79-80-29, "Parking Lot Sidewalk," was discussed by the Committee. In the Resolution, the Student Senate requested that a concrete sidewalk be built at the pedestrian entrance to Commuter Parking Lot No. C-5. (A copy of the Resolution is on file in the Student Affairs and Traffic Office).
Affairs and Traffic Office). During the discussion, the Chairman advised that the Committee had taken action on a similar request at the April, 1979 meeting. At that meeting, the Committee recommended that a walkway and steps be constructed from the North end of the C-4 and present C-5 parking lot to the paved circle in front of Lee Hall (see Traffic and Parking Committee Minutes dated April 26, 1979, item 2. b. and Committee Action).

Committee Action: The Committee reaffirmed the action of April, 1979 and in addition, recommended that the Physical Plant take interim steps to make the egress from the C-5 lot more suitable.

d. Student Senate Resolution No. R-79-80-36, "S.T.R.B. Reappointments," was discussed by the Committee. The Resolution requested that procedures under which the Student Traffic Review Board operates be modified so that if a student misses an appointment, he/she may contact the office of Student Government within 24 hours and reschedule the appointment. If this is not done, the ticket will be automatically affirmed and the student will lose his/her right of appeal. (A copy of the Resolution is on file in the Student Affairs and Traffic Office).

Committee Action: The Committee recommended that action on the Resolution be delayed until such time as the full Traffic Code can be reviewed. Such action will be taken by the Traffic and Parking Committee during the Spring Semester.

e. The Committee discussed a memorandum from E. Earl Burch, Professor of Industrial Management (attachment #1).

Committee Action: The Committee was informed by RADM. Joseph McDevitt, University Counsel and member of the Traffic and Parking Committee, that according to the Code of Laws of South Carolina, Clemson University has the legal right to establish such rules and ordinances as are reasonable and are necessary to operate in an orderly manner. The Committee was also reminded that the Clemson University Traffic and Parking Code in Article 3-2 authorizes the Vice President for Executive Affairs to restrict parking in any area of the campus to certain categories of people. Also Article 3-7 allows the Chief of Public Safety to temporarily appropriate for visitor use any parking area reserved for other categories of people.

The Committee recommended that a letter be written to Professor Burch to make him aware of the above information.

3. The Committee adjourned at 2:45 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for January 24, 1980, at 1:30 pm in Room 300 Sikes Hall.

John W. Pace
Chairman

Approved:

Joseph B. McDevitt
Vice President for Executive Affairs

cc: President Bill L. Atchley
    Dr. Horace V. Fleming
    Mr. James P. Burns
    Mr. Helvin Barnette
    Dean George Cookley
    Mr. Stanley Nicholas
    Dean Victor Hurst
    Mr. Bob Fuzzy
    Mr. Walter D. Stone
    Mr. Jeff Anderson
December 7, 1979

Dr. E. Earl Burch
Industrial Management
312-C Sirrine Hall
Campus

Dear Dr. Burch:

I have been asked by the Traffic and Parking Committee to respond to your November 6, 1979 memorandum to John Pace. At its meeting on November 29, the Committee discussed your concerns but took no action after my clarification of a misunderstanding which formed the basis of your inquiries.

IPTAY is not a private organization; its funds are public funds and they are in the custody of and invested by the State Treasurer—who, by law, is prohibited from handling any monies which are not public monies.

Enclosed are pertinent excerpts from the South Carolina Code which constitute the statutory authority for the Clemson University Board of Trustees to regulate parking and traffic on campus. The University Traffic Code has been approved by the Board of Trustees. Section 3-2 authorizes the Vice President for Executive Affairs to restrict parking in any area of the campus to certain categories or classifications of people. Section 3-7 authorizes the Chief of Public Safety, upon special occasions, to temporarily appropriate for visitor use exclusively any parking area normally reserved for other categories of people. As a matter of policy, home football and basketball games are deemed to be such special occasions. Our policy is not unlike policies at other comparable institutions.

Also relevant to this discussion is the fact that the lot west of Sirrine and several other parking areas on west campus are maintained with funds generated from athletic contests and not with appropriated funds.

Your view that a faculty member required to work on a football Saturday—should be permitted to utilize faculty parking—is valid. When such a requirement occurs in the future, contact the Security Department in advance as provided in Section 3-6 of the Code and special authorization will be granted.

Sincerely,

Joseph R. DeStefani
Vice President for Executive Affairs

JBM/CF Copies: Dr. Ronald W. Fleming, Jr., Dr. John W. Eace, Dr. George H. Wom
MEMORANDUM

TO: Horace W. Fleming, President of Faculty Senate
FROM: E. Earl Burch, Professor of Industrial Management

Attached is a copy of a memorandum which I sent to the Traffic and Parking Committee Chairman, Mr. J. W. Pace. Also attached is a copy of the minutes of the Traffic and Parking Committee meeting of November 29, 1979 at which time my memorandum was discussed as well as a response to the memorandum from Mr. Joseph B. McDevitt, Vice President for Executive Affairs.

In response to both the minutes and the letter I would like to make several points.

1. The implication of both the minutes and Vice President McDevitt's letter is that my memo was due to a "misunderstanding which formed the basis of (my) inquiries." This simply is not the case. Prior to writing the memo, I was aware of the portions of the South Carolina Code and the University Traffic Code which are referenced.

2. There was never any doubt in my mind that the State allowed the University to regulate parking and traffic on campus. However, nothing in the code, as far as I can tell, allows parking privileges on state owned property to be sold. I have been told that "sold" is too strong, but when faculty members and others are told they can park in certain spaces only if they have made "contributions" of specified dollar amounts to IPTAY, it seems that "sold" is certainly an appropriate word. Section 3-7 which authorizes the Chief of Public Safety "upon special occasions, to temporarily appropriate for visitor use exclusively any parking area normally reserved for other categories of people" certainly seems reasonable under some circumstances, but I see no mention as to the reasonableness or legality of such "appropriations" based on specified payments to any private or public organization. The fact that "our policy is not unlike policies at other comparable institutions" neither makes it legal nor desirable.

3. The question as to whether contributions to IPTAY, since they do purchase such privileges, are legally-tax-deductible, which IPTAY advertises, is not addressed in the minutes nor in Vice President McDevitt's letter. It is my understanding that contributions for which goods or services are rendered (see Federal Income Tax Forms, page 37) are not tax deductible. Since we are told that specified dollar contributions are necessary for parking, I can only surmise that the parking is considered worth that amount, and therefore the contributions should not be deductible. Perhaps a check with the IRS will clarify this point.
January 2, 1980
Page Two

4. The fact that "the lot west of Sirrine and several other parking areas on west campus are maintained with funds generated from athletic contests" seems irrelevant. Who gives the authority for this? Is it appropriate? Carried to extremes, the implications of such policies seem rather interesting.

5. Ignoring all other questions previously mentioned, I feel the third question in my memo as to whether it is right, even if it is legal, that a faculty member be denied the right to park in his normal parking lot when fulfilling his responsibilities at the University (assigned or otherwise) is the most important. The minutes ignore this question as well as my fourth question. Vice President McDevitt's response that advanced permission may be obtained is not very satisfying. Who in the Security Department determines which work is valid? Is research, preparing a lecture, reading? Why should a faculty member have to obtain permission to work?

6. Finally, parking is not really the issue. I was informed that if the lot were not reserved, students would use it and I could not find a space anyway. That is well and good. I'm willing to compete with other faculty, students and visitors. I simply do not wish to be denied the right to compete because the administration chooses to give athletic interests priority over faculty interests. Such priority seems out of place at a university.

Before I'm written off as an anti-athletic fanatic, I would like to say I am not. I attend and enjoy athletic activities. The question is simply, if priorities are going to be developed, how should it be done in a university setting? It seems to me that the principle involved here should be of importance and interest to our faculty and administration whether the specific issue of parking is important or not. Precedent is not justification.

Horace, if you feel that the questions I have raised and the points I have made are legitimate, I would like for the Faculty Senate to consider the issues, the parking issue as well as the more important issue as to the Administration's seeming consistent willingness to place athletic interests above faculty interests. The parking issue, it seems to me, is only a symptom of a more deep-seated problem. However, I do intend to pursue it as an individual if the Senate does not wish to.

EEB/dg
Enclosures
cc: Mr. John W. Pace
Vice President Joseph B. McDevitt
Dr. George H. Worm
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

February 19, 1980

1. Call to Order
   The meeting was called to order by President Fleming at 3:30 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes - The January 15, 1980 Minutes were approved as written.

3. Special Presentation: J. E. Clark, Chairman, University Self-Study Committee

   Professor Clark listed the members of the Committee, described the structure of the Committee, and made a progress report. He described the creation of 12 sub-committees and announced that the Self-Study Committee was screening potential members for these sub-committees. He described the scope of the proposed study as "comprehensive," involving all aspects of University operations. The approach will be analytical, and the Committee will make recommendations on remedies to problems identified by the Committee. A ten-year projection of University activities is contemplated. A Steering Committee will see that standards of the Southern Association are adhered to. College and Departmental Committees will also be formed. The schedule through September, 1981, was described, and faculty participation and support was requested.

4. Committee Reports
   (A) Admissions and Scholarship - Senator Grubb

   Admissions and Scholarship Report

   The Admissions and Scholarship Committee met on Tuesday, February 5, 1980. A number of items was discussed.

   In response to a query from Dean Hurst concerning the composition of the University-wide committee to review academic regulations (those policies listed on pages 42-52 of the Bulletin), the committee agreed that two members should come from the Faculty Senate. We have proposed to Dean Hurst that one of these two should be selected from a member of the Admissions and Scholarship Committee, from one of the five members who will continue on the Senate next year. The other Senate member we have proposed should be elected (or selected) by the Senate from one of its ranks. Our thinking is that the Senate should play an important part in the review; further, that it should be involved in the review as changes are being proposed rather than afterwards. The committee itself will be composed, as I understand it, of representatives of the Senate, the administration and the student government.

   The Admissions and Scholarship Committee has been trying to improve the format of the current Grade Distribution Report. To this end Herman Senter and Bob Mazur presented a report for the subcommittee created to study this problem. The committee adopted its recommendations and a full report of the changes proposed will be given next month after talking with Dean Hurst. Generally we are proposing the following changes in the present format:

   Section 1. None (This section deals with "freshman" grade performance, that is 100-level courses.)
Section 2. Add course numbers and credit hours to achieve the format:

Prof.'s name  Course #1  Credit hrs.  #grades  Distribution
Course #2  Credit hrs.  #grades  Distribution

This section deals with instructor performance. If reasonable, we would like to list team-taught sections by names of all team members. However, this may not be possible either because of space or because it is presently impossible to identify team-taught courses. We will probably eliminate team-taught courses from this section, assuming that we can get information from colleges as to which courses are team-taught and who teaches them. This has been the problem area of any proposed change.

Section 3. Drop the present format. Instead, report the grade distribution for each course summarizing by departments, colleges, and the university.

Course #  Credit hrs.  #Grades  Distribution

A completed report will be presented at our next meeting.

The committee will meet again on March 4 in Room 411 of Strode Tower. At that time we will discuss the items we think the committee created to review the University's academic regulations should look into.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Grubb, Chairman (Signed)

(B) Policy Committee  Senator West

Faculty Senate Policy Committee Report, Feb. 19, 1980

The Faculty Senate Policy Committee did meet three times since the January Faculty Senate Meeting. The first meeting on January 29, 1980 focused on two issues: (a) the search committee for Clemson University Director of the Library and (b) the AAUP Report on Department Head.

The Committee recommended that Faculty Senate President Fleming convey to Dean Hurst the committee's recommendation that the Search Committee be constituted as listed in the Faculty Manual. (It should be noted that the Search Committee is now so constituted).

The Policy Committee has discussed the AAUP Report during the three meetings (January 29, February 12, and February 19). The Committee has another meeting scheduled for February 26 at 12:10 p.m. in the 1st Floor Lounge of Strode Tower. The Committee does not have a report on the discussions at this time.

William E. West, Chairman (Signed)
(C) Research Committee – Senator Smith

Faculty Senate Research Committee Report, Feb. 19, 1980

The Research Committee has prepared a revised copyright policy proposal. A copy of the proposal has been sent to Ben W. Anderson, University Legal Counsel, for review. Counsel has in turn solicited comments on the proposal from a copyright and patent attorney.

The Research Committee will meet again as soon as Legal Counsel returns the proposal.

Bill R. Smith, Chairman (Signed)

Senator Smith was asked how much change there will be between the new copyright policy now in the works and the old one passed by the Senate two years ago. He replied that there was quite a difference. The new one is in more legalistic terms and places more conditions on defining university interest. There is also more detail on splitting royalties. Senator Smith was unsure as to when the new policy would be referred to the Senate.

(D) Welfare Committee – Senator Baron – No report.

(E) Ad Hoc Committees:

1. Committee to Review the Use of Textbooks and Reference Books – Senator Schindler

The report, dated January 31, addressed to Dean Hurst from the Committee, is attached.

After reviewing the above-mentioned report, Senator Schindler solicited questions which produced the following points:

a. The report was prompted by parental concern, but it will not placate them much.

b. Dean Hurst will discuss the report with President Atchley.

c. Not enough data could be collected to ascertain the extent to which Clemson professor's publications were being used elsewhere.

d. The Ad Hoc Committee plans no resolutions or further recommendations.

2. Ad Hoc Committee on Advising – Senator Kimbell

Senator Kimbell reported that his committee would be prepared to make recommendations to the Senate next month. At the present, four topics were under discussion:

1. Student desire for rapport, continuity, and accessibility with faculty advisors and their desire for this to be consistent through one advisor for four years.

2. Student responsibilities in advisement and the role of the catalogue as a contract.

3. The purpose and utility of advisor signatures of approval.

4. An ombudsman for continuing dialogue between the Faculty and Student Senates on advisement.
January 31, 1980

MEMORANDUM

TO: Victor Hurst, Dean of the University

From: M. Brewington
C. Harlow
M. A. Kelly
J. Kimbell
R. Lambert
K. Messick
J. Schindler

Subject: Use of Textbooks and Reference Books

Statement of the Problem:

In his discussions with students, parents and others, President Atchley has been asked questions relative to textbooks and reference books assigned by the faculty. Some of these questions are: Why are the text books changed so frequently? Are the texts written by our faculty and sold to our students widely accepted by other colleges and universities? Is it necessary to cause the student to buy as many as four or five reference books for one course? Who makes the decisions on what texts are to be used?

Response:

Note: In this report the term textbook refers to the basic reading assignment for a course, and the term parallel book is used to indicate titles that are used to supplement the text (reference books). The term laboratory manual is self-explanatory.

Number of Books Required:

The numbers and types of books that individual students are asked to buy depends on: (1) the subject matter of the course; and (2) the level of instruction in the course.

For example, in courses in the physical sciences, natural sciences, management, and several of the social sciences, students are required to purchase a text and a laboratory manual. In the humanities and some other fields, they are asked to secure a text and several parallel books. These parallel readings (i.e. novels and plays in literature, biographies, original sources, and interpretive readings) are designed to expose students to the materials of these subjects just as the laboratory enables students in the sciences to test theories introduced in their lecture sections.

Introductory courses tend to rely on a single text, with exceptions according to the subject as noted above. Students in upper division courses are expected to do more reading and thus buy more separate titles.
Changing Texts:

It may be necessary to change textbooks for a number of reasons:

1. In disciplines where information is continually changing, publishers respond by bringing out new editions of their texts, or, in some instances, they offer completely new texts to keep up-to-date. In other fields, minor revisions will be made when an older edition is out of print.

2. When publishers decide not to reprint a book that did not sell well, it becomes unavailable and another choice must be made.

3. To the degree that teachers have a choice (see below, "Book Decisions") and where there is frequent turnover in faculty, new selections will be made as personnel changes.

4. Teachers are nearly all in agreement that they cannot be certain that their choice of a text is wise until it is actually used in a course. Occasionally texts are not as good as expected (too deep or too superficial, students' reactions are adverse, and other reasons) and are dropped as soon as possible.

Book Decisions:

Committees prescribe book choice in a few departments and individual teachers are free to choose in others; in most departments, however, committees choose texts in introductory and multi-section courses but individual teachers exercise their own judgement at the junior and senior level.

Clemson Authors:

A growing, but proportionately small (2%), number of Clemson faculty members have written texts and manuals that are used in some courses at Clemson. These have been adopted because: (1) the writers are experts in the subjects; or (2) it is necessary that manuals be adapted to particular equipment in Clemson laboratories.

An attempt to survey the publishers for information on the use of Clemson faculty authored books resulted in an inadequate response. The committee cannot objectively address the question of the dispersal of these textbooks to other universities and colleges.

Conclusions:

Everyone is concerned about the costs of education these days. The cost of books required of college students depends on: (1) the market for certain types of books, whether they are general or narrowly specialized; (2) the type of binding, hardcover books tend to be more durable and more expensive than paperback editions; (3) the number and quality of illustrations (tables, charts, graphs, maps and pictures) and (4) their length. Generally the hardcover, specialized and copiously illustrated books tend to be used most frequently in the sciences, engineering, and some of the social sciences, whereas, books in other disciplines are more likely to be paperbound, longer, and to rely less heavily on illustrations.
The educational experience in universities is valuable only to the degree
that students are exposed to a variety of theories, philosophies and techniques
of information acquisition, interpretation and dissemination. To optimize the
educational experience of the students, it is important that teachers retain a
wide variety of options in selecting reading materials for their students. In
some disciplines and at some levels where there is need to impart a particular
body of knowledge to large numbers of students, choice of texts by committee
makes sense; otherwise, educational goals will be better served by leaving the
choice of books to the teachers of the courses.

Text and parallel books are just as important to the teaching and learning
function in universities as are laboratories, equipment and instruments. Along
with everything else, the cost of books has risen considerably in recent years.
Teachers, who buy books frequently, are aware of rising costs and have this in
mind when they assign books for students to buy.

Recommendations:

1. Teachers and departments must retain as much latitude as possible in the
   choice of text and parallel books.

2. The choice of books for introductory or multi-section courses should be
   made by departmental committees.

3. Heads of departments and the individual instructors should keep in mind
   the cost of text and parallel book selections.

4. Department heads must monitor book choices sufficiently to prevent unnec-
   essarily high book costs in courses and to guard against excessive changing
   of texts.

5. Texts should not be changed during the academic year. If it is necessary
   to change textbooks, the reason for the change should be written up and
   given to the department head for distribution to the students.

6. Close communication must be maintained between departments and the Clemson
   Bookstore to facilitate book ordering and minimize book costs.

7. The administration of the university should examine the following:
   a) Profit-sharing and/or bookstore subsidies to reduce the
      textbook costs.
   b) Techniques for reducing shipping costs such as the use of
      university vehicles to ship books from major suppliers or
      publishers or the consideration of book ordering efforts
      by the universities in the area.
A general discussion of the four areas ensued during which the following points were made:

a. Students need to be more responsible for their programs.

b. Some students complaints about advisement are legitimate.

c. Some catalogue ambiguities need correcting.

d. Faculty have too much trouble getting the latest information on course substitutions and other variations in programs.

e. Advisement approaches cannot and should not be entirely uniform; they will inevitably vary from department to department because of intrinsic differences among numbers of students, programs, and faculty resources.

f. Faculty need to keep catalogue descriptions up to date.

The consensus of the Senate appeared to center on two assertions: (1) Students need to learn to be more independent in the advisement process; and (2) Faculty signatures and "contractual responsibilities" ought to be dropped.

(F) University Committees

Search Committee for New Academic Dean - Senator West

Senator West reported that the search had narrowed to eight candidates. Six of these will visit Clemson, beginning March 3, and will see the Committee, Deans, Department Heads, Students, and Faculty. Dr. West asked for good faculty participation and especially for negative comments. The Faculty Senate will put together a review committee of its own to interview candidates. Two copies of each candidate's resume will be in the office of college deans for review by those who will interview the candidates.

5. President's Report

President's Report, February 19, 1980

1. A contract in the amount of $4.1 million for renovation of Tillman Hall has been let to Triangle Construction Company.

2. Room rates for students on campus will be raised by 15% for the academic year 1980-81.

3. The Office of the Dean of Extension will be dissolved July 1, 1980.

4. At the January 23 meeting of the President's Cabinet, the following actions were taken and information made available.

   a. The Traffic and Parking Committee was asked to review the use and advisability of continuing use of Bowman Field for parking for special events on campus.

   b. The Committee also has been asked to review the feasibility of a turning lane for the junction of Hwy 76 and Perimeter Road.
c. Total alumni giving amounted in 1979 to $2.4 million, a new record. This amount, however, includes donations earmarked for the Edwards Endowment.

d. Permission was granted to two classified employees to file grievances based on their performance appraisals.

e. A site across from the Horticulture Gardens has been approved for location of the new University Fire Station. (The site is identified as Site Number 2 on the Campus Master Planning Office drawing entitled "Fire Station Site Alternate Study," dated December 5, 1979).

5. FS 80-1-1 (Resolution on Abatements of Out-of-State Tuition on Equal Basis to Recipients of Athletic and Academic Scholarships) has been referred to the Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for study.

6. Our resolution responding to Dean H. M. Cox's proposal to have faculty turn in exam materials at the end of each semester elicited the attached clarification from Dean Cox. There have been no further discussions of this proposal in the Council of Deans.

7. Dean Hurst, Acting Dean of Undergraduate Studies Jerry Reel and I attended the conference February 11-13 on "The Faculty Handbook Revision: Content and Process." The conference was sponsored by the American Council on Education and held in Memphis, Tennessee. The presentations were excellent and resulted in greater understanding on my part of the complexity of this entire process, given recent and evolving judicial decisions and administrative rulings. Clearly, our own process of faculty manual revision cannot be commenced until President Atchley has implemented the University Council and the General Assembly has taken definitive action on the pending amendment to exempt faculty from provisions of the State Grievance Procedure Law. In the meantime, however, we can accomplish some preliminary planning. Specifically, Dean Hurst will begin immediately to locate and reference all documents basic to University administration and bearing upon the faculty and our relationship, responsibilities and duties to the University. Dr. Reel and I will compile basic informational materials gathered at the ACE conference. These materials will be available for your examination and that of any interested faculty colleagues. I will keep you informed of our progress on these fronts and will be seeking your comments and proposals regularly until the time that a committee to revise the manual is specifically proposed.

8. The Advisory Committee met Thursday, February 14.

a. The Committee heard progress reports from me on Representative Ed. Simpson's proposed amendment to the State Retirement Law on the 15-year service qualification for a pro-rated pre-retirement death benefit and on the proposed amendment to exempt faculty from the State Grievance Procedure Law.
b. The Committee discussed the request of the Search Committee for Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs that a six-member Faculty Senate delegation be elected to interview those candidates who will visit the campus beginning the first week in March. A report will be given to the Senate during our meeting. The Committee feel that a single continuing committee is preferable to a series of delegations or committees paired individually to each of the several visiting candidates.

9. You will be pleased to know that in a letter to Dr. James B. Holderman, dated February 12 and following our visit to USC, President Atchley has stated: "One of the topics discussed was the possible exchange of faculty members between the University of South Carolina and Clemson University. I should be very pleased to see such a program placed in effect and I should be pleased to have you permit Frank Borkowski and Victor Hurst to get together in order to see just how such a valuable program might be implemented."

10. You already have received and reviewed my report on our visit with our counterparts at USC-Columbia. I wish to incorporate this report into our record and such is attached.

11. On Thursday, February 14, I received a telephone call from a representative of Tri-Delt Sorority challenging the Faculty Senate to participate in the upcoming marathon football game for the American Cancer Society on campus. Specifically, they are challenging us to match their $50 contribubution and to engage them in a one-hour game on Saturday, February 23. I tentatively accepted this very formidable challenge on behalf of the Senate and hope that you will concur and participate. Matching the $50 should not be difficult; finding a dozen or so able-bodied players from among our group will be. Close approximations will have to suffice.

Respectfully submitted,

H. W. Fleming (Signed)

Commenting on the report, President Fleming noted that Faculty Handbook changes cannot begin until the University Council concept is in place and until the State Legislature resolves issues relating to Grievance procedures. We will probably hold on this until next year. When we do write a new manual, it should be done well enough to last for a while. He also noted that the Welfare Committees of the Senates of Clemson and the University of South Carolina will meet jointly in the near future (See Attachment A).
6. Old Business

Report on Admissions Policy - Senator Grubb

Senator Grubb moved the adoption of the report as recorded in the Minutes of January 15, 1980 (See those Minutes - Attachment B). Senator Young moved to strike from paragraph D, page 2, all the remaining words of that paragraph beginning with "and in no way implies" and extending through "standards of admission." He claimed that the existing wording would undermine Architecture's ability to use interviews as admission requirements. Dr. Grubb responded that the purpose of the wording was to defeat the autonomy of colleges in admission standards, and deviations, such as interviews would have to be supported by the Undergraduate Council. Senator Young protested that he wasn't able to oppose this when the report was written and he wished to do so now before the Senate. A general discussion ensued centering on the issue of whether the offending verbiage constituted a clarification, a redundancy or a potential limitation on autonomy. This fascinating etymological debate was resolved through the crude method of voting when the question was called. The motion passed, and the wording is now struck from the report.

The next issue concerning the report dealt with the question of citing algebra and geometry as math requirements instead of simply saying three units of math on page 6. After a heated exercise in arguing from the specific to the general and a series of bizarre parliamentary maneuvers, a move to delete the references to algebra and geometry was defeated and the whole amended report was adopted.

7. New Business:

A. Resolution FS-80-2-2 Resolution on Summer School Study Committee
(The Resolution is attached)

The Resolution was moved by Senator Coulter on behalf of Senator Baron who was ill. In a big discussion, Senator West urged its passage while the administration was still new. The Resolution passed.

B. Resolution FS-80-2-1 Resolution on Summer School Employment
(The Resolution is attached)

The Resolution was moved by Senator Coulter. A debate ensued over the reference to a figure of 12½% as that portion of a faculty salary paid for teaching a course during the regular sessions. It was noted that during the regular sessions faculty are paid for purposes other than teaching, but that during the summer sessions 9-month faculty are paid only to teach. After a motion to recommit the resolution to the Welfare Committee failed, a motion to amend the resolution by striking the reference to 12½% passed. After that, the Resolution was passed.

C. Resolution FS-80-2-3 Resolution on Privileges for Retired Clemson Faculty
(The Resolution is attached)

The Resolution was moved by Senator Coulter. After a brief discussion, it was passed.
WHEREAS: Clemson University has a specific responsibility to professional people, students enrolled in the several cooperative education programs, as well as the general student body to provide sound educational programs during the summer,

Therefore: Be it resolved that the administration immediately form a committee consisting of academic administrators, faculty members and a representative of the business office to examine the summer school. This committee shall define the purposes and objectives of summer school and once having defined these, shall then examine those questions relating to meeting these objectives; the committee shall be specifically charged with the consideration of:

- the summer school calendar
- the types of programs and courses that should be offered during the summer session,
- the administration of the summer school,
- the funding of the summer school,
- the employment of summer school faculty, and
- any other items that the committee or the administration may deem appropriate.

Submitted by,

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION

FS 80-2-1

Resolution on Summer School Employment

Whereas: Faculty members do not receive the same salary in the summer school session as they receive during the academic year for teaching the same course, (7½% of the academic year salary for a course in the summer, 12½% of the academic year salary for the same course during the academic year); and

Whereas: Faculty members must commit themselves to summer teaching responsibilities in advance of the summer while the University will not commit itself to providing summer employment at that same time.

Therefore: Be it resolved that the salary scale for summer teaching be made equivalent to the academic year salary scale, and further,

Be it resolved that the University give prospective summer faculty a letter of teaching commitment by March 15th; Said letter, to be signed by both parties, will serve the purpose of committing both parties to a specific teaching assignment in the coming summer session.

Submitted by

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION

FS 80-2-3

Resolution on Privileges for Retired Clemson Faculty

Whereas: Retired faculty have contributed many years of devoted service to Clemson University, and
Whereas: Retired faculty are valued and respected members of the University community, and
Whereas: Intellectual curiosity is not necessarily satiated at retirement, and
Whereas: Retired faculty can continue to make significant scholarly contributions to the educational community well past the age of retirement and thereby bring honor to Clemson University,

Therefore: Be it resolved that Clemson University permit its retired faculty to continue to use as many of its facilities as practicable and aid such faculty in obtaining access to such facilities by offering the following:

1. A computer-compatible identification card.
2. Library privileges offered active faculty.
3. Fike Field House membership option.
4. Reduced rates on athletic tickets.
5. Faculty parking privileges.
6. Use of available office and/or laboratory space.
7. Right to apply upon approval, for University research grants under the same rules as regular faculty.
8. Any other active faculty benefits which do not exert an undue financial burden on the University.

And furthermore, that the University will notify its retired faculty, in writing, of the existence of these benefits and the procedures necessary to obtain them.

Submitted by,

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
D. The Election of an Interview Committee of the Faculty Senate to Meet with Academic Dean Candidates.

Senator Grubb moved the creation of such a committee in order to increase the Faculty Senate input into the decision process. Specifically he moved:

I. The creation of a committee of six Senators plus the Vice President of the Senate to interview all six candidates; and

II. That the responsibility for selecting the six members be given to the Advisory Committee. After a question asking why there would be six members to the committee was answered (Why not?), both of the motions passed.

E. Resolution FS-80-2-4:

Whereas the Faculty Senate Resolution (Item D under New Business on January 15, 1980 was based on erroneous information

Therefore be it resolved that; the Faculty Senate hereby recall that resolution, and further

Be it resolved that the President of the Faculty Senate express our regrets to Dean Cox that such a misunderstanding did occur, and further

Be it resolved that the concerns expressed by Dean Cox in his letter of January 18, 1980 and the solution suggested therein, be addressed by the Faculty Senate Policy Committee after consultation with Dean Cox.

Further be it resolved that the committee will make recommendations concerning this matter to the Faculty Senate by the March 1980 meeting of the Senate.

(The above Resolution was submitted by W. Baron)

The Resolution was moved by Senator Coulter who explained that Dean Morris Cox had been misunderstood by the Faculty Senate last month and that the resultant resolution found in the January 15, 1980 Minutes (Item D under New Business) should be rescinded. After a brief discussion, the motion passed. (See Attachment B).

8. Announcements:

A. Senator Dick announced his intention to introduce a salutary letter to Sigma Xi next month thanking them for the recently announced research award.

B. Senator Rollin announced the next AAUP Meeting.

C. President Fleming responded to a football challenge and solicited a Faculty Senate Team presumably called the "Clemson Decrepits."

9. Adjournment: The Senate adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Edwin M. Coulter, Secretary

Members Absent:

Turnipseed, Harris, Blanton and Senter

EMC/Im
February 5, 1980

Professor Charles Coolidge, Chairman
The Faculty Senate
The University of South Carolina
Faculty House
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

Dear Charles:

Thanks again for the very gracious hospitality extended us during our visit with you and Dr. Borkowski on Monday of this week.

I am very encouraged about our evolving, close working relationship. Together, there are many goals of our faculties that we can address and accomplish. I am especially pleased that our two welfare committees may get together soon and that we have the support of you, Dr. Borkowski, quite likely that of President Holderman and your Board of Trustees for the proposed Simpson amendment to the State Retirement Law.

I want to suggest specifically that you allow us to host your welfare committee on our campus sometime during the next month or so—whenever the time from classes and other obligations on your campus will allow. We would be happy to arrange a luncheon and meeting accommodations, plus any other accommodations you and the committee might require. Please consider this approach and let me have your thinking on it.

I look forward to seeing you again very soon.

Sincerely,

Horace W. Fleming

bxcc: Faculty Senate Advisory Committee
January 18, 1980

Professor Horace Fleming
President, Faculty Senate
Clemson University

Dear Professor Fleming:

Upon reading in this morning's Tiger that a number of Faculty Senators were "incensed" by my proposals concerning deposit of grade books and final examination papers, I re-read more carefully the minutes of the Deans' Meeting where they were made. I find that, as reported, these minutes do give an incorrect impression of what I wish to accomplish. The fault is mine for not reading the draft minutes more carefully, but I think I should make known to the incensed Senators what I actually did suggest, and also something about the problem that prompted the suggestion.

The report which the Senators read seemed to suggest that I wish all faculty to deposit their gradebooks and examination papers with their departments each semester before they leave for the semester break or the summer holiday. This is not at all the case; such a measure is unnecessary and impractical. I propose only that faculty leaving the employ of the University should leave these materials, and only for their last semester of teaching. Moreover, I propose that grade books be returned to the teacher after they have been held for one semester. If teachers object to leaving their gradebooks, a xerox copy of the records of the final semester would serve equally well.

More and more frequently students are questioning and contesting their final grades, frequently going so far as filing formal grievances. Such grievances often allege misgrading of the final examination or miscalculation of the final grade; sometimes they allege that teachers did not follow their own announced weighting of quizzes, examinations, and other work. If these documents are not available for review (as when a teacher leaves University employ), there is no adequate basis for adjudicating the grievance; the student testimony stands uncontradicted; and the department or the grievance committee must base a decision solely on the one-sided evidence produced by the student. It seems to me, therefore, that it is certainly no imposition on faculty rights to ask that departing faculty leave behind the documents necessary for reviewing any claims against them. Rather, by my logic, it is a means of protecting them and their professional reputation against groundless claims of malfeasance or negligence. After all, we ask our continuing faculty to keep examination papers and gradebooks for a reasonable time; there should be nothing wrong with asking departing faculty to make the same documents available.

It might be argued that charges by students should be made before faculty leave Clemson, or be adjudicated by correspondence. This might be ideal, but it is also impractical. Most students leave Clemson for the summer before learning their final grades for the spring semester, and faculty whose connection with the University is being severed usually leave immediately after turning in their grades. Moreover, they almost never take final examination papers with them, but destroy or throw them away before leaving. It is mid-August at the earliest before the student who believes he has been treated unfairly has opportunity to discuss the matter with a department head; additional days, weeks, or
even months elapse before the laborious three-way correspondence among student, department, head, and teacher can be developed. If the student then files a grievance, the process is further extended, and usually it turns out that the examination paper has been destroyed. The clever student, knowing that he has the right to see his paper and knowing also that the department cannot furnish it, is even more tempted to file a grievance because the evidence against him is not available. Again, it seems to me that the faculty person rather than the student would be protected by my proposal.

In my College there have recently been two grievance cases in which it was not possible to secure faculty testimony because the documents were not available. In both, adjudication had to be handled on the basis of the student testimony alone, and the student had to be given the benefit of considerable doubt. Having the examination papers and semester record at hand would without question have made the process fairer and would probably have served to protect the faculty person's reputation against allegations of unfairness—allegations which, as it was, gained credence by default.

I am quite willing to accept that a grade book is the property of the teacher, but the information therein is a part of the student record; and equity, as well as University responsibility, requires that it be available. I know of no legal ruling concerning the ownership of examination papers, but it seems to me that the University is the only agency in position to preserve them for a reasonable time as part of the student record. Again, please note that I have no interest in asking continuing faculty to file their grade books or examination papers.

The problem is important enough to justify the attention of the Faculty Senate, and if it does not approve of my solution, it should come up with something better.

Because of the earlier misunderstanding, I should appreciate your making this letter a part of the Faculty Senate record.

Very sincerely yours,

H. Morris Cox
Dean, College of Liberal Arts

CC: Liberal Arts Senators
Dean Hurst
Academic Deans
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

March 25, 1980

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by President Fleming at 3:54 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes
The Minutes for February 19, 1980 were approved as written.

3. Election of Officers
Senator Burt moved the suspension of the normal order of business so that the Senate might move directly to the election of officers. He noted the late start of the meeting due to a room conflict, and he feared that, should the normal order of business be followed, many members would have to leave before the Election occurred. His motion passed. New officers were then elected by secret ballot. They are:

   President: C. Stassen Thompson, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics & Rural Sociology
   Vice President: Edwin M. Coulter, Associate Professor of Political Science
   Secretary: Priscilla M. Kline, Assistant Professor of Nursing

President Fleming bade welcome to Mr. Richard Brooks, the new editor of The Tiger, and Ms. Margaret C. Pridgen from the Office of Public Relations.

4. Special Presentation by the Advisory Committee
President Fleming announced that he was going to discuss a recent meeting between the Advisory Committee and President Atchley concerning recent administrative changes at the University. Senator Snipes moved that the Senate go into executive session for the discussion. Senator Worm seconded the motion. Senator Baron opined that, despite the sensitivity of the issue, the whole matter was already quite public and therefore there was no reason to hide the facts of our discussion. The motion failed.

President Fleming recalled recent events relating to the dismissal of Dr. H. Morris Cox from the position of Dean of the College of Liberal Arts (effective July 1, 1980), pointing out the President's official reasons for the action, which were (1) Dr. Cox's age (63) and (2) Dr. Cox's tenure in the job (10 years). President Fleming noted the concern of some faculty that there might be a presidential policy on the age and tenure of academic administrators about which the Senate had not been consulted. He noted other concerns about the effect of the rather sudden dislocation of Dean Cox on the College of Liberal Arts in terms of the College's internal situation at the present time. He reported that, after a delegation including Senators West, Lambert, and Fleming had visited with President Atchley and Dean Hurst, the President agreed to meet with the Advisory Committee as a whole to discuss the matter. At that meeting, President Atchley admitted that problems might arise from the timing of the dismissal, but that the University could surmount
them. President Atchley also stated that no such policy on age or tenure existed. Rather, he attributed the replacement of Dean Cox to a managerial philosophy of limited administrative tenure for academic administrators, involving the spending of one's final few years at Clemson in teaching and research. President Atchley indicated the desire for some better means of administrative evaluation to enable him to better implement his managerial philosophy. President Fleming noted that the Advisory Council was generally satisfied with President Atchley's explanation, but some members expressed reservations about the "management style" which accompanied the philosophy.

A general discussion ensued. Senator Burt noted that the Senate's responsibility in this matter appeared to be limited to the question of whether any procedures of the Faculty Manual had been violated, and that in his opinion, none had. He went on to say that matters of style and taste should not be commented upon by the Senate. He reminded the Senate that, at the beginning of the year, the Senate had asked President Atchley to examine the performance of administrators, and he cautioned that we should not now give the impression that we had second thoughts on the matter. Senator Baron agreed, and noted that, whereas some had been concerned about the speed of recent dismissals, including that of Dean Cox, the Senate had previously supported changes of this nature, as reflected by the Senate's position on the University Council concept. Senator Edie inquired as to when a system of administrative evaluation, such as the one alluded to by President Atchley, might be in place. Senator West suggested that it might take as long as two years. Senator Komo indicated his intention to introduce a resolution in support of the President under New Business. Senator Young expressed concern over the disorderly situation now extant and the effect this might have on candidates for Provost and other key posts now open. He worried about the attraction of Clemson to first-class people who might take a dim view of the disorder and about the effect on accreditation. President Fleming said that President Atchley did not view these issues as serious. Senator Rollin objected that President Atchley did not view the issue as more than style and taste. He insisted that the real issue was the manner of implementation of the managerial philosophy. He questioned the managerial soundness of removing too many people too soon. He feared that there were too many searches going on in the College of Liberal Arts to allow for efficient and effective management of both the College and the University. Senator Burt asked Dr. Rollin if President Atchley was appraised of this concern? The answer was Yes! Dr. Rollin went on to state his opinion that President Atchley's reasoning with regard to the timing, and manner of Dean Cox's dismissal was not impressive and that President Atchley seemed less than appreciative of the difficulties he had caused the College, which might well find itself in the position of operating under three deans within the space of a single year. Senator Turnipseed noted that Acting Administrators are normal when removals occur. Dr. Rollin responded that the problem was one of timing. If Dr. Cox had been allowed to continue for another year, he could have served the purpose of an acting dean without disturbing the continuity of the College. The discussion ended on this note.

5. Committee Reports

A. Admission and Scholarship: Senator Grubb

The Admissions and Scholarship Committee met Tuesday, March 5. The following items were discussed:

1) List of matters the Admissions and Scholarship Committee recommends that the Committee to Review Academic Regulations and Policies take
into consideration when it begins its review. Among these are the withdrawal policy, re-examination in courses failed, incomplete grades, transfer credits, substitutions and course exemptions, repeat of courses, and required course loads. Also posed is the question of whether there is a need to redefine the "discretionary authority" traditionally allowed deans regarding academic requirements and regulations. This list is being forwarded to Dean Hurst.

2) Completion of revamping of the present Grade Distribution Report. These changes, announced in last month's report, will be presented under New Business. Herman Senter, in the name of the Admissions and Scholarship Committee, discussed the recommended changes with Dean Hurst. Dean Hurst had no objections to the changes requested in the present format, saying this was a matter for the Faculty Senate to decide. The new format, if approved by the Senate, cannot be introduced until next semester; at that time it is also proposed by the Committee that all faculty members will be sent copies of the Grade Distribution Report.

3) Review of Report by Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Grade Inflation (February 10, 1976). Presently the committee is studying this report with a view to updating its findings and recommendations.

This and other matters, including a final review of the committee's work to date, will be taken up at our next meeting on Tuesday, April 1 at 3:30 in 411 Strode Tower.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Grubb, Chairman (Signed)

B. Policy: Senator West

The Committee met once, last month. No formal report has been prepared. The Committee hopes to carry over all current issues to the 1980-81 Senate. The report due this month on the issue of faculty grade books will be given at the April meeting of the Senate.

C. Research: Senator Smith

Senator Smith had no formal report this month, but he expects to make a thorough report on the status of the Copyright Policy next month. He pointed out a problem area in this regard not yet considered. The Legal Advisor to the Administration has indicated that recent decisions by the S. C. Ethics Commission indicate such a narrow definition of "work for hire" situations involving the payment of royalties for copyrighted material that the use of any University resources in such an endeavor seems to place such works under the ownership of the University. That being the case, the Senate is being asked to consider whether or not we want to create a Copyright Policy at all, since doing so would involve the submission of such a policy to the S. C. Ethics Commission for review. At present, no rulings affecting Clemson have been made. The suggestion was that we might wish to keep it that way and "let sleeping dogs lie."
Senator Grubb wondered how vulnerable we would be without a policy. Senator Smith did not know. President Fleming noted that the University was not, and would not be the problem here. The problem is the thinking of state officials who cannot distinguish between the role of faculty employees and other employees. Senator McDowell expressed reservations about the thesis that the University would not be a problem in copyrighting noting the current effort to create a "Clemson University Foundation for Intellectual Properties" which might be partially funded through royalties from University copyrighted materials. He warned that we would need a copyright policy should this come to pass. Senator Baron demurred, insisting that Clemson need not be governed by the inadequacies of the Ethics Commissions' view on the subject and noting that we might get into more trouble with a policy than without one. President Fleming agreed.

D. Welfare: Senator Baron

Senator Baron presented the Summary of the 1978-1979 Clemson University Salary Survey (Attachment A). He indicated that he would report on a similar comparison of fringe benefits next month. By way of an interim report, he noted the following:

1) Health insurance costs seem to be about the same throughout our peer institutions.

2) Life insurance shows minor differences in costs and benefits.

3) Retirement benefits are essentially the same in South Carolina, Virginia and Georgia, but North Carolina allows faculty to join optional retirement systems such as TIAA. These provide both tax-shelter advantages and transferability from state-to-state.

E. Ad Hoc Committee on the Use of Textbooks and Reference Books: Senator Kimbell

Senator Kimbell noted that the Textbook report was included in the February Minutes (see the fourth page) and that he had nothing to add there. He did offer a further report on advising, plus a minority report adding three new recommendations. The Report of the Committee on Advising is appended as Attachment B of these Minutes. The minority report in the form of a memorandum to the Faculty Senate is appended as Attachment C.

Senator Kimbell noted that the catalogue needs to indicate more clearly to students their primary responsibility for meeting their academic requirements, and that the Student Senate agrees. Further, the Student Senate agrees with the Faculty Senate that the advisor's signature on a course change is redundant.

Ad Hoc Committee on University Research and Research Funding: Senator McDowell

Senator McDowell made a progress report:

The Ad Hoc Committee on University Research and Research Funding has a preliminary draft of its final report available. We will be polishing up the report over the next few weeks and will submit a final draft to Faculty Senators before the April meeting.

Keith McDowell (Signed)
3/25/80
F. University Committees:

Athletic Council: Vice President Thompson

Vice President Thompson noted two developments:
1) It has been proposed that faculty be given a year's free membership to IPTAY.
2) Athletic Director McLellan has proposed that the number of season tickets per household, purchased at a discount, be limited to two.

The matters will be studied by the Athletic Council.

Senator Baron proposed that the Council might also fruitfully study the abuse of University automobiles by members of the academic departments. Senator Smith questioned the use of the title "academic advisor" to justify the inclusion of such "hangers on" as the Vice President for Business and Finance on out-of-state athletic trips.

Planning Council: President Fleming

President Fleming noted the continuing efforts of this body to study the feasibility of a Fine Arts Center and to undertake various landscaping projects. Senator Edie wondered if the latter included flattening the hill at the entrance to the Cemetery. President Fleming stated that this was done to create a parking lot. This was greeted by expressions of astonishment, puzzlement, curiosity, and a general reluctance to pursue the subject further.

6. President's Report: President Fleming (Attachment D - 15 pages)

President Fleming explained a number of the items in the report. Senator Baron asked why the Advisory Council had excluded the Welfare Committee's previous resolution on the subject of Faculty Senate assistance from Dean Hurst's office as discussed in item #8 of the report. President Fleming noted that the aforementioned resolution had been rejected in large part by Dean Hurst, and now the Advisory Committee was raising the issue again in a new form.

7. Old Business:

Senator Grubb proposed the election of a Senate member to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee on Scholastic Regulations. He cautioned that such a member should be a continuing member of the Senate. Three nominations were made. Senator Kimbell was elected.

8. New Business:

Senator McDowell submitted a salutary letter to be sent to Sigma Xi for its recent establishment of an award honoring a Clemson faculty member for research. (See Attachment E)

The Senate dissolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to discuss the letter. Upon reassembling, the Senate passed the letter unamended.

Senator Grubb moved the adoption of the Recommendations of Changes in the Format of the Grade Distribution Report. (Attachment F). Senator Grubb explained the provisions of the report. It was adopted as written.
Senator Komo introduced FS 80-3-1:

**FS 80-3-1**

Resolution on support of President Atchley.

WHEREAS most of the media coverage indicates that the faculty are opposed to President Atchley's recent administrative changes.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate wholeheartedly supports President Atchley in his efforts to improve the present and future Clemson University, including whatever changes in administrative responsibilities or personnel are in his judgement necessary to achieve these ends.

Senator Komo stated that he was responding to the urging of several of his colleagues. Senator Rollin opposed the resolution. He pointed out that it moves the Senate into a sensitive area, draws a line between the President and the College of Liberal Arts, and possibly draws a line between the President and the Faculty Senate. He went on to say that the Senate need not respond to media comment, noting that "we cannot control the interpretations of the media put upon our internal problems." He concluded by observing that Liberal Arts would view the passage of the resolution as a "slap in the face." Senator Coulter stated that the preamble of the resolution was inaccurate in its statement that "the media coverage indicates that the faculty are opposed to ... recent administrative changes," noting that the story concerned showed a divided faculty. There followed a heated debate on the appropriateness of the resolution.

Senator Coulter moved to table the resolution and the motion passed.

President Fleming announced the need to select three persons to work with Mr. John Newton on a committee to address the issue of student liability insurance coverage. He asked permission to name former Senator Clarence Hood. This was approved by voice vote and by similar method, Dr. Fleming was instructed to let the Advisory Council choose the other two. A suggestion was made to include a member of the Welfare Committee on the list of two names.

9. Announcements

President Fleming announced that reservations have been made for two persons to attend the second ACE Conference on the Faculty Handbook/Manual, this one to be held the week of April 21 in Pittsburgh, Pa. The new President of the Faculty Senate will be one of these persons.

10. Adjournment: The Senate adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

Edwin M. Coulter, Secretary

There were no absences.
SUMMARY OF THE
1978-1979 CLEMSON UNIVERSITY SALARY SURVEY

Attached is a summary of the Clemson University Business Office's 1978-1979 Clemson University Faculty Salary Survey. This summary of the salary data was accomplished by the Welfare Committee of the Faculty Senate.

The 1978-79 Salary Survey was presented as a graphical display of the salaries of faculty at Clemson University and seven other universities. The Welfare Committee using the graphical data, determined the average salary for each faculty unit, for each university, as reported in the salary survey. The difference between the averages for Clemson faculty unit and the averages for the corresponding faculty units at the other seven institutions were also determined. Both the averages and the differences are listed on the following pages. A negative difference indicates that the Clemson University faculty unit's was lower than the average. The Clemson faculty unit's ranking amongst all the schools was also determined. A position of eighth out of eight indicates the Clemson faculty unit received the lowest average salary within the comparison group.

Note: Agriculture and Forestry salaries are expressed on a 12 month salary; all others are 9-month salaries. No faculty having administrative duties were included in any period.
**COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>$31,931</td>
<td>$24,521</td>
<td>$21,416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>32,363</td>
<td>- 432</td>
<td>26,723</td>
<td>- 2,202</td>
<td>23,792</td>
<td>- 2,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>32,521</td>
<td>- 590</td>
<td>25,742</td>
<td>- 1,221</td>
<td>22,557</td>
<td>- 1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>32,975</td>
<td>-1,044</td>
<td>26,091</td>
<td>- 1,570</td>
<td>22,366</td>
<td>+ 950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>30,225</td>
<td>+1,706</td>
<td>25,066</td>
<td>- 545</td>
<td>20,993</td>
<td>+ 432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clemson Ranking: 4 of 5
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# SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>23,027</td>
<td>-7,697</td>
<td>22,280</td>
<td>-115</td>
<td>17,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30,725</td>
<td>-973</td>
<td>22,395</td>
<td>+1,938</td>
<td>17,917</td>
<td>-867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>-4,373</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>+280</td>
<td>17,669</td>
<td>-619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>22,850</td>
<td>+177</td>
<td>19,744</td>
<td>+2,536</td>
<td>16,950</td>
<td>+100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>23,250</td>
<td>-223</td>
<td>21,145</td>
<td>+1,135</td>
<td>16,854</td>
<td>-196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>28,014</td>
<td>-4,987</td>
<td>19,247</td>
<td>+3,035</td>
<td>17,845</td>
<td>-795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>26,830</td>
<td>-3,803</td>
<td>21,438</td>
<td>+842</td>
<td>18,483</td>
<td>-1,433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clemson Ranking: 7 of 8  2 of 8  6 of 8
## College of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>$23,510</td>
<td>$20,200</td>
<td>$17,400</td>
<td>- $3,040</td>
<td>$17,990</td>
<td>- $590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26,780</td>
<td>- 3,270</td>
<td>23,240</td>
<td>- 3,040</td>
<td>17,890</td>
<td>- 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>- 1,390</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>- 400</td>
<td>17,990</td>
<td>- 590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>27,870</td>
<td>- 4,380</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td>- 2,900</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>- 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>26,130</td>
<td>- 2,620</td>
<td>22,600</td>
<td>- 2,400</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>- 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>26,810</td>
<td>- 3,300</td>
<td>21,910</td>
<td>- 1,710</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>- 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>26,380</td>
<td>- 2,870</td>
<td>19,010</td>
<td>+ 1,190</td>
<td>17,850</td>
<td>- 450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clemson Ranking: 7 of 7

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>$27,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>31,600</td>
<td>- 3,900</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>- 1,100</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>- 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>- 1,100</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td>- 800</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>- 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>30,200</td>
<td>- 2,500</td>
<td>25,400</td>
<td>- 3,100</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>- 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>29,400</td>
<td>- 1,700</td>
<td>23,700</td>
<td>- 1,400</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>- 1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>- 700</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>- 600</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>+ 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clemson Ranking: 6 of 6
### College of Forestry and Recreation

#### Forestry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemson</td>
<td>$32,628.13</td>
<td>$26,093.75</td>
<td>$21,033.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>33,100.00</td>
<td>- 472.00</td>
<td>29,544.44</td>
<td>- 3,450.69</td>
<td>24,273.44</td>
<td>- 3,240.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>33,412.50</td>
<td>- 784.37</td>
<td>27,200.00</td>
<td>- 1,105.25</td>
<td>23,318.00</td>
<td>- 2,284.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>29,037.50</td>
<td>+ 3,590.63</td>
<td>23,130.00</td>
<td>+ 2,963.75</td>
<td>20,158.33</td>
<td>+ 875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>31,056.67</td>
<td>+ 1,571.46</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23,275.00</td>
<td>- 2,241.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lemson Ranking: 3 of 5

#### Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemson</td>
<td>$22,193.75</td>
<td>$20,450</td>
<td>$19,350.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>27,100.00</td>
<td>- 4,906.25</td>
<td>20,950</td>
<td>- 500</td>
<td>18,260.71</td>
<td>+ 1,089.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17,925</td>
<td>+ 2,525</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>+ 3,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>25,200.00</td>
<td>- 3,006.25</td>
<td>19,890</td>
<td>+ 560</td>
<td>16,995</td>
<td>+ 2,355.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23,330</td>
<td>- 2,880</td>
<td>17,071</td>
<td>+ 2,279.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lemson Ranking: 2 of 5
### COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

#### Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>18,343</td>
<td>+ 1,257</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>+ 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>32,600</td>
<td>21,550</td>
<td>- 2,050</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>+ 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>27,675</td>
<td>19,243</td>
<td>+ 357</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>+ 800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>+1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>24,467</td>
<td>19,635</td>
<td>+ 35</td>
<td>16,750</td>
<td>+ 250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clemson Ranking: -- 3 of 5

#### Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30,533</td>
<td>23,375</td>
<td>- 3,375</td>
<td>18,067</td>
<td>-1,667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>27,900</td>
<td>20,440</td>
<td>- 440</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>31,380</td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>- 1,375</td>
<td>17,040</td>
<td>- 640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>28,360</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>+ 400</td>
<td>-16,602</td>
<td>- 202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>21,067</td>
<td>- 1,067</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>+ 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>29,138</td>
<td>19,556</td>
<td>+ 444</td>
<td>16,750</td>
<td>- 350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clemson Ranking: -- 5 of 7
### Foreign Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td>- 8,400</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>- 6,100</td>
<td>17,575</td>
<td>- 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>- 1,200</td>
<td>20,720</td>
<td>- 1,220</td>
<td>16,775</td>
<td>+ 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>32,320</td>
<td>-10,320</td>
<td>23,060</td>
<td>- 3,560</td>
<td>17,071</td>
<td>+ 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>30,760</td>
<td>- 8,760</td>
<td>20,672</td>
<td>- 1,170</td>
<td>16,629</td>
<td>+ 521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>+ 1,400</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>+ 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>28,543</td>
<td>- 6,543</td>
<td>21,275</td>
<td>- 1,775</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>- 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>- 2,000</td>
<td>20,514</td>
<td>- 1,014</td>
<td>16,550</td>
<td>+ 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson Ranking</td>
<td>7 of 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Political Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30,520</td>
<td>- 8,320</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>- 2,200</td>
<td>16,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26,733</td>
<td>- 4,533</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>+ 500</td>
<td>17,714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>34,261</td>
<td>-12,061</td>
<td>24,666</td>
<td>- 4,666</td>
<td>16,825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>29,336</td>
<td>- 7,136</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>- 800</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>32,475</td>
<td>-10,275</td>
<td>20,571</td>
<td>- 571</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>32,250</td>
<td>-10,050</td>
<td>18,171</td>
<td>+ 1,829</td>
<td>17,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson Ranking</td>
<td>7 of 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sociology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>33,166</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,410</td>
<td>- 3,760</td>
<td>16,258</td>
<td>+ 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,083</td>
<td>+ 1,567</td>
<td>17,762</td>
<td>- 1,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>36,662</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,075</td>
<td>- 3,425</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>+ 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>32,964</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,230</td>
<td>- 580</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>- 1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>31,650</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,865</td>
<td>- 1,215</td>
<td>15,151</td>
<td>+ 1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>24,718</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,387</td>
<td>- 737</td>
<td>15,550</td>
<td>+ 825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson Ranking</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 of 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ENGLISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>27,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>29,600</td>
<td>-1,800</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>+400</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>+700</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>38,800</td>
<td>-11,000</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>-3,400</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>-1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>31,600</td>
<td>-3,800</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>+100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>+6,700</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>+1,600</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>+800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>26,400</td>
<td>+1,400</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>-400</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>+3,700</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>+400</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>-900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clemson Ranking: 4 of 8

### HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>27,075</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>28,910</td>
<td>-1,835</td>
<td>20,187</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>18,721</td>
<td>-3,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26,720</td>
<td>+355</td>
<td>21,087</td>
<td>-887</td>
<td>17,654</td>
<td>-2,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>31,773</td>
<td>-4,798</td>
<td>23,547</td>
<td>-3,347</td>
<td>17,483</td>
<td>-2,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>29,910</td>
<td>-2,835</td>
<td>19,867</td>
<td>+333</td>
<td>17,707</td>
<td>-2,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>27,725</td>
<td>-650</td>
<td>19,794</td>
<td>+406</td>
<td>17,025</td>
<td>-1,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>29,634</td>
<td>-2,559</td>
<td>19,085</td>
<td>+1,115</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>-897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**MUSIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,343</td>
<td>+1,257</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>+ 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>32,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,550</td>
<td>-2,050</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>+ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>27,675</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,243</td>
<td>+ 357</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>+ 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>+1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>24,467</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,635</td>
<td>+ 35</td>
<td>16,750</td>
<td>+ 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson Ranking</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Of 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Of 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PSYCHOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30,533</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,375</td>
<td>-3,375</td>
<td>18,067</td>
<td>-2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>27,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,440</td>
<td>- 440</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>-2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>31,380</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>-1,375</td>
<td>17,040</td>
<td>-1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>28,360</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>+ 400</td>
<td>16,602</td>
<td>-1,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,067</td>
<td>-1,067</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>29,138</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,556</td>
<td>+ 444</td>
<td>16,750</td>
<td>-1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson Ranking</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Of 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Of 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Professor Difference</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof. Difference</td>
<td>Assist. Prof. Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>+9,317</td>
<td>+419</td>
<td>17,473 +1,267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>+12,000</td>
<td>+1,554</td>
<td>18,350 +3,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Chemistry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>27,327</td>
<td>-4,058</td>
<td>21,282</td>
<td>-2,018</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>-3,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>31,385</td>
<td>+1,627</td>
<td>21,464</td>
<td>-182</td>
<td>17,550</td>
<td>-1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>25,700</td>
<td>-2,210</td>
<td>22,888</td>
<td>-1,606</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>-1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>29,537</td>
<td>-2,279</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>+82</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>-1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>29,606</td>
<td>-1,573</td>
<td>20,629</td>
<td>+653</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>-1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>31,663</td>
<td>-4,336</td>
<td>22,412</td>
<td>-1,130</td>
<td>17,109</td>
<td>-1,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>28,063</td>
<td>-736</td>
<td>21,033</td>
<td>+249</td>
<td>17,455</td>
<td>-1,655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Bio Chemistry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>20,067</td>
<td>-1,833</td>
<td>16,733</td>
<td>-1,007</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21,900</td>
<td>-1,833</td>
<td>17,740</td>
<td>-1,007</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>23,120</td>
<td>-1,833</td>
<td>18,410</td>
<td>-1,817</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>20,650</td>
<td>-1,833</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>-267</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>20,733</td>
<td>-1,833</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>-1,567</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Computer Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>24,120</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19,166</td>
<td>-966</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>22,675</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>-2,300</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18,850</td>
<td>-650</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>23,925</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19,379</td>
<td>-1,179</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Biology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>24,600</td>
<td>-7,680</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>-1,800</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>-960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>32,280</td>
<td>-3,190</td>
<td>20,520</td>
<td>+80</td>
<td>17,260</td>
<td>-930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>27,790</td>
<td>-6,970</td>
<td>23,350</td>
<td>-2,750</td>
<td>16,070</td>
<td>+260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>31,570</td>
<td>-4,980</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>-500</td>
<td>17,670</td>
<td>-1,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>29,580</td>
<td>-850</td>
<td>21,380</td>
<td>-780</td>
<td>19,570</td>
<td>-3,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>25,450</td>
<td>-5,670</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>+100</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>-1,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>30,270</td>
<td>+750</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>+100</td>
<td>18,070</td>
<td>-1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>23,850</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Micro Biology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>-3,600</td>
<td>17,130</td>
<td>+270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>28,475</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>-5,200</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>32,333</td>
<td>32,767</td>
<td>27,670</td>
<td>-5,200</td>
<td>23,700</td>
<td>-6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>37,100</td>
<td>37,900</td>
<td>27,670</td>
<td>-2,910</td>
<td>19,820</td>
<td>-2,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td>25,310</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>+1,100</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>+1,100</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>29,726</td>
<td>-3,547</td>
<td>22,404</td>
<td>-966</td>
<td>17,770</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>33,273</td>
<td>+3,294</td>
<td>23,928</td>
<td>-1,524</td>
<td>17,856</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26,432</td>
<td>-2,106</td>
<td>20,854</td>
<td>+1,550</td>
<td>16,990</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>31,832</td>
<td>-2,866</td>
<td>20,504</td>
<td>+1,900</td>
<td>16,121</td>
<td>1,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>32,592</td>
<td>+1,247</td>
<td>19,360</td>
<td>+3,044</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>2,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>28,479</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>29,830</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>26,653</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30,644</td>
<td>-3,991</td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>-3,700</td>
<td>18,146</td>
<td>-2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>28,740</td>
<td>-2,087</td>
<td>21,611</td>
<td>-1,111</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>-1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>30,767</td>
<td>-4,114</td>
<td>24,455</td>
<td>-3,955</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>-1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>28,409</td>
<td>-1,756</td>
<td>20,380</td>
<td>+120</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>28,712</td>
<td>-2,059</td>
<td>21,518</td>
<td>-1,018</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>-1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>28,433</td>
<td>-1,780</td>
<td>21,383</td>
<td>-883</td>
<td>19,060</td>
<td>-3,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clemson Ranking: 8 of 8
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8 of 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemson</td>
<td>$28,190</td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,640</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>-4,810</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>-2,360</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>-1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26,580</td>
<td>+1,610</td>
<td>24,700</td>
<td>-1,060</td>
<td>19,930</td>
<td>-760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>29,140</td>
<td>-950</td>
<td>22,970</td>
<td>+670</td>
<td>19,560</td>
<td>-390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>33,290</td>
<td>-5,100</td>
<td>23,310</td>
<td>+330</td>
<td>20,390</td>
<td>-1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>30,520</td>
<td>-2,330</td>
<td>22,750</td>
<td>+890</td>
<td>18,650</td>
<td>+520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>32,580</td>
<td>-4,390</td>
<td>22,130</td>
<td>+1,510</td>
<td>18,690</td>
<td>+480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>26,450</td>
<td>+1,740</td>
<td>22,130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textile Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemson</td>
<td>$29,310</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,930</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>+3,810</td>
<td>21,930</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td>+2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>27,650</td>
<td>+1,660</td>
<td>23,680</td>
<td>-1,750</td>
<td>21,070</td>
<td>+270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>+2,310</td>
<td>21,130</td>
<td>+800</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>+2,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lemson Ranking       | 6 of 8    |            | 4 of 8      |            | 6 of 8        |            |
Agriculture - 12 Month Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>31,931</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,521</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>32,363</td>
<td>-432</td>
<td>26,723</td>
<td>-2,202</td>
<td>23,792</td>
<td>-2,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>32,521</td>
<td>-590</td>
<td>25,742</td>
<td>-1,221</td>
<td>22,557</td>
<td>-1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>32,975</td>
<td>-1,044</td>
<td>26,091</td>
<td>-1,570</td>
<td>22,366</td>
<td>-950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>30,225</td>
<td>+1,706</td>
<td>25,066</td>
<td>-545</td>
<td>20,993</td>
<td>+432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson Ranking</td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 of 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salaries Expressed on Nine-Month Basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Assist. Prof.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>26,126</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,063</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,523</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26,479</td>
<td>-353</td>
<td>21,865</td>
<td>-1,802</td>
<td>19,467</td>
<td>-1,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26,609</td>
<td>-483</td>
<td>21,062</td>
<td>-999</td>
<td>18,456</td>
<td>-933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>26,980</td>
<td>-854</td>
<td>21,348</td>
<td>-1,285</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>-777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>24,730</td>
<td>+1,396</td>
<td>20,509</td>
<td>-446</td>
<td>17,176</td>
<td>+347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson Ranking</td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 of 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report of the Committee on Advising

A joint faculty/student committee on advising, which has representation from the Undergraduate Council, the Student Senate and the Faculty Senate, have found several points to be important in academic advising and would urge an advising system that encourages the following:

a. an environment for good rapport between advisor and advisee,

b. a clear understanding of student and advisor responsibility,

c. continuity of the student/advisor relationship at Clemson, and

d. easy accessibility to the advisor by the student.

Therefore, we recommend that:

1. A faculty advisor be routinely assigned no more than 25-30 advisees. However, in those departments where the number of advisees for one advisor must exceed a reasonable number (25-30), either an administrative secretary, or an administrative advisor be appointed to help alleviate the advising problem, or a central advising office which would function as an administrative check-up office for students be established on campus, or advisors with more than 30 students be compensated in some way.

2. The assigned advisor/advisee relationship continue for the undergraduate's tenure in a major.

3. The advisor's posted office hours be observed throughout the year for advising and that the advisor be especially accessible during the pre-registration period.

4. The pre-registration period be extended to two weeks to allow for more even distribution of advising time at the department's discretion.

5. Students obtain their pre-registration packets from their advisors.

6. A pamphlet be published or a more detailed section be added to the Student Handbook concerning advising, registration and pre-registration.

Further, we urge debate on the necessity of the advisor's signature of approval and the student and advisor responsibility in the advising process. And, we suggest that the chairman of the Student Senate Academic Affairs Committee and the chairman of the Faculty Senate Admissions and Scholarships Committee be informal Ombudsmen for advising problems.
March 10, 1980

MEMORANDUM

To: The Faculty Senate

From: Senators Kimbell and Mazur, Student Representatives Oscar Lovelace and John Pettigrew

In addition to the six (6) recommendations in the "Report of the Committee on Advising," we recommend that:

(1) The second paragraph on the inside cover of the 1979-80 Clemson University Undergraduate Announcements that satisfactorily stipulates the respective responsibilities in the advisor/advisee relationship be shown in a much more noticeable manner (location, bold print, etc.).

(2) The third and fourth paragraphs in the aforementioned locations be carefully reviewed for both their intent and extent of application.

(3) The advisor's initials or signature be intended as an acknowledgement that advice and not approval has taken place. The advisor's signature is redundant in the drop and add process (refer to (1) above).

JAK: mj
The purpose of this catalog is to provide prospective students with a general description of Clemson University and give detailed information regarding the various colleges and departments within the University and curricula offered by the University. Inasmuch as the educational process necessitates change, the information and educational requirements in this catalog represent a flexible program which may be altered where such alterations are thought to be in the mutual interest of the University and its students.

All colleges and departments establish certain academic requirements which must be met before a degree is granted. Advisers, department heads, and deans are available to help the student understand and arrange to meet these requirements, but the student is responsible for fulfilling them. At the end of a student's course of study, if requirements for graduation have not been satisfied the degree will not be granted. For this reason, it is important for each student to acquaint himself or herself with all academic requirements for the desired degree, to remain currently informed of such requirements throughout his or her college career, and to be responsible for completing all such requirements in a timely manner.

The provisions of this catalog do not constitute any offer for a contract which may be accepted by students through registration and enrollment in the University. The University reserves the right to change without notice any fee, provision, offering, or requirement in this catalog and to determine whether a student has satisfactorily met its requirements for admission or graduation. The University further reserves the right to require a student to withdraw from the University for cause at any time.

The requirements for each curriculum shall be the catalog requirements in effect on the date of enrollment in that curriculum. If a student withdraws from the University and subsequently returns, the catalog requirements in effect at the time of return will control.
President's Report
March 25, 1980

1. During the past month, I have addressed to you several memoranda containing information on a variety of subjects. I wish to make these a part of our record and append them to this report. Items listed in my memorandum to Dean Hurst of March 4, 1980 are still under review by his office and other executive officers of the University.

   a. The Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee is still at work on revising their charter and will present proposals to President Atchley shortly.

   b. A report on the review by Vice President Cox's office of access by faculty and staff to Fike Recreation Center also is due shortly to the Cabinet.

   c. A list of specific measures for more adequately supporting Faculty Senate officers has been developed by the Advisory Committee and is described below.

2. I recommend that we proceed immediately to constitute a three-member ad hoc committee to address the issue of student liability insurance coverage in consultation with Mr. John Newton. (See memorandum to Faculty Senate, March 5, 1980.)


   a. It was announced to the Council by Dean Hurst that the S. C. Commission on Higher Education soon will begin a review of graduate programs for the purpose of determining if they should be continued. Presently, CHE is studying mathematical, physical and biological sciences programs across the state. No other fields probably will be examined prior to January 1, 1980 or thereabouts.

   b. The Council received final recommendations of the Graduate Council's Subcommittee on Admissions Requirements for Foreign Students and decided that the attached (see President's Report, Attachment 1) should be considered interim guidelines with the graduate school consulting closely with colleges and departments in evaluating other evidence of candidates' proficiency in English.

   c. The Council adopted the recommendations of the Graduate Council's Ad Hoc Committee on Alumni Graduate Fellowships pertaining to criteria for selection of Alumni Graduate Fellows. (See President's Report, Attachment 2.)
d. The Council received for comment a report from the Undergraduate Council on definitions for the Student Data Base. (See President's Report, Attachment 3.)

4. The Council of Deans currently has under discussion the possibility of rotating the Alumni Distinguished Professorships. President Atchley has mentioned the possibility of awarding these professorships for a five-year period on an "immediately" non-renewable basis once each has expired. The deans have voiced concern over this concept and have raised questions about various aspects of tenure within colleges, renewal, reduction of salaries on their expiration, whether President Atchley's proposal would extend to endowed chairs, and the like. I recommend that one of our standing committees be directed to contact Dean Trevillian, who is chairing a subcommittee of the Council, to receive whatever information he and the committee might properly share with us and to begin to develop a position on the issue for the Faculty Senate.

5. The Highway 93 Committee have presented their report to President Atchley and the Cabinet. He should release it shortly. As soon as it is released, I will ask that copies be made available to all Senators for comment and in order that we can provide comments before any final decisions are made.

6. Since the Faculty Senate has proposed changes in the current format of the grade distribution report, Dean Hurst has decided to withhold printing the results of the first semester 1979-1980 report until these changes have been effected.

7. President Atchley will become chairman of the Council of Presidents in July of this year. I know that you join me in congratulating him on being named to this position. The Council can have a substantial impact on higher education planning and policy in the state, as can President Atchley in this particular position.

8. The Advisory Committee met three times during the past month, twice to take care of routine business and once to discuss with the President recent administrative changes within the University. A report by the Committee on our session with the President March 19 will be presented early in the meeting. In meetings of the committee March 5 and 10, the following matters were considered and actions taken.

   a. The Committee received nominations for Faculty Senate offices, to be voted on during this meeting. The Committee recommend to you the following:
b. The Committee proposed that we seek the following assistance for Faculty Senate officers:

- summer stipend for Faculty Senate President
- quarter-time reduction in load for Vice President and Secretary
- part-time secretarial assistance
- travel budget
- typewriter and filing cabinets to be located in Senate office space
- an office in the Student Government/Student Union building complex

I have discussed this matter with Dean Hurst and hope to have some commitments from his office very soon.

9. A letter has been drafted by me and forwarded to Dean H. M. Cox expressing regrets that his proposal to the Council of Deans in December that grade books be turned in to departments by departing faculty at semester's end was misinterpreted by the Senate, thus prompting a rather strongly-worded resolution directed toward this proposal. A copy is appended. (See President's Report, Attachment 4.)

10. Contrary to the report in the Tiger, the Faculty Senate forces prevailed over those of Delta-Delta-Delta, although barely (7-6), in the football marathon for the American Cancer Society. The prize was a bucket of chicken donated by Kentucky Fried Chicken. The prize was passed on to our opponents, as we were too sick and tired after an hour's exertion even to consider the prospects of trying to eat it.

11. At the February 21, 1980 meeting of the Cabinet, the following policy on rock concerts on campus was adopted.

(1) The Union Staff and the Union Board, in conjunction with the Central Dance/Concert Committee, will work
towards screening out potential concerts that attract a less than desirable audience.

(2) The Union will initiate a program to educate the campus community and encourage participants to take a mature position in regards to their conduct at rock concerts. Students must assume an active role in promoting responsible behavior with their peers.

(3) A concerted effort to inform off-campus participants of state and university regulations is essential if we are to promote responsible behavior amongst all who attend concerts at Clemson. The University Union will approach this task through:

   a. Dissemination of information at all off-campus ticket outlets including Greenville, Anderson and Clemson.

   b. The publication of university policy through local newspaper and radio avenues.

   c. Printing information about University policy on the back of all admission tickets.

(4) The Union will encourage the use of total reserved seating whenever feasible to facilitate better crowd control.

(5) A more stringent policy of search and seizure will be enforced at all entrances to coliseum concerts. Those participants who refuse to be searched when asked by venue security will be refused admittance. Our objective is not to increase arrests but to decrease the amount of alcohol and drugs entering the Coliseum.

(6) All segments of concert security personnel (University Police Officers, CROWE security, and student police) will be utilized more effectively at key locations inside and outside the coliseum to facilitate crowd control and curtail alcohol and drug abuse.

(7) Ushers will also be utilized to assist the hired security in patron seating and keeping check on smoking, etc. in their designated areas. The exact number of ushers will be determined by total venue attendance.

(8) The Central Dance/Concert Committee will organize
President's Report
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a Concert Peer Patrol. This organization of 20-30 volunteers will patrol the coliseum to keep check on cigarette smoking, alcohol and drug abuse. Used successfully at other institutions, this "Peer Patrol" advocates peer pressure and encourages concert participants to use more responsible accepted behavior. They are not a substitute for hired security but an avenue to eliminate irresponsible, immature behavior of their peers. The "Peer Patrol" will keep a check on coliseum bathrooms and other lobbies as well as the seating areas.

(9) Signs will be posted inside and outside the coliseum to inform participants of University regulations and strict enforcements of state laws governing alcohol and drugs. Local announcements of the above shall be utilized.

(10) The University Union will work closely with the Director of Public Safety to insure effective coordination of all security in Littlejohn Coliseum.

(11) The University Union will periodically review procedures involving the supervision of concerts.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

H. W. Fleming
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS*

Philosophical Statement

The political ramifications associated with foreign student enrollment are beyond the scope of the Graduate Council. This subcommittee and the Graduate Council should confine their efforts to two questions:

(1) How do we identify foreign students that have satisfied the academic requirements established by the Graduate School and individual departments?

(2) How do we determine if a foreign applicant is sufficiently proficient in English to handle graduate study?

Determination of Foreign Applicant's Academic Preparation for Graduate Study

Tradition imposes three indicators of an applicant's aptitude and preparation for graduate study: (1) GRE-scores, (2) GPR, and (3) Letters of Recommendation. When possible, the same standards utilized for evaluating domestic students should be imposed on foreign students. When similar evaluations are not possible, then available information should be scrutinized as follows:

GRE -

(1) A satisfactory score (>1000 on quantitative + verbal) should be viewed as a strong indication of appropriate aptitude and preparation for graduate study. Recall that a foreign student faces a language barrier in this exam. Hence, satisfactory scores may indicate strong potential for success.

(2) Marginal scores (900-999) should be viewed more cautiously. In graduate studies that emphasize quantitative and analytical aptitude (i.e., mathematics, chemistry, physics, engineering) a relatively lower verbal score but a high analytical score may warrant acceptance. The reverse combination may be true for graduate study in English and allied areas. In contrast, below average scores in both areas of the GRE should dictate rejection.

(3) Departments should be advised to require foreign applicants to take the appropriate advanced portion of the exam. This score should be of considerable assistance to a department when an applicant's GPR is difficult to evaluate.

* For the report a "foreign student" is any non-American who has not completed an undergraduate degree in its entirety in the U.S.
GPR -

(1) Evaluation of foreign students' transcripts (or lack of it) is probably the weakest point in our admission system. Someone in The Graduate School office should be trained in this area so departments would have some feedback on the quality of the applicant's undergraduate institution and also his or her level of academic performance. When terminology used at the foreign school can be equated with Clemson's GPR system, the student should meet the same requirements as domestic students. (See Figure 2, Manual for Graduate Advisors.)

(2) When terminology cannot be equated and the applicant's GRE is ≥ 900, then the Graduate School should seek the assistance of the applicant's major department. Departmental faculty may be able to: (1) assess the quality of education based on the foreign institution's reputation; or (2) evaluate the student's aptitude for graduate study based on advanced GRE scores along with an estimate of the GPR. (The major point here is that the department and Graduate School must work closely in deriving an evaluation of the student's preparation.)

Letters of Recommendation -

Recommendations are always difficult to evaluate and should be judged in light of the author's reputation, institution, and the spectrum of qualities evaluated in the letter. Ultimately interpretation of recommendations resides totally with the department and should carry the greatest influence in marginal cases and in cases where the GPR is difficult to evaluate.

Summation -

Academic preparation and aptitude of foreign applicants should be judged by the same standards as for domestic applicants. When interpretation of the GPR precludes the normal acceptance procedure, the appropriate department should assist in the acceptance procedure by evaluating: (1) the institution and department sending the transcript, (2) advanced GRE scores, and (3) letters of recommendation.

Evaluation of English Proficiency

Our understanding of the purpose for the TOEFL test is to evaluate a foreign applicant's readiness to embark on a graduate program that utilizes English as the principal language. After review of literature concerning TOEFL and a survey of the practices of other universities, the committee recommends that the present procedures be continued. In brief the following interpretation of scores is suggested for applicants that meet the academic requirements of a graduate program:

TOEFL Scores 550 and Above and Scores of 50 or More on Each Section

Accept for admission.

TOEFL Scores Less Than 550 and/or Score of Less Than 50 On One Or More Sections:

Not acceptable.
December 5, 1979

Subcommittee on Admission Requirements
For Foreign Students

Minority Report
Prepared by L. A. Dyck

The subcommittee was charged with the responsibility for reviewing the Admissions Requirements for Foreign Students. For efficiency the charge was divided into two parts: (1) Determination of the minimum academic qualifications a foreign student must have for acceptance by the Graduate School, and (2) Determination of the proficiency in English a foreign student needs for acceptance by the Graduate School.

This (minority) report addresses the second point (English proficiency). Majority and minority are in agreement on academic requirements: Foreign students must satisfy the same academic standards as expected of domestic students.

The question to be addressed is twofold: (1) What is the minimal English proficiency expected of foreign applicants, and (2) How do scores on the TOEFL-exam (test of English as a foreign language) relate to English proficiency? The Educational Testing Service (administer of the TOEFL exam) has extensively reviewed both questions and also has surveyed the use of TOEFL scores by universities throughout the United States (1977). Based on these data they make recommendations on how the TOEFL-scores should be utilized in making admission decisions. On the following page are their recommendations (pg. 12, TOEFL Test and Score Manual).
### Admissions Recommendations Relative to TOEFL scores

The 1977 survey yielded additional specific information relating to the use of TOEFL scores in admissions decisions. The recommended admissions policies below are based on the assumption that individual applicants meet the academic requirements of the programs for which they are applying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Recommended Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 550 and above | Admit with no restrictions at both graduate and undergraduate levels. Exceptions:  
1. Applicants with significantly lower scores in one test section may require supplementary work in English to develop their skills in this area.  
2. Graduate students in fields such as journalism, which require near-native proficiency in English, should have total scores of at least 600 for unrestricted programs of study in these subjects. |
| 500-549 | Admit with no restrictions graduate students in highly technical fields, such as mathematics, chemistry, physics, and engineering. Other students may be admitted but with initial limitation on academic load and with supplementary instruction in English for at least the first term. |
| 450-499 | Admit if strong in all aspects of application other than English proficiency. Individual cases should be reviewed, with consideration given to field of study and TOEFL section scores. Applicants scoring in this range generally require a significant amount of English instruction (perhaps half time) with a corresponding reduction in normal course load.* |
| Below 450 | Readiness to begin studies doubtful. Applicants scoring in this range generally require a full-time program in English before embarking on even a limited academic program. *In compliance with Immigration and Naturalization Service requirements, which call for full programs of study, an institution that does not offer courses in English as a second language should consider advising applicants in this range to attend an English language institute at a full-time level, and such time as they can begin a full program of study at the institution requested. |

---

*In compliance with Immigration and Naturalization Service requirements, which call for full programs of study, an institution that does not offer courses in English as a second language should consider advising applicants in this range to attend an English language institute at a full-time level, until such time as they can begin a full program of study at the institution requested.
The minority position holds that the Educational Testing Service recommendations should form the basis for establishing Clemson University's admission policy. Specifically, admission to the Graduate School requires that foreign applicants meet the academic requirements established by the Graduate School, and the English proficiency requirement recommended under the "admit with no restrictions" - heading by the Educational Testing Service. Guidelines for English proficiency are scaled according to discipline as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Minimum Acceptable TOEFL Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journalism and related areas</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Technical Fields</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Other&quot; Fields</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Recommendations

1. Although the minimum acceptable TOEFL-scores form the guidelines for making admission decisions, exceptions can exist.
   
   (a) Applicants with outstanding academic credentials should not be eliminated from consideration for admission on the basis of TOEFL scores alone.

   (b) Departments and/or major professors that have good "track records" with foreign graduate students should be consulted in making admission decisions in "marginal" cases. (Note: at minimum, marginal cases are those involving scores that fall within the TOEFL standard error of measurement; 16 points).

2. Subscores (section scores) on the TOEFL exam should not be utilized by the Graduate School in making admission decisions. However, the Graduate School should be encouraged to continue the practice of advising departments and potential major advisors on the meaning of subscores.

Additional Support and Information

1. About one-half (58 of 120) of the Graduate Schools responding to the 1979 Graduate Council Survey indicated that the minimum acceptable TOEFL-score varied among the individual departments and colleges within their respective universities.

2. Eighty six percent (96 of 112) of the universities surveyed by the Graduate Council did not use minimum subscores (section scores) in making admission decisions.
3. The use of TOEFL scores in making admission decisions should change as more is learned about the academic success of foreign students.

(a) The Educational Testing Service recommends that each institution (and implicitly each discipline) should derive its own admission policy based on the academic success of foreign students admitted.

(b) The recent petition submitted to the Graduate Council by faculty within both the College of Sciences and the College of Engineering indicates that many faculty members have already judged the academic success of their foreign students. Their conclusion is that excessive TOEFL requirements have prevented otherwise (highly) qualified applicants from gaining admission to their programs.

4. Based on the admission policy proposed here, supplemental English programs are not required. However, if students were admitted with TOEFL subscores that indicate a need for additional work in some aspect of English, they could be required to obtain tutoring in English at their own expense.
February 22, 1980

TO: GRADUATE COUNCIL

FROM: Ad hoc Committee on Alumni Graduate Fellowships
D. P. Froman, R. A. Conover, A. R. Mazur, W. E. Gettys

We present two recommendations concerning the selection procedures and criteria for awarding Alumni Graduate Fellowships. The first proposal deals with the mechanics of the selection of fellows by the Graduate Council. The second proposal is a statement intended primarily for distribution to departments offering a graduate degree. This information will assist a department in the selection of its nominee and in the preparation of its nomination.

I. Selection Procedures for Alumni Graduate Fellowships

A. A Fellowship Awards Committee will be appointed each year to recommend fellowship awards to the Graduate Council. This committee is to consist of four members, two from colleges offering a doctoral degree and two from colleges offering the master's but not the doctoral degree. The membership list will revolve so that each college is represented on the committee over a period of two to three years.

B. The Graduate School will accept nominations, no more than one from each department, through February 15 (March 3 this year only). The Graduate School will assemble relevant, available information on each nominee and distribute it to the members of the Fellowship Awards Committee.
C. The Fellowship Awards Committee, at the March meeting of the Graduate Council (probably the April meeting this year only), will recommend a list of nominees, ordered in descending priority, to the Graduate Council for its consideration. The number of nominees on this list will be at least twice the number of fellowships awards available. The Graduate Council will determine the final ordering of nominees.

D. Fellowship awards will be offered in accordance with the ordering of nominees. Should an awardee not accept the fellowship, that award will pass to the next remaining nominee on the priority list. For example, if five awards are available, those fellowships would be offered to the first five candidates. If one of these is not accepted, it would be offered to the sixth place nominee.

E. Fellowships awards will be announced by the Graduate School, usually by March 15 (later this year only).
II. Selection Criteria for Alumni Graduate Fellowships

The primary purpose of the Clemson University Alumni Fellowship program is to enhance the efforts of departments to attract students of the highest quality into their graduate programs. With the addition of a $5000 fellowship to the approximately equal assistantship stipend, a department can make an attractive and very competitive offer to an outstanding candidate. Accordingly, emphasis in the selection process will be placed on new applicants rather than on continuing students; however, a fellowship may be renewed at most for a second year provided that fellow's nomination shows sufficient evidence of continued excellence.

As initial screening at the departmental level is desirable, a department may submit no more than one nomination each year. A departmental nomination must contain a commitment to provide an assistantship (of the usual and customary amount) to the student in addition to the fellowship award.

Fellowship awards will be made by the Graduate Council based on information contained in the departmental nomination, in the student's application materials, and in other available documentation. Included in those data are the following:

1. Undergraduate GPR and rank in class, if available.
2. Quality of the program and general academic reputation of the undergraduate institution.
3. Evidence of academic excellence, e.g., publications, creative accomplishments, GRE scores, leadership qualities, letters of recommendation.
REPORT TO: The Undergraduate Council
FROM: The Definitions Committee
Professors J. D. Sheriff, Chairman; L. H. Brown, D. R. Sloan,
and Mr. C. C. Wingard, Student Representative
DATE: March 8, 1980
SUBJECT: Definitions for the Student Data Base

In compliance with the charge to "develop a few definitive terms for the Student
Data Base Committee," the Definitions Committee recommends the following:

A. DEGREE: The title bestowed by the University as official recognition for
the satisfactory completion of all the requirements of a curriculum.

B. CURRICULUM: The systematic listing and sequence of course and subject requirements
leading to a degree in a specific field of study.

1. **General Education**: That part of the curriculum which provides an introduction
to the basic areas of knowledge and assists in developing foundational skills.

   a. Specified Courses
   b. Selected Courses

2. **Major**: That part of the curriculum designated as the principal field of study.
   (Some curricula may have concentrations or specialization areas
   within the major.)

   a. Specified Courses
   b. Selected Courses

3. **Minor**: That part of the curriculum designated as a secondary field of study.
   (In some curricula, option, minor concentration, secondary concentra-
   tion, or other terms are used instead of "minor"; certain curricula
do not require a minor.)

   a. Specified Courses
   b. Selected Courses

4. **Elective**: An optional subject or course acceptable for credit in the curriculum.

C. **OTHER NON-CURRICULAR COURSES**: Courses remedial to or in excess of the requirements
of a specific curriculum.
   (Credit hours do not fulfill degree requirements, but are counted
   in the grade-point ratio.)
March 25, 1980

Robert L. Edwards  
President of Sigma Xi  
Department of Animal Science  
154 P&AS Building  
Clemson University  
Clemson, SC 29631

Dear Sir:

The recent establishment of an award honoring a Clemson faculty member who has made outstanding contributions to the research community by the Clemson University chapter of Sigma Xi is a praiseworthy endeavor.

The Faculty Senate would like to take this opportunity to both thank and praise your organization for creating this award.

Sincerely,

Horace Fleming  
President  
Faculty Senate
Recommendations of Changes in the Format of the Grade Distribution Report

Purpose of the Grade Distribution Report

The Grade Distribution Report is prepared at the request of the Faculty Senate in the interest of promoting and maintaining quality academic programs at Clemson University. The sole purpose of the report is to inform the faculty itself of the distribution of undergraduate grades throughout the University. The report serves as a guide to current grading practices and norms as well as an indicator of trends in grading. Thus the report allows interested faculty to compare their grading with that of colleagues at this institution, and thereby assists the individual instructor in evaluation of his grading habits.

The Grade Distribution Report is an outgrowth of faculty concern that grading be a fair and useful measure of student achievement, and the realization that sound grading practices contribute to the credibility and integrity of this University’s academic programs.

Proposed Changes

As prepared in the Spring of 1979, the Grade Distribution Report consisted of three sections. We propose the following changes in the present format:

Section 1. Freshmen grades.

1. Include credit hours with each course.
2. Compute departmental, college and university freshmen "grade point ratios."*

Instructor

Section 2. Undergraduate grades by professor

1. For each instructor, give grade distribution by course and a summary if more than one course is listed. The following format is suggested for individually taught courses:

Instructor's name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No. 1</th>
<th>credit hrs.</th>
<th>No. grades distribution</th>
<th>Course No. 2</th>
<th>credit hrs.</th>
<th>No. grades distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary total credit hrs. total grades distribution

2. Team taught courses listed separately under the name "team."
3. Department, college and university summary and grade point ratios.*

Section 3. Undergraduate grades by course number.

1. Drop the present format. Instead, give the distribution for each course, summarizing by departments, colleges, and university. The following format is suggested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course number</th>
<th>Credit hours</th>
<th>No. grades distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 106</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>486 .20 .30 .30 .10 .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math H106</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30 .60 .20 .20 .20 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Math 203  3  500  .10  .20  .40  .20  .10

2. Compute departmental, college and university grade point ratios.

The grade point ratio will be computed according to the following formula. For a given department, the total number of A credit hours x 4.0, the number of B credit hours x 3.0, C credit hours x 2.0, etc., divided by the total number of credit hours of A, B, C, D and F grades. In this way X and W grades or designations will not be included.
Memorandum

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: H. W. Fleming
RE: Simpson-Russell-Martin Amendment to State Retirement Law on the Subject of Pre-Retirement Death Benefit

I am attaching hereto a list of members of the General Assembly who have given their support to the Simpson amendment. Any personal words of encouragement which you can direct to them along with your thanks for their efforts would aid this cause considerably.

Unfortunately, faculty and other state employees have not rallied to the support of this pending bill. There must be more open support for it if it is to stand much of a chance of passing the General Assembly this session.

You may wish to pass this information along to colleagues and others. Please do so.

Also attached is some additional information on the bill which may be used in explaining the measure and responding to questions on it.
Persons who can assist in favorable consideration of the proposed Simpson amendment on pre-retirement death benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
<th>Columbia Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed W. Simpson, Jr.</td>
<td>104 Lewis Road</td>
<td>Downtowner Motor Inn</td>
<td>House (Pickens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(co-sponsor)</td>
<td>Clemson 29631</td>
<td>(B) 758-2908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) 654-2100</td>
<td>(H) 779-7790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H) 654-2100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris P. Smith</td>
<td>104 Laurel Road</td>
<td>Heart of Columbia Motel</td>
<td>Senate (Pickens) Member, Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easley 29640</td>
<td>(B) 758-5742</td>
<td>Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) 859-0814</td>
<td>(H) 799-1140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H) 859-9305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. L. Hendricks, Jr.</td>
<td>Box 612</td>
<td>Downtowner Motor Inn</td>
<td>House (Pickens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easley 29640</td>
<td>(B) 758-5202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) 859-3122</td>
<td>(H) 779-7790 and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H) 859-4773</td>
<td>758-2367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry A. Martin</td>
<td>Route 5, Box 359-C</td>
<td>Downtowner Motor Inn</td>
<td>House (Pickens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(co-sponsor)</td>
<td>Easley 29640</td>
<td>(B) 758-2924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) 859-9951</td>
<td>(H) 779-7790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H) 859-9951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma C. Russell</td>
<td>92 Nob Hill Road</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>House (Lexington)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(co-sponsor)</td>
<td>Columbia 29210</td>
<td>(B) 758-5025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H) 772-3088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Leon Rampey</td>
<td>Route 4, Box 76</td>
<td>Heart of Columbia Motel</td>
<td>House (Greenville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piedmont 29673</td>
<td>(B) 758-3066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) 277-3872</td>
<td>(H) 799-1140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H) 277-3872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David O. Hawkins</td>
<td>23 Independence Drive</td>
<td>Carolina Inn</td>
<td>House (Spartanburg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roebuck 29376</td>
<td>(B) 758-5365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) 582-2878, 573-7621</td>
<td>(H) 799-8200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H) 576-0877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Persons who can assist—Simpson amendment (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
<th>Columbia Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell T. Hinson</td>
<td>1115 Chesterfield Ave.</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>House (Lancaster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lancaster 29720</td>
<td>(B) 283-4286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(H) 283-4286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Box 10091</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>House (Greenville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenville 29603</td>
<td>(B) 235-6361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(H) 232-3021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theo W. Mitchell</td>
<td>6 Oakdale Place</td>
<td>Tremont Motor Lodge</td>
<td>House (Charleston)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charleston 29407</td>
<td>Cayce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(B) 758-7792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(H) 796-6240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(B) 758-8713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(H) 232-3021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Messrs. Hendricks, Hawkins and Brinker are on the House Committee on Medical, Military, Public and Municipal Affairs to which the proposed Simpson-Russell-Martin bill was committed. They have been particularly helpful with the bill and have demonstrated substantial personal commitment to it.*
CONDENSED INFORMATION ON H-3290, the "Simpson-Russell-Martin Bill", to refine survivor benefits provided through the S. C. Retirement System to the designated surviving beneficiary of any covered employee who dies before retirement, after completing 15 years of service.

1. This bill (H-3290) was referred to the House Committee on Medical, Military, Public and Municipal Affairs. A hearing was held on Feb. 19, 1980, after which the Committee requested additional information.

2. The SCRS is an excellent system for those employees who qualify for retirement, but the purpose of H-3290 (and S-741, filed by Senator Harris P. Smith) is to correct an inequity in S. C. Law (Sec. 9-1-1660) which effectively deprives the survivors of any employee who dies before retiring of any assistance from the EMPLOYER'S "matching money". At present, before the survivor of a deceased employee can receive a monthly allowance, even reduced under Option 2, the employee must have died:
   (a) after age 65 years . . . . . . OR
   (b) after 30 years of service . . . . OR
   (c) after age 60, with 20 years.

No pension is provided for the family of a covered employee who dies before age 60, after the completion of 15, 20, 25, or even 29 years. This is harsh, but need not be so. Funds are already available in the S. C. Retirement System to finance a reduced monthly benefit under Option 2.

3. We repeat: the SCRS is a good system for employees who live to retire (after age 60, or after 30 years of service). It also provides a generous benefit (with options) to any employee who is severely disabled (after only 5 years of service). It even provides a proportionate benefit, at age 60, through limited vesting, to an employee who leaves after working only 5 years, regardless of the reason. HOWEVER, the surviving family of a career employee who dies before age 60 is deprived of any assistance from the "matching money" which the employer has contributed, for 15 years or more, especially for that individual employee's benefit, or for his family.

4. No "new money" is needed. Each EMPLOYEE contributes 4% of the first $4,800 earned each year, plus 6% of earnings over $4,800. Concurrently, the State (or other public EMPLOYER) contributes 6.8% of gross earnings. These two sources principally finance retirement payments, later. According to a recent (1980) report by the SCRS Actuary, in the year 1977-78, the total of all retirement allowances paid to 19,960 beneficiaries was just $60,048,573 (an average of $3,008), while the employers contributed the sum of $85,351,900 (6.8% of the payroll of $1,255,175,095 earned by 133,832 active member employees). It appears that the SCRS added $25 million to its reserves in that one fiscal year from employer contributions, alone. (In addition, the SCRS earns approximately 7% on its investments, and retains the "matching money" for all short-term employees who withdraw their own contributions upon terminating employment.)

5. At the hearing on February 19, Mr. Purvis W. Collins, Director of SCRS, reported that the system's actuary estimates a "cost" of $1,870,000 per year if H-3290 (and S-741) are enacted into law. This seems to be a very high estimate, but it is very clear that the SCRS, in Fiscal 1978, could have absorbed this amount and still have $23 million to add to its reserves for its other unfunded liabilities. This bill, of itself, would require no new appropriation from The General Assembly.

6. In summary: the estimated cost is feasible, and the need is very real. Employees who have completed 15 years have established themselves as career employees (half of the full 30). When each completed only 5 years, he (or she) was promised that EMPLOYER'S matching contributions could help fund Retirement. Let's enact this amendment (H-3290). It is long overdue.
March 17, 1980

Dean H. M. Cox
The College of Liberal Arts
Clemson University
801 Strode Tower
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

Dear Dr. Cox:

Pursuant to adoption by the Faculty Senate of Resolution FS 80-2-4 at our regular meeting February 19, 1980, I wish to express to you our regrets that we misunderstood the intent of your proposal to the Council of Deans that faculty departing Clemson University be required to turn in their grade books and examination materials at semester's end. A copy of FS 80-2-4 is appended.

The concerns which prompted your proposal are of interest to the Faculty Senate, and, as the resolution requires, members of the Senate Policy Committee will be in touch with you shortly concerning this matter.

Thank you for your consideration and for your understanding.

Sincerely,

Horace W. Fleming, President
For the Faculty Senate

Attachment

xc: Dean Victor Hurst
Resolution FS 80-2-4
Adopted February 19, 1980

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate Resolution (Item D under New Business on January 15, 1980 was based on erroneous information.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate hereby recall that resolution and further

BE IT RESOLVED that the President of the Faculty Senate express our regrets to Dean Cox that such a misunderstanding did occur and further

BE IT RESOLVED that the concerns expressed by Dean Cox in his letter of January 18, 1980 and the solution suggested therein be addressed by the Faculty Senate Policy Committee after consultation with Dean Cox.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that the committee will make recommendations concerning this matter to the Faculty Senate by the March 1980 meeting of the Senate.

(This resolution was submitted by W. Baron and adopted unanimously.)
March 10, 1980

Memorandum

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: H. W. Fleming
RE: Items of Information

I am attaching three items for your review and information. None of the three necessarily require any action on the part of the Faculty Senate.

1. Articles in the March 7 Edition of The Tiger. See Attachment 1. There is misunderstanding in both articles. First of all, I was not aware of any complaint which Mr. Kraus had concerning operation of the Vending Machine Committee. It is generally understood that vending machine revenue can be used for any worthwhile project not otherwise fundable from appropriated funds. That is the only "guideline," and, to my knowledge, that guideline is not written down. I will say that during the year only one request that I know of has been refused. In that particular instance, it was felt by the committee that it would be proper to expend appropriated funds. As you know, the Faculty Senate has drawn on these funds twice, once for our chicken barbeque for President Atchley and again for the reception for the Board of Trustees in January of this year. I am aware that funds may be requested to assist in the inauguration of President Atchley, but the committee as yet has received no formal request. As for how widely-known this source of additional funding is, I can only say that the membership of the committee covers all sectors of the University, and it appears that the University generally knows of this source.

Exam Proposal. On Wednesday of last week (March 5), Mr. John Holliman of the Student Senate telephoned me in reference to the proposal summarized in the second article appearing in Attachment 1, Student Senate's request that no examinations be scheduled for the week immediately preceding final examinations. Mr. Holliman was of the impression that Faculty Senate would meet the next night, Thursday, March 6. He wanted us to take up the proposal at that time. I corrected him on our meeting schedule, but indicated that we would be happy to take a look
at the Student Senate proposal as soon as it could be made available for distribution. I also indicated to him that he might come to the March 25 meeting of the Faculty Senate to discuss the proposal. At no time did I indicate to him how the proposal might be received--i.e., its chances for favorable action on the Faculty Senate's part. Previously, Mr. Holliman had discussed the proposal with Dr. Jerry Reel, Acting Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Dr. Reel had offered the opinion that the proposal would stand a better chance of our favorable review if no other extracurricular activities or programs were scheduled during that week. As soon as Mr. Holliman sends me the Student Senate resolution, I will have it copied and distributed.

2. Report of the Committee on Advising. See Attachment 2. Jim Kimbell gave us a preliminary report on this subject at our February 19 meeting. The Faculty Senate may wish to respond formally to the committee's final report at our March 25 meeting.

3. Extension by Dean Hurst of Committee Terms. See Attachment 3. This action seems reasonable under the circumstances.

If you have questions or comments about any of these items, please contact me.

Attachments

xcc: Dean Victor Hurst
     Dr. Jerry Reel
     Mr. J. T. Roberts
     Mr. David W. Kraus
     Mr. John Holliman
     Mr. Robert L. Fuzy
     Mr. Oscar Lovelace
     Mr. W. Kirkland
     Mr. Charles Bolchoz
Vending machines provide large unused revenue

By Holly Hamor
Tiger Staff Writer

The Vending Machine Committee, an organization composed of administrative, faculty, and student members, currently expects to have available $74,467.00 through June 1981. According to committee member David Kraus, however, there are no set guidelines to regulate allocations of these funds to Clemson organizations.

The committee is responsible for distributing money collected from vending machines on campus not controlled by the Canteen. It receives nine percent of this money to allocate to organizations.

“We use the money to do things which we would otherwise have reservations about using state funds or university fees for,” Roberts said. Such activities, according to Kraus, include the wine and cheese parties planned for Clemson president Bill Atchley’s inauguration. State funds cannot be used to purchase alcohol, Kraus stated.

According to Kraus, these parties are expected to cost approximately $10,000. Both Roberts and Kraus estimated the committee’s total allocation toward the inauguration at $25,000, although the request has not been formally submitted to the committee.

The Vending Machine Committee also supplied the student government with $50,000 to allocate to various student organizations. This money is in addition to the base amount of $120,000, with which student government operates, according to the student government Finance Committee chairman Robert Sox.

Next year, the allocation of the vending machine funds to student government will be cut back to $30,000, and the following year, said Roberts, “we won’t have the additional funds to give them.”

Roberts stated that organizations not funded through student government have not been notified that vending machine funds are available to them. The committee does receive requests from some departments and organizations, and has supplied money for speakers’ programs and other activities. But according to Kraus, “nobody knows about it. The money’s there, and they (the organizations) should be able to use it.”

“We have not had requests to meet the amount of money we have available,” Roberts said. Kraus stated that there is a surplus of money. “I don’t think they want people to know they have that money,” Kraus said. He feels that the reason for this is that state funding for certain areas might be jeopardized by the university’s access to surplus funds. “So they’re having to spend it,” said Kraus.

Exam proposal may affect April concert

By Mark Sublette
Assistant News Editor

Members of the University Union are moving ahead with plans for a possible concert in April, even though it could conflict with a new student government proposal. The Faculty Senate has indicated that it might accept the student government’s proposal to ban all tests the week prior to exams if there are no campus activities scheduled during that week.

In a proposal put together by John ‘J’ Holliman this week, student government has presented the faculty with a proposed ban that has long been desired by students, but which may conflict with the April 25 date under consideration by Union personnel for scheduling a concert. Student government hopes, however, to get the proposal okayed while still allowing the concert date to be held open.

“There are only three events presently scheduled for that week,” explained Holliman, and two of them are educationally oriented, while the third is a charity run for cystic fibrosis sponsored by Chi Psi. We hope that the Faculty Senate will accept the proposal while allowing both the run and the concert date to be held.

Holliman explained that he hoped to have the proposal ready to present to the Faculty Senate’s Thursday night meeting on March 6 so that there would be sufficient time for the proposal to be considered for this semester’s exam period. If it were not ready, the ban on tests would not take effect until the fall semester if the faculty approves the measure.

Union members are moving ahead with plans for a concert on Friday, April 25, despite a possible conflict with the measure. Tentatively scheduled for that evening will be a performance by guitarist Jeff Beek, with Sea Level as the opening band.

“It looks good that we’ll be able to do something for that date,” explained Bill Mandicott, Union program director. “We may be setting it up as a completely (Continued to page 2)
March 12, 1980

Memorandum

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: H. W. Fleming
RE: Fall Break Proposal of Student Senate--March 25 Agenda Item

Dean Hurst has requested the Faculty Senate to respond to this proposal submitted by the Student Senate.

The proposal will be placed on the agenda for our March 25 meeting.

Attachment

xcc: Dean Victor Hurst
     Mr. Wes Kirkland, President of the Student Senate
"FALL BREAK"

WHEREAS, the fall semester is two days longer than the spring semester (spring having 72 school days and fall having 74 school days), and

WHEREAS, faculty presently have to alter their syllabus to include two extra days in the fall, and

WHEREAS, the only break for the fall semester is two days for Thanksgiving in late November,

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

There will be a two day fall break on the Monday and Tuesday of the eighth full week which is the week following midterms.

Wes Kirkland
President of the Student Senate

Copies to:
Dr. Bill L. Atchley
Dean Walter T. Cox
Dean Susan G. Delony
Dean George E. Coakley

The Tiger
WSFB
Memorandum

TO: Dean Victor Hurst
FROM: H. W. Fleming
RE: Items Pending

Of the resolutions and recommendations forwarded to you by the Faculty Senate, the following are of particular interest to us and, after the passage of considerable time, are still pending. We would appreciate your assistance in clearing up these matters as soon as possible.

1. Establishment of an Advisory Committee to the Physical Plant (FS 79-3-2). I understand your desire to hold this matter in abeyance until the University Council is in place. However, problems persist and are of an immediate, continuing nature, impinging heavily on teaching and research. If only on a temporary basis, we feel that it is advisable to go ahead and charter this committee as soon as possible so that some of these problems can be addressed.

2. Establishment of University Procedures to Cover Faculty and Staff Emergencies (FS 79-7-2). Your comments on this proposal—namely that we should list the kinds of circumstances to be covered and the kinds of procedures we have in mind—are well taken. However, we feel that in-service emergencies (deaths, disabilities and other sudden catastrophes) are best addressed by the University administratively with input from all sectors of the University. We therefore would ask that President Atchley go forward with an ad hoc committee to study and devise such procedures.

3. Access by Faculty and Staff to Pike Recreation Center on a No-Fee Basis. This has been the subject of Faculty Senate resolutions on at least two occasions since 1977, and I raised the issue in September at a meeting of the Cabinet. At that time, President Atchley asked Vice President Cox to review its feasibility. Can we expect a report on his findings soon?
4. Recharging and Reconstitution of the Ad Hoc Group on Life Insurance Committee. I understand that this committee, after meeting with subscribers, is now working on a proposal for handling surplus funds and that they are preparing a new charge for President Atchley's review. The Faculty Senate is still interested in progress made in revamping this committee.

5. Financial Support for Faculty Senate Officers (FS 79-11-2). With election of new officers to take place on March 25, it would help greatly if we could get some commitments on this item very soon. It would help candidates in assessing how they would address the increased demands made on them.

I understand that you and President Atchley wish to defer our previous recommendations on tenure, faculty rank and privileges, evaluations and grievance procedures until a committee is constituted to revise the Faculty Manual. Likewise, we understand that the committee will be formed shortly to address revision of scholastic regulations, including withdrawal dates.

At our meeting February 19, we acted favorably on resolutions on summer school, emeriti privileges and admissions. I look forward to discussing these with you as soon as you have had some time to review them.

Your assistance in helping us to resolve these pending issues will aid us in insuring a smooth transition in the Senate as new officers take their places and our new Senate is seated.

Thank you for your consideration.

xcc: Faculty Senate
Memorandum

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: H. W. Fleming
RE: Amendment of State Retirement Law on the Subject of Pre-Retirement Death Benefit

Attached is a copy of H. 3290 filed by Representatives Ed Simpson, Larry Martin and Norma Russell. The companion bill (S. 741) is sponsored by Senator Harris P. Smith. They were filed concurrently on January 10, 1980.

S. 741 was referred to the Senate Finance Committee of which Senator Smith is a member.

H. 3290 was referred to the House Committee on Medical, Military, Public and Municipal Affairs, chaired by Representative B. L. Hendricks of Pickens.

This information is provided for your reference and update on progress of these measures.

xcc: Cabinet
TO AMEND SECTION 9-1-1660, CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, 1976, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA RETIREMENT SYSTEM, SO AS TO REDUCE THE REQUIREMENTS TO QUALIFY FOR A SURVIVOR BENEFIT.

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 644 of 1978, is further amended to read:

"Section 9-1-1660. (1) 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 such member dies in service after the attainment of age sixty-five or after the accumulation of fifteen years of creditable service, elect to receive in lieu of such accumulate 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."

SECTION 2. The provisions of this act shall not take effect unless the governing body of the South Carolina Retirement System shall first determine that funding for such increase on a sound actuarial basis has been provided or is concurrently provided.

SECTION 3. This act shall take effect upon approval by the Governor.

(Note: H 3290 seeks to amend only Sub-Section 1 of 9-1-1660; not Sub-Section 2)
Memorandum

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: H. W. Fleming
RE: Student Liability Insurance Coverage and Review of Faculty-Staff Liabilities in Job-Related Settings

In a memorandum dated February 22, 1980, I attempted to bring you up-to-date on disposition of FS 79-2-7, Resolution on Student Liability Insurance Coverage. A response to that resolution from Mr. John C. Newton was attached. Yesterday afternoon, I had a lengthy conversation with Mr. Ben Anderson, University Legal Counsel, concerning further implications of FS 79-2-7.

The resolution itself is written very imprecisely, although its thrust seems to be understood by Mr. Anderson. At the time that Mr. Newton responded, I am not convinced that he understood it. To be specific, the title of the resolution is misleading: it implies that our concern mainly is with the student's liability--i.e., to what extent would a student be liable for any damage he/she may cause by their actions? Actually, the body of the resolution reflects concern with faculty, staff and University (generally) and our collective and individual liabilities for actions of students and our own actions in the contexts or settings described in the body of FS 79-2-7.

As I read the faculty's concerns, they are a mix of the above. So I believe that we want to propose a thorough review of the subject matter in order to (1) fully apprise faculty and staff of their liabilities and the liabilities of the University to students participating in instructional and extracurricular activities, (2) determine which of these activities are considered University sanctioned and the extent of liability insurance coverage for accidents and omissions on the part of the University generally and faculty and staff
personal and (3) devise adequate measures—including insurance coverage—to cover these potential problems.

Rather than proceed with this matter to the President's Cabinet, as I had indicated to the Advisory Committee that I wanted to do, I believe that it is advisable for the moment to ask a small ad-hoc committee to review the University insurance policy informally, speak further with Mr. Newton and then give us a preliminary assessment of the real concerns extant on this subject. Then the Faculty Senate and/or Cabinet can more precisely address the matter.

I will raise this item for consideration by the Advisory Committee on Monday, March 10 when we meet to receive additional nominations for Senate Secretary. Your views and questions on this subject should be addressed to me or to them prior to Monday.

Attachments
Resolution on Student Liability Insurance Coverage

WHEREAS the general liability policy which covers employees of the University does not cover students participating in various activities such as student clubs, fraternities, sororities and intramural sports programs; and

WHEREAS it is not fully clear as to the liability coverage of students involved in assigned laboratory, or field exercises, shop exercises; and

WHEREAS it is in the best interest of the University to provide liability coverage for all student activities sanctioned by the University, be it therefore

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests the Administration to clearly identify the current liability insurance coverage for students and to obtain student coverage for all University sanctioned activities.

(Minutes of the Faculty Senate, February 20, 1979, p. 9)
Attachment 2

April 10, 1979

TO: Admiral Joseph E. McDevitt
    Vice President for Executive Affairs

FROM: John C. Newton
    Director of Auxiliary Services

SUBJECT: Resolution on Student Liability Insurance Coverage

In response to your request to review the Faculty Senate's Resolution FS-79-2-7 on student liability insurance, the following information is submitted:

1. Students whose parents have either a Homeowner's Policy or a separate Comprehensive Personal Liability Policy are insured by definition under these policies and, therefore, are already covered for bodily injury and property damage liability up to the limits and under the conditions of their family's respective policies.

2. Part-time and student employees are already covered by the University's tort liability policy and students are covered by our automobile liability policy when driving a University automobile on official business.

3. The state statute authorizing the Division of General Services to provide tort liability insurance for agencies and their employees makes no provision for extending this coverage to students. While a law was passed last year to allow agencies to procure liability insurance coverage for "volunteers", the Chief of Insurance, Mr. Paul V. Hawkins, indicated that this statute was not applicable to students.

4. Finally, even if state law authorized agencies to procure liability insurance for students, the increase in the University's premium would be approximately $75,000 per year at current rates.

I am at your service on these matters.

JC: zz

xc: Mr. Jack Wilson
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

April 8, 1980

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by President Fleming at 3:34 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The Minutes for March 25, 1980 were approved as written with only a minor change in wording.

Although not in order, Senator Worm inquired as to how information had been obtained for the press release by the Greenville News which followed the March 25 meeting. President Fleming explained that initially during that meeting he had observed Mr. Richard Brooks, The Tiger editor, sitting at the back of the Senate Chamber, accompanied by a photographer. The meeting itself was not closed. Later President Fleming noted that Steve Matthews was seated with Mr. Brooks. He did not at first point this out to the Senate because he did not see Mr. Matthews. President Fleming apologized to the Senators for not noting this sooner. He did meet with both Mr. Brooks and Mr. Matthews immediately following the meeting to clarify the discussion that had occurred. However, he stated that the subsequent report appearing in the Greenville News was Mr. Matthews' own report.

The order of business was then resumed.

3. Introductions

President Fleming introduced Ms. Beulah Cheney of the University's Office of Public Relations, and Mr. Richard Brooks, editor of The Tiger.

4. Special Invitation

President Fleming extended an invitation to all Senators to a reception in the Alumni Center immediately following the meeting as a "thank you" for their efforts this year.

5. Committee Reports

A. Admissions and Scholarship: Senator Grubb

The Committee met on Tuesday, April 1, at 3:30 in Room 411 of Strode Tower. In this our last report we leave two recommendations to the members of next year's committee:

1) That it follow up on this year's report on admissions policies and not allow this report, like so many others before it, to end up in administrative oblivion.

2) That a cover letter accompany future Grade Distribution Reports, indicating significant trends in grading compared to the past. Furthermore, since the purpose of the GDR is to indicate how effective our academic standards are, we suggest it would also be enlightening to include in this analysis projections of grades based on present trends. Such an analysis would greatly enhance the value and effectiveness of the report.

Respectfully submitted,
Alan Grubb (Signed)
Chairman
President Fleming inquired as to whether the Committee had considered the two resolutions brought by the Student Senate regarding a fall break and a moratorium on exams during the week preceding finals. Senator Grubb indicated that the Committee will consider the proposal for a fall break at its first fall meeting, but that the Committee had not received any information regarding the moratorium on exams. President Fleming offered to clarify the status of the proposal.

B. Policy: Senator West

Faculty Senate Policy Committee
April 8, 1980
Committee Report

The Policy Committee reports discussion of four agenda items. Each of these items is of considerable importance to the faculty and deserves Senate consideration.

1. Turn in of faculty grade book and examination material. The policy committee agrees in principal that in those instances where a faculty member is leaving the employment of the University, that the faculty member should make provisions for student access to those elements that were used to determine the grades given during the last semester of employment. The committee's discussion focused on the system that could provide student access to the grade information, but not place the burden of explaining the grade on the department head. The committee believes that in cases involving student questions about grade(s) given by a faculty member no longer at Clemson University, that the Student Relations Committee should have access to the faculty member's grade book and final examination information.

2. Discussion of proposed changes in endowed chairs. The committee received a report that changes were being discussed in the length of appointments to endowed chairs. The committee discussed the issues surrounding the proposed change: rotating every five years; reason for appointment to endowed chair; explaining why a faculty member could only serve for a predetermined amount of time, etc.

3. The committee discussed the continuation of their work on the Headship Study Report. The committee recommends to the 1980-81 Faculty Senate that those members of the 1980-81 Faculty Senate that are currently members of the policy committee be appointed to finish work on the report.

4. The policy committee discussed the status of the proposed Faculty Constitution and the proposed restructuring of the University Committees and Councils. The committee suggests that the 1980-81 Senate solidify a position of both of these items as soon as possible.
C. Research: Senator Smith

Faculty Senate Research Committee Report
April 8, 1980

The Research Committee spent considerable time this year at work on revision of a proposed copyright policy. University Legal Counsel and a copyright-patent attorney reviewed the proposed policy, and they concluded that the proposed policy would have to be much more restrictive than now written if it is to be approved by the State Ethics Committee and the State Attorney General's Office. The Research Committee then recommended, with these opinions in mind, that the Faculty Senate no longer consider the adoption of a copyright policy at this time.

A resolution passed by the Faculty Senate requested the formation of an ad hoc committee, composed of members of the Research Committee, the Office of University Research, the Office of Grants and Contracts, and other interested faculty, to review and recommend ways to assist research effort of the faculty. Senators McDowell and Kline are the Research Committee members on this committee, and McDowell serves as chairman. The Ad Hoc Committee on Research and Funding will have a separate report.

Bill R. Smith (Signed)
Chairman, Research Committee

D. Welfare: Senator Baron was absent. No report was available.

E. Ad Hoc Committees: None reported

F. University Councils/Committees: None reported

6. Outgoing President's Report: President Fleming (See Attachment A)

President Fleming commented on crucial items from the President's Report, indicating that most will be ongoing during the coming year. He expressed the feeling that this has been a good year for the Senate in terms of having studied important issues and having compiled data to help the Senate take positions on such items as faculty welfare, compensation and the proposed University Council. He further stated that he believes the Faculty Senate has established itself as a body to be heeded in regard to establishment of University policy, as well as a body which is receptive to faculty viewpoint. It is his hope that the Senate will continue in its predominant role as faculty spokesman under the new administration.

President Fleming expressed disturbance over the forces off-campus which are beyond our control particularly citing the disregard in Columbia as to what the faculty and the University are all about: the dispute of the Ethics Commission vs the copyright policy; disagreement regarding possible exemption of university faculty from the State grievance procedures; and the ever-present problem of budgeting. It is Fleming's opinion that higher education faces serious problems within the State and an uncertain future; he hopes that we can arrive at a forceful position. Fleming spoke in favor of Resolution FS-80-4-1 and urged that the Senate take hold and move forward in the area of faculty development.
In summary President Fleming thanked the entire Senate for their "one hundred fifty percent effort"; the officers, committee chairmen for their diligence; The Tiger for "more than enough coverage"; and University Relations and the Student leaders for their cooperation.

President Fleming then introduced President-Elect Stassen Thompson who assumed the duties of his office.

7. President's Report: President Thompson (See Attachment B)

A. Regarding Item 1, creation by Dean Hurst in response to FS-80-2-2, of a committee to examine summer school, Senator Coulter questioned the appropriateness of the Associate Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences serving as Chairman in that this college would have less interest in the issue than other colleges. He inquired as to how this had occurred and whether it is appropriate. Senator Gray objected to the fact that the College of Education is not directly represented on the committee as it has a large interest in summer school issues.

President Thompson indicated he was not aware of the criteria used for selection of the Committee and that as far as he knew there had been little or no input from the Faculty Senate. It has been two weeks since their last meeting, and Dean Hurst has already formed the Committee which seems rapid. President Thompson stated he would pursue the matter with Dean Hurst. Senator Worm also indicated that the College of Industrial Management and Textile Science has a sizable interest in this issue and would appreciate having input.

B. Item 3 raised considerable discussion. Dean Hurst has indicated the Senate could select whether to proceed to distribute the first semester's grade distribution report in the present format or to hold the report. In response to Senator Grubb's inquiry whether the next report would contain both semester's data or whether the data would simply disappear, President Thompson replied that the copies of the present first semester report are already printed and in Dean Hurst's Office.

Senator Melsheimer moved that Dean Hurst proceed to distribute the copies of the Fall 1979 Grade Distribution Report that have already been printed. The motion was seconded.

In further discussion Senator Coulter spoke against the motion on the basis of the inadequacy of the report. Senator Grubb expressed the feeling that the Senate has already made known its distress with the old format and that unless we disperse the existing report we may lose important data. Senator Senter concurred in this opinion, stating that Dean Hurst already knows our feelings and has agreed to a changed format; further, that faculty still need access to the present report even with its flaws, therefore we should distribute the already existing copies. The motion carried.

C. Several other items in the President's Report were briefly mentioned. In regard to Item 7.a., Senator Young commented that advance, correct information from the Administration to the news media might help avoid the "tempest in a teapot" as has occurred with Riggs Field. President Thompson indicated this has already been discussed by the Administration.
D. Items added to the President's Report:
1. There will be a meeting in Charleston on Friday, April 11, of representatives from the various faculty senates throughout South Carolina. At a Senate Advisory Committee Meeting earlier today, Senators West and Coulter were selected to attend if possible.

2. On Friday, April 11, at 9:00 a.m., President Atchley will hold a press conference during which he will make known his plans for the President's Council (formerly referred to as the University Council). President Thompson has been asked to attend this press conference.

3. Dean Hurst has requested that all current University Committee and Council members remain in their positions until further notice due to the upcoming changes in University structure. This will be clarified by President Thompson.

E. Senator Quisenberry responded to Item 5 with the opinion that Dean Hurst's letter does not address some points of Resolution FS-80-2-3. President Thompson indicated that it was Dean Hurst's request that the Senate consider his ideas and if we reach the consensus that it is not sufficient, that we bring FS-80-2-3 to his attention again.

8. Old Business
A. Ad Hoc Committee for the Study of Student Liability Insurance: FS-79-2-7
   At today's meeting of the Advisory Committee, the following persons were suggested as members of this committee: Senators Hood, Schultz and Blanton; Professors Ray (Forestry) and Russell (Math). Assuming their consent, it was moved, seconded and passed by voice vote that the committee be accepted as named.

B. Senator Coulter raised the issue as to whether adoption of a committee report constitutes endorsement of any suggested or recommended action therein. He referred specifically to the suggestion of the Research Committee at the March meeting that the Senate drop all efforts in pursuit of a copyright policy.
   Discussion ensued on two levels: that of the specific action of the Senate in regard to the copyright policy and that of acceptance of reports constituting endorsement of action recommended. On the specific level Senator Snipes moved that the Faculty Senate take no further action on the Copyright Policy. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes.
   Subsequently several senators questioned the long-range implications of the creation of the "Clemson University Foundation for Intellectual Pursuits", need for a patent policy, possible future conflict with the State Ethics Commission and whether the statement of Ben Anderson was in the nature of advice or a formal recommendation. Senator Hood advised that the Senate may need to be alert to Administrative action related to this whole issue.
   On the more general level no consensus was reached. However Senators West and Snipes gave opinions that committee reports are information and that actions and recommendations must come up under old or new business. No one disagreed.
9. New Business

A. Resolution FS-80-4-1 was introduced:

Faculty Senate Resolution on Endowed Professorships - FS-80-4-1

WHEREAS endowed professorships are, by academic tradition and precedent, awarded for achievement;

AND WHEREAS endowed professorships are, like other academic honors, not taken away once they have been bestowed;

AND WHEREAS endowed professorships are presumed to be awarded on a permanent basis unless the donor of the endowment has otherwise stipulated;

AND WHEREAS depriving a recipient of an endowed professorship could constitute a breach of good faith and breach of contract;

AND WHEREAS limiting the term of an endowed professorship would:
(1) discourage recipients from using such titles because of their impermanence; (2) discourage meritorious individuals from accepting appointments at Clemson; (3) depreciate the value of such honors;

AND WHEREAS all of the above consequences run counter to the spirit and intent of such endowments, which are to commemorate persons and entities, to attract and retain distinguished faculty, and to enhance the reputation of Clemson University;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends the retention of the present policy regarding endowed professorships and opposes the establishment of any policy entailing the rotation of endowed professorships or otherwise limiting their terms.

Senators West, Rollin and Coulter spoke in strong support. Discussion focused on the fact that endowed chairs or professorships are faculty rather than administrative positions; they constitute an honor and thus, once bestowed, can only questionably be "removed", and that the main problem at Clemson is not one of tenure but rather that we do not have enough such positions. Senator Idol spoke to the issue that we need more energetic effort to obtain funding for this.

After brief discussion regarding the particulars of funding of chairs and professorships, the motion to adopt the resolution was passed by voice vote with no dissension.

B. Senator Grubb introduced a resolution (FS-80-4-2) dealing with faculty development. Due to lengthy discussion of whether the intent of the motion was upheld in the manner written, Senator Grubb withdrew the motion for rewording.

C. Resolution FS-80-4-3 was introduced by Senator West:

(See Page 7 for FS-80-4-3)
RESOLUTION ON TURN-IN OF GRADE RECORD BOOK AND FINAL EXAMINATIONS FOR FACULTY LEAVING CLEMSON UNIVERSITY EMPLOYMENT

WHEREAS it is recognized that students have an opportunity to discuss with the faculty member the grade recorded as their final grade, and

WHEREAS, the best source of information about the grade recorded is the faculty member, the faculty member's grade record book and the graded final examination, and

WHEREAS, there have been requests to answer student's questions about a grade recorded by a faculty member no longer a member of the Clemson University faculty, and the former faculty member did not supply information about the grade determining elements, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that faculty members that are in their last semester of employment at Clemson University, will, before leaving the University, deposit with the Provost copies of their last semester's record of grades and copies of each student's graded final examinations, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Provost shall be responsible for providing access to these grade records and final examinations ONLY when the Student Grievance Committee deems the information appropriate to its investigation, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the provisions of this resolution be written into the revised Clemson University Faculty Manual.

Dr. West moved that the resolution be accepted for introduction, read into the minutes and tabled until the next meeting for consideration. The motion was seconded, passed by voice vote with no dissension.

D. It was moved, seconded and passed that the Senate recess for ten minutes to select Advisory Committee members. The Senate recessed at 4:44 p.m. and reconvened at 4:53 p.m.

E. The Senate Advisory Committee for 1980-81 will include the officers of the Senate plus the following persons:

V. L. Quisenberry
J. L. Young
G. W. Gray
S. S. Melsheimer
D. L. Ham
G. H. Worm
C. A. Grubb
E. D. Schultz
D. S. Snipes
M. A. Armistead

10. Announcements

A. All Senators, old and new, are invited to the luncheon prior to President Atchley's Inauguration at 11:30 in Jervey Athletic Center. President Thompson will ascertain whether incoming Senators have or will receive invitations.
B. Senator Snipes announced that Horace Fleming prepaid the donation for the Senate to participate in (and win) the football game, but that we are still $18 short. He requested payment from old Senators only.

11. Adjournment
   The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 p.m. so that the Senators might attend the Flemings' reception.

Respectfully submitted,

Priscilla M. Kline
Priscilla M. Kline, Secretary

Senators absent: Bursey, Baron, Gowdy, Schindler
Outgoing President's Report
April 8, 1980

It has been a privilege for me to serve you this past year as President of the Faculty Senate. We have accomplished quite a lot, although not as much as any of us would have liked. On balance, it has been a year for study and review of policies and a year for "getting acquainted" with President Atchley and his administration. In this regard, I am pleased with the performance of the Senate and the way in which our efforts have been received by the University at-large.

What success we have enjoyed over the year is due to the efforts each of you have expended. I am convinced that no previous Senate has worked any harder or any more harmoniously. I appreciate beyond words the support and cooperation you have given me as President and the contributions that you have made to the Senate and the University.

I will not attempt here to present you with a "scoreboard" or in any way try to cite wins and losses. We are still in the batter's box at this point. Moreover, the Faculty Senate is a continuing body, and what we have not achieved at this juncture we hopefully can achieve if we now follow-up closely on the preparation that we have done in all areas.

I do want to comment on the report produced by our ad hoc committee on University priorities, which I consider to be our single most significant accomplishment of the year. (See Minutes, May 8, 1979, Attachment A.) That document has guided our actions all year and, in my opinion, should constitute the Senate agenda until each objective listed is achieved.

1. Faculty Participation in University Governance. The proposed University Council will enhance the participation of faculty in University policy making, provided that all parties concerned approach this forum in a spirit of openness and honest "give-and-take." We have helped to shape this concept, and the members soon to be appointed will further assist in shaping the Council's substructure. In the process, we essentially will rewrite the Faculty Manual and redefine relationships between administration, faculty, staff and students. It is just as much our responsibility now as President Atchley's to see that the Council works and that the best decisions possible are made for the entire University in that body. I know you will take this responsibility seriously, for the opportunity may not pass our way again anytime soon.

I would caution you, however, that, regardless of the Council's success, it is incumbent upon you to insure that the Faculty Senate's place in the scheme of University governance is not diminished.
We--and others before us--have labored long and hard to make the Senate representative of the faculty and an institution to be heeded in University policy making. I believe we have succeeded on this front. The University Council should not be allowed to preempt the Faculty Senate but, instead, to complement it. I know that President Atchley has great respect for the Senate, that he expects the Senate to continue providing responsible and articulate faculty leadership and that the Senate will continue working well with his administration.

It is becoming more and more difficult for our executive and administrative officers to run the University. Circumstances in Columbia sometimes change by the hour, making it necessary for the President and others to spend an inordinate amount of their time simply putting out brush fires. Then there are the voluminous rules and regulations, state and federal reporting requirements and other mandates, not including the more routine decisions to be made relating to the campus and to programs internally. In the midst of all this, one wonders just how much time our leaders have for creative thought, planning and longer-range problem solving. I can assure you that it is becoming less and less.

This makes it even more important that we implement a truly effective and informed University Council—not just to make the views of faculty, staff and students known but to assist in overcoming these obstacles to effective accomplishment of our mission.

President Atchley has stressed the importance of openness and effective campus communications. Both are critical. But demands on all of us and the complexities of University administration tend to disrupt normal communications channels. We have seen in recent days and weeks how this can happen. Had the University Council been in place, perhaps much of this disruption could have been prevented. Even so, we must recognize that executive officers and staff of the University possess much more information than we ever have and are in positions to respond much more quickly by virtue of this fact and their authority. Therefore, we must make the communications channels work better and make them more efficient. And, most of all, the faculty must resist the temptation simply to retreat from it all. That would be fatal for us and for the University as a whole.

The opportunity given the President of the Faculty Senate to sit on the President's Cabinet is unparalleled and, in my opinion, can be the means for an even closer working relationship with the members of the administration and student body. I feel that I have been heard in that forum. Certainly, I have spoken up candidly and forcefully on issues coming before that body. At no time have I felt constrained in that setting or pressured to "conform" to any particular line of reasoning or to any particular decision. If I was any less effective on the Cabinet than I should have been, then I alone must accept the blame.
2. Faculty Compensation. President Atchley's commitment to improving faculty compensation is encouraging. However, we must recognize that general fund revenues are forecast to decline relative to funding needs over the next decade. This is why we have felt it so important to review fringe benefits and the state retirement system this year. Unfortunately, we have not accomplished much in the latter areas. I trust that the Senate will vigorously pursue both during this next year. Meanwhile, the faculty salary survey, performed by the Office of Budgets and Systems, is a good start in the direction of meaningful salary adjustments, and I trust the Senate will carefully monitor that continuing effort, in addition to contributing to improvement of the survey instrument.

3. Funding of Programs and Essential Units. There have been relatively few major developments in this area during the year. Of course, President Atchley has not yet had time to get a complete grasp on programming and funding in all areas touched upon by our narrative. I would cite the increased funding for international travel and proposed establishment of alumni graduate fellowships as two significant accomplishments this year. Expansion of the library, completed in the fall, also has resulted in visible benefits. Equipment money remains tight.

In some areas, restrictions on funding hamper the development of instructional programs abroad. Some faculty teaching special, short courses in Europe, for example, must presently pay a major portion of their own expenses. We should work to establish a studies program abroad generally and work for adequate funding for it. Such programs are invaluable not only to specific areas of instruction but to the standing of the University as a whole in academic circles.

4. Improvement of the Intellectual and Cultural Environment. Having discussed with President Atchley the prospects for a Performing Arts Center on campus, I am very pleased with his commitment to the idea. He is pursuing private funding for the A&E work on the Center and hopes to make an announcement soon of his progress. Frankly, this is more progress on the Center than I had expected this year. We must remember, however, that we are pursuing simultaneously state funding for a continuing education center, an energy research center and other improvements of buildings on the campus to meet urgent research and instructional needs. So my enthusiasm is tempered by the knowledge that even if A&E money is secured the Performing Arts Center will not become a reality overnight.

It remains for the Senate or administration or students to come forward with an overall plan for general improvement of the University's intellectual and cultural environment (including a University distinguished lecture series, film series, and the like). I see no reason why the Faculty Senate cannot take the lead in this endeavor, and I would now urge you to do so.
In other areas, we have broken important ground and proposed some meaningful courses of action. I wish to comment briefly on some of these and to propose to you one other subject which I feel the Senate should address.

1. Academic Programs and Scholastic Regulations. Our review of the current admissions policy of the University, the work of the ad hoc committee on academic advising and establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on Scholastic Regulations, and establishment of the ad hoc committee to review our summer school program should result in some of the more meaningful decisions made on campus in recent years on curricula. Proposals in each area have been considered repeatedly and in piece-meal fashion by the Senate over the past three years that I have served. I am pleased that we have resisted impulse and chosen to review thoroughly each of these subject areas before acting on proposals. Like you, I shall anxiously await the findings of those committees still at work, and I commend those who already have presented us their findings on the advisory system and admissions policy.

2. Ad Hoc Committee on University Research and Research Funding. This committee, chartered by resolution in May 1979, is due to report to the Senate within the week. In establishing this committee, we recognized that the increasing demands made upon the University and upon faculty compel us to give careful thought to stating our philosophy on research and to implementing the necessary mechanisms and procedures to make us more competitive for research dollars, as well as better prepared to efficiently allocate faculty and staff to perform up to the expectations our clients and the public generally have of the University.

3. Copyright Policy. I agree with the findings of our Research Committee: that it is preferable, in light of conflicts between any such policy and state ethics law provisions, simply to proceed without an explicit copyright policy. It is regrettable that so much valuable time should have been spent in investigating our options on this subject only to find the contradiction. But this is part of a larger failing among pertinent officials and agencies in Columbia to grasp the unique nature of faculty and public universities in the state, and our roles.

4. Exemption of Faculty from State Grievance Procedures. This is just one small part of a larger, very disturbing situation in the state. It appears to me that the State Personnel Division is determined to move all state employees into the classified system. That certainly seems to be the trend, even absent any overt plan to bring this about. I doubt that this exemption will be accomplished this legislative year. I trust, however, that you will continue your support of President Atchley as he attempts to bring this about.
My larger fear is that, unless the General Assembly and certain state agencies become more sensitive to our uniqueness both of mission and needs, higher education in this state will undergo drastic change—all for the worse.

5. Amendment of State Retirement Laws on Pre-Retirement Death Benefit. Mr. John Gentry deserves commendation by the faculty and the Faculty Senate for his untiring efforts on our behalf in pushing the proposed Simpson amendment, which would make available a prorated death benefit for survivors of employees who die in service to the state after only 15 years. The State Retirement Board continues to resist the amendment, arguing that the costs to the system are too substantial. They are, of course, mistaken. But they seem to feel that their responsibility is more one of saving money than meeting the needs of subscribers. I hope that you will urge our colleagues to continue their support of this bill and—if you and they have not already done so—to speak with the sponsors and others to enlist more support for the bill.

President Atchley’s support of this measure is greatly appreciated. He has assisted in this matter from the beginning.

6. Faculty Evaluation. This continues to be a hotly-debated issue in some quarters, mainly the proposition that the evaluations must be quantitative in part. I am not convinced that they must be, and I hope that those who share my difficulties with this part of the evaluation form will continue to raise the question and propose alternatives.

7. Faculty Development. I hope that you will give serious and positive consideration to FS 80-4-1 on the subject of faculty development. I consider this my parting shot. It seems to me that this is a subject too long overlooked by the Faculty Senate.

I wish the Faculty Senate every success during the coming year and trust that you will call on me whenever you feel that I can be of assistance to you.

Respectfully submitted

H. W. Fleming
President's Report
April 8, 1980

1. In response to Faculty Senate resolution 80-2-2 Dean Hurst has appointed a committee to examine the summer school. Members of the committee are:

   Dr. Steve Chapman, Associate Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences, Chairman
   Dr. Bill Baron, Faculty Senate representative
   Dr. Alan Schaffer, Head, Department of History
   Dr. Thomas E. Wooten, Alumni Professor, Forestry
   Mr. Clarence L. Addison, Associate Professor, Architecture
   Mr. James T. Roberts, Budget Director, Budgets and Systems
   Mr. Reggie Berry, Registrar
   Mr. Jeffery A. Clark, Undergraduate representative
   Graduate student representative to be named

2. A University-wide committee has been appointed to review academic regulations. Members of this committee are:

   Dr. Alan Grubb, Faculty Senate, Chairman
   Dr. Jim Kimbell, Faculty Senate representative
   Dean Henry Vogel, Dean College of Sciences
   Dr. Herbert Brantley, Associate Dean, Recreation and Parks Administration
   Dr. Richard Larson, Head, Department of Sociology
   Dr. Farrell Brown, Associate Dean, Graduate School
3. Dean Hurst had one objection to our grade distribution report. He stated that it would be too costly to send the report to all faculty members. The new format cannot be implemented until next semester. He's left it up to the Senate to decide on whether to send the current report out under the present format or to hold it.

4. Dr. Dick Calhoun and Dr. John McKelvey have been appointed as Clemson's representative to the USC-Clemson Press Board.

5. Dean Hurst responded (See Attachment A) to questions posed by an AAUP Ad Hoc committee on retired Clemson Faculty. He requested that the Senate consider his reply and see if it meets the request of FS 80-2-3.

6. Assistance for the Faculty Senate was again discussed with Dean Hurst. Our request has been passed along to President Atchley. The likelihood of receiving any additional financial assistance will depend upon the budget. Dean Hurst is checking with Vice President Cox to see if office space is available in the Student Government Complex.

7. At the Cabinet Meeting on April 3, the following items were discussed and acted on:

   a. Designation and Work on New Parking Areas and Riggs Field (See Attachment B)

   b. A policy on hazing was presented and adopted (See Attachment C)

   c. A Performance Appraisal Procedure for Classified Personnel was presented and adopted. There were some minor changes made and I will provide you with a copy of the policy as soon as possible.
September 11, 1979

Professor Herman M. Felder
106 Strawberry Lane
P. O. Box 1602
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

Dear Herman:

This is in response to your inquiry regarding the rights and privileges of emeriti faculty. I have had each item checked with the people responsible for the specific areas about which you are inquiring. I will give a brief response outlining present policy and practices following the numbers in your July 6th inquiry:

1. At the present time a retired faculty member may, upon request, procure a courtesy I. D. card from the Clemson University Photo Lab. At the present time there is no emeriti faculty decal available.

2. The policy of conferring emeritus, which was adopted by the Educational Council March 1958 upon the recommendations of the Faculty Senate, specifically mandated that the emeriti faculty names appear in the catalog under a separate heading entitled "Emeriti Faculty."

3. Retired faculty can presently receive the Clemson Newsletter and the Clemson World upon request.

4. While there has never been a formal invitation to retired faculty to attend general faculty meetings, they would be most welcome to attend; however, they would not be entitled to vote according to the Faculty Constitution and By-Laws.

5. Participation in departmental social affairs varies somewhat by department, but it is believed that local retired faculty persons are most often included in departmental social functions. Emeriti faculty would presently be most welcome in full regalia at ceremonial affairs such as graduation or inaugurations.

6. Present policy does not allow for emeriti faculty to use laboratory space or be assigned to office and desk space.

7. Research and publications of emeriti faculty may be listed in University publications presently if the retired person makes
the information available to the persons responsible for
submission of material in those publications.

8. Emeriti faculty under present practices would not be eligible
for research grants from the University Faculty Research
Committee. If, however, a retired faculty member were to
receive a research grant from another source, he could be
reappointed to active status.

9. Departmental transportation to out-of-town meetings would be
available to emeriti faculty on a space-available basis.
They would, however, be required to sign the "Release of All
Claims Including Claim for Personal Injury," because they are
no longer in the employee status.

10. Emeriti faculty are privileged to park on campus as "visitors"
which, in reality, is more lenient than faculty parking privileges.

11. Emeriti faculty have the adult privileges at the University
Library, and on a space-available basis would have the use of
the faculty carrels. They do not, however, have access to the
lockers.

12. Under present practices emeriti faculty have the same privileges
as active faculty on tickets for campus entertainment, programs,
recreation and athletic events.

13. Under present practices emeriti faculty receive the same discount
as active faculty at the University Bookstore.

14. There is presently no policy with respect to emeriti faculty
and the use of the cafeteria. However, as a matter of practice,
no cash-paying customer -- whether active faculty or retired
faculty -- is turned away from the dining hall.

15. The use of laundry services is presently available to both
active and emeriti faculty.

16. At the present time there is no consolidated statement available
to present at retirement stating the rights and privileges of
the emeriti faculty.

Thank you for your continued interest in the welfare of our retired
faculty. If I may be of any further assistance to you, please do not
hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Victor Hurst, Vice President
for Academic Affairs and
Dean of the University

VII/cp
Dear Dr. Hurst:

Since the University Faculty Handbook contains no statement of the rights and privileges of emeriti and since few emeriti know what these are, the Executive Council of the local chapter of AAUP has appointed us as an ad hoc committee to look into the status of this group and to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

The Committee is now studying the policies and practices of institutions similar to Clemson and the results of questionnaires sent to 100 emeriti and 130 full and associate professors over the age of fifty. Most important for our study would be an official statement of Clemson's policies and practices in reference to emeriti.

The rights and privileges listed below reflect the interests of both emeriti and senior faculty. Although some of these are already in effect at Clemson, we would appreciate very much your statement of the University's position on each item.

1. An emeritus ID card and decal.
2. Listing in University publications on same basis as active faculty.
3. Eligibility to receive University news mail-outs.
4. A standing invitation to attend general Faculty meetings.
5. Participation in departmental social and ceremonial affairs.
6. Use of desk/lab space when available.
7. University recognition of research and publication.
8. Eligibility for research grants under same rules as active faculty.
9. Use of space-available departmental transportation to meetings.
10. Faculty parking privileges.
11. Faculty Library privileges.
12. Faculty rates on tickets for campus programs, entertainment, recreation, and athletic events.
13. Faculty discount at University bookstore.
14. Use of the cafeteria.
15. Use of laundry services.
16. A written statement at the time of retirement of emeriti rights and privileges.
Our committee would be glad to meet with you if you think such a meeting would be advisable.

Sincerely yours,

Herman M. Felder
Herman M. Felder, Chairman
Ernest M. Lander, Jr.
J. R. Hanson
April 4, 1980

Memorandum

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: H. W. Fleming
C. S. Thompson

RE: Designation and Improvement of Parking Areas and Proposed Relocation of Soccer Field

At the April 3 meeting of the President's Cabinet, these matters were discussed further. This memorandum, copies of which are addressed to Cabinet members as well, is an attempt to clarify any previous misunderstandings and to put these matters in proper perspective.

At a meeting of the Cabinet in March, Vice President Cox pointed out problems which previously had existed in the parking of automobiles in the vicinity of the entrance to the cemetery during football games and other times. It was noted that the traffic across the area was resulting in wearing down of the ground cover and damage to the aesthetics of the area. Vice President Cox proposed that the area be graded and that new grass be put in. This, it was felt, would improve the area for parking during athletic events as well as the convenience of visitors to the cemetery. At no time was paving of that area discussed. You can imagine then why we would have acted so surprised to hear from various sources that paving was planned and on the verge of accomplishment in that area. Because Bob Fuzy was absent from this particular Cabinet meeting, Vice President Cox stated that he would seek Mr. Fuzy's opinion on the matter. He did that, and Mr. Fuzy concurred. Paving in this area, however, has not been authorized by the Cabinet or by President Atchley or any of the Vice Presidents, and no such plans exist.

The decisions to improve the old soccer field and to relocate soccer to what is now Riggs Field was made, according to Vice President Cox, in order to maximize use of the athletic fields available. It is true that neither of these actions were channeled through any council or committee. President Atchley, Vice President Cox and Mr. McLellan made what they consider to be field-maintenance decisions without any intention to change the nature or purpose or use of the fields in question. In fact, if the present soccer field is to be used for parking in the future as in the past, it is advisable under any circumstances to improve the ground cover and perhaps provide a
better access to the field for automobiles. Relocating soccer to Riggs Field is another matter. In this instance, Vice President Cox and others concerned state that they have no intention to displace students or harm the intramural program. In fact, President Atchley indicated rather clearly to us that the ultimate decision on relocation of soccer to Riggs Field has not yet been made, contrary to impressions left by those with whom we spoke earlier on, as well as Tiger news reports of today.

President Atchley and Vice President Cox, in particular, feel that the controversy generated over these actions stem in large part from lapses in communication. This is a continuing problem, especially in communications between persons in the academic sector and the athletic sector. And it continues to be an unfortunate problem for all parties concerned.

Any further action on these matters will depend upon the wishes of the Senate.

cco: President Bill L. Atchley
     Cabinet
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY HAZING POLICY

NO ORGANIZATION SHALL ALLOW ANY OF ITS ACTIVE MEMBERS, ALUMNI MEMBERS, PLEDGES OR ASSOCIATE MEMBERS, OR ANY OTHER PERSONS, TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY HAZING CEREMONY, ACTIVITY, OR PRACTICE, MENTAL OR PHYSICAL IN NATURE. THIS INCLUDES ALL TYPES OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT, ANY ACTION THAT WOULD PLACE A PERSON IN PERIL, ANY ACTION WHICH INVOLVES PHYSICAL EXHAUSTION OR ABUSE, ANY ACTIVITY OF A DANGEROUS, RUDE, OR DEGRADING NATURE, ANY ACTIVITY WHICH WOULD INTERFERE WITH A PERSON'S ABILITY TO PERFORM COLLEGE WORK, OR ANY OTHER ACTIVITY WHICH WOULD REFLECT UNFAVORABLY UPON THE ORGANIZATION AND THE UNIVERSITY.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ACADEMIC UNIT</th>
<th>CAMPUS ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>TERM ENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>** V. L. Quisenberry (W) +</td>
<td>Agronomy &amp; Soils</td>
<td>277 P&amp;AS</td>
<td>3102</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. M. Harris (W)</td>
<td>Agric. Ec. &amp; Rur. Soc.</td>
<td>270 Barre</td>
<td>3475</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. E. Hood (R)</td>
<td>Agric. Engineering</td>
<td>203 McAdams</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Cross (R)</td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>150 P&amp;AS</td>
<td>3426</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** J. L. Young (A)</td>
<td>Arch. Studies</td>
<td>159 Lee</td>
<td>3081</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** G. W. Gray (A)</td>
<td>Elem. &amp; Sec. Education</td>
<td>122A Godfrey</td>
<td>3482</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. H. Blanton (P)</td>
<td>Agri. Education</td>
<td>446 Nursing</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. F. Olive (A)</td>
<td>Elem. &amp; Sec. Education</td>
<td>109C Godfrey</td>
<td>3482</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** W. Baron (W)</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>212 Lowry</td>
<td>3002</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. E. Bennett (R)</td>
<td>Elec. &amp; Computer Engr.</td>
<td>213 Riggs</td>
<td>3376</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** S. S. Melsheimer (A)</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>130 Earle</td>
<td>3056</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** G. E. Howard (A)</td>
<td>Rec. &amp; Park Adm.</td>
<td>290 For. &amp; Rec.</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** D. L. Ham (R) +</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>262 For. &amp; Rec.</td>
<td>2478</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** G. H. Worm (P)</td>
<td>Ind. Management</td>
<td>312B Sirrine</td>
<td>3499</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. A. Kimbell (A) +</td>
<td>Acct &amp; Finance</td>
<td>304 Sirrine</td>
<td>3265</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. W. Gooding (W)</td>
<td>Ind. Management</td>
<td>402 Sirrine</td>
<td>3499</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** C. A. Grubb (A)</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>203 Hardin</td>
<td>3153</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. B. Rollin (P) +</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>602 Strode</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. Idol (W)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>607 Strode</td>
<td>3041</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. H. Wainscott (A)</td>
<td>Pol. Science</td>
<td>417 Strode</td>
<td>3149</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** M. A. Armistead (P)</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3024</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. M. Kline (Sec.) (R)</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>519 Nursing</td>
<td>3072</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** E. D. Schultz (P)</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>426 Nursing</td>
<td>3072</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. E. Schindler (W)</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>336 Long</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. F. Senter (A)</td>
<td>Math. Sciences</td>
<td>0-304 Martin</td>
<td>3433</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** D. S. Snipes (P)</td>
<td>Chem. &amp; Geology</td>
<td>210 Brackett</td>
<td>3438</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. W. Huffman (P)</td>
<td>Chem. &amp; Geology</td>
<td>114 Brackett</td>
<td>3133</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. P. Miller (W)</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Astro.</td>
<td>117 Kinard</td>
<td>3417</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*J. N. Gowdy replacing J. C. Hester until 8/14/80 while Dr. Hester on leave.
*J. L. Stevenson replacing G. E. Howard second semester, 1980 while Dr. Howard on Sabbatical.
**=Advisory Comm.; +=Comm. Chairman; A=Adm & Scholarship; P=Policy; R=Research & W=Welfare