MINUTES

of the

FACULTY SENATE

of

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

May 1980 through October 1980
<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><strong>AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>ARCHITECTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>FOREST &amp; RECREATION RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT &amp; TEXTILE SCIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>LIBERAL ARTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>LIBRARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3024</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A. Armistead (P)</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NURSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>1981</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 & Welfare
<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><strong>AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>ARCHITECTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>FOREST &amp; RECREATION RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT &amp; TEXTILE SCIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>E. C. Hipp (P)</td>
<td>Ind. Management</td>
<td>268 Sirrine</td>
<td>3476</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBERAL ARTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>LIBRARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A. Armistead (P)</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3024</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NURSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>1981</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>

*Advisory Comm.; + = Comm. Chairman; A = Adm & Scholarship; P = Policy; R = Research & W = Welfare*
<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><strong>AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Smith (A)</td>
<td>Agronomy &amp; Soils</td>
<td>277 P&amp;AS</td>
<td>3102</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Dick (P)</td>
<td>Poultry Science</td>
<td>116 Newman</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Quisenberry (W)</td>
<td>Agronomy &amp; Soils</td>
<td>277 P&amp;AS</td>
<td>3102</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Harris (W)</td>
<td>Agric. Ec. &amp; Rur. Soc.</td>
<td>270 Barre</td>
<td>3475</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Hood (R)</td>
<td>Agric. Engineering</td>
<td>203 McAdams</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Williams (R)</td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>140 P&amp;AS</td>
<td>3424</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHITECTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Young (A)</td>
<td>Arch. Studies</td>
<td>159 Lee</td>
<td>3081</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Webb (P)</td>
<td>Bldg. Science</td>
<td>142 Lee</td>
<td>3081</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1981 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Gray (A)</td>
<td>Elem. &amp; Sec. Education</td>
<td>122A Godfrey</td>
<td>3482</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Blanton (P)</td>
<td>Agric. Education</td>
<td>446 Nursing</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Olive (A)</td>
<td>Elem. &amp; Sec. Education</td>
<td>109C Godfrey</td>
<td>3482</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron (W)</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>212 Lowry</td>
<td>3002</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Bennett (R)</td>
<td>Elec. &amp; Computer Engr.</td>
<td>213 Riggs</td>
<td>3376</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Melsheimer (A)</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>130 Earle</td>
<td>3056</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOREST &amp; RECREATION RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Howard (A)</td>
<td>Rec. &amp; Park Adm.</td>
<td>290 Lehotsky</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Ham (R) +</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>262 Lehotsky</td>
<td>2478</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT &amp; TEXTILE SCIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1981 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Worm (P)</td>
<td>Ind. Management</td>
<td>312B Sirrine</td>
<td>3499</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Kimbell (A) +</td>
<td>Acct &amp; Finance</td>
<td>304 Sirrine</td>
<td>3265</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Hipp (P)</td>
<td>Ind. Management</td>
<td>268 Sirrine</td>
<td>3176</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBERAL ARTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1981 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Grubb (A)</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>203 Hardin</td>
<td>3153</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Rollin (P) +</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>602 Strode</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Idol (W)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>607 Strode</td>
<td>3041</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Wainscott (A)</td>
<td>Pol. Science</td>
<td>417 Strode</td>
<td>3149</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBRARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Armistead (P)</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3024</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NURSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Kline (Sec.) (R)</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>519 Nursing</td>
<td>3072</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1981 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Schindler (W)</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>336 Long</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Palmer (A)</td>
<td>Math. Sciences</td>
<td>0-205 Martin</td>
<td>3432</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Snipes (P)</td>
<td>Chem. &amp; Geology</td>
<td>210 Brackett</td>
<td>3438</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Huffman (P)</td>
<td>Chem. &amp; Geology</td>
<td>114 Brackett</td>
<td>3133</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Miller (W)</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Astro.</td>
<td>117 Kinard</td>
<td>3417</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Advisory Comm.; + = Comm. Chairman; A = Adm & Scholarship; P = Policy; R = Research & W = Welfare
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MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

May 13, 1980

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by President Thompson at 3:31 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes
The minutes for April 8, 1980 were approved as written.

3. Special Presentation
On behalf of the Faculty Senate, President Thompson presented to Ex-President Horace Fleming an original sketch of Tillman Hall by Senator Joe Young. Fleming thanked the Senators for the gift and for their work this year.

4. Special Guest
President Thompson announced that he was notified today that special guest, Mr. Melvin E. Barnette, Vice President for Business and Finance, would not be able to attend today's Senate meeting due to his traveling to Columbia. President Thompson indicated he will ask Mr. Barnette to address the Senate at the June meeting or to meet with the Advisory Committee some time this month.

5. Committee Reports
A. Admissions and Scholarship: Senator Kimbell
The Committee has not met since the new members have been assigned. Senator Kimbell informally ascertained the number of Committee members who would be available during the summer. He asked them, including persons standing in for regular Senators, to give thought to items for a committee agenda for 1980-81. The agenda will include followup on Resolutions passed by the 1979-80 Senate.

Senator Kimbell reported that one of the major tasks of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Academic Regulations, to which he has recently been appointed, will be to review all scholastic regulations in the new catalog (in press) as well as in the graduate catalog. As he would like to represent all faculty as well as possible, he asked that all Senators look at the catalogs carefully and communicate ideas to him.

The Senators on the Admissions and Scholarship Committee will be notified of meetings in the near future.

B. Policy Committee: Senator Snipes for Senator Rollin
Senator Snipes indicated that Senator Rollin intends to convene this Committee as soon as possible but has not done so thus far because of illness in his immediate family. He will contact committee members directly when a meeting is set.
Senator Snipes read the following report:

The major items this committee plans to consider during the forthcoming year are:

1. Departmental governance including the Headship question which we were asked to study by the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors. This study was initiated during the 1979-80 academic year. During that interim the committee agreed in principle on some of the chief aspects of these questions. It is anticipated that we will present a proposal on this matter to the Senate before the end of this summer.

2. Revision of the Faculty Manual. In this regard we expect to work with the President of the Faculty Senate, the new Provost, and the President's Council.

3. Study of some of the specific policy questions which we expect will arise during the detailed organization of the President's Council. In this regard we expect to work with the Ad Hoc Committee on the President's Council, chaired by Vice President Coulter.

C. Welfare Committee: Senator Quisenberry

The committee met to consider changes in the University faculty housing policy.

The Administration proposed to the Board of Trustees that major changes be made in policy regarding faculty housing. Briefly, the proposal states that 100 faculty and staff housing units must be vacated by July 1, 1981, to provide housing for married students. The married students will come in part from 100 units of East Campus housing which will be converted to undergraduate housing. This move is expected to provide housing for approximately 400 undergraduates.

Twelve small houses on the north side of Highway 93 and adjacent to the apartments behind the Clemson House would be used for one-year, temporary housing to meet critical faculty and staff needs.

The committee asked President Thompson to express our support of this change to the Administration. However, President Thompson was requested to express our opinion that the number of units which would remain for temporary faculty and staff use should be based on anticipated need. The committee could not determine if the twelve units to be made available would be sufficient.

The Committee will meet Tuesday, May 20, at 3:00 p.m. to consider agenda items for 1980-81. Senator Quisenberry stated that suggestions for topics are welcome. The location of the meeting is to be announced.

D. Research Committee: Senator Ham

There was no report.

E. Ad Hoc Committee on University Research and Research Funding: K. McDowell

Professor McDowell thanked those who served on the committee, stating they had served well. He commented on the report by saying that it covers many controversial issues but generally represents a consensus and was formally
accepted by a vote of all committee members. It contains a number of recommendations, largely directed toward President Atchley, but the committee hopes the Faculty Senate will examine them and look closely at problem areas identified therein. The recommendations were stated in general rather than specific terms as the Administration's choice of direction in regard to research has not yet been clearly shown. Although the body of the report deals with a summary of major problem areas identified with a number of miscellaneous problems listed at the end, it should not be construed that these miscellaneous items are unimportant. Indeed, they may well represent major issues in themselves.

Professor McDowell mentioned that three members of this Ad Hoc Committee are still on the Senate for 1980-81 (Ham, Bennett, Kline) and may be considered a resource as questions arise.

Senator Bennett moved to accept the report. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote with no dissent. (See Attachment I.)

F. University Athletic Council: Senator Coulter

At a meeting approximately three weeks ago two items of possible interest to the Senate were considered:

1. Employee athletic event ticket privileges: The former move to limit the number of tickets available to faculty was indeed studied by a committee of four persons. It was found that the average number of tickets per faculty member was 2.8 (for 1400 persons). Some concern still exists so several recommendations were made and adopted by the Council including continued study of the numbers of tickets per employee, and the ruling that the Athletic Department can, in the future, limit ticket purchases to two per employee if approved by the Athletic Council at that time.

2. Riggs Field controversy: A Student Senate Resolution indicating that the Athletic Council should have been consulted prior to the changes being made was not adopted by the Council. Senator Coulter indicated that he had supported the resolution but that the matter was dropped after Athletic Director McClellan's explanation of the Department's rationale for the change was heard.

Senator Miller expressed concern over the implications of the issue, specifically whether or not a legal contract for use of Riggs Field had preexisted the change and had thus been ignored. He further urged that the Council review the matter again. Senator Coulter indicated that the Council had not been aware of a pre-existing contract and referred to a master plan which allegedly contained information about the long range use of Riggs Field. Specifics were not clear.

President Thompson commented that this whole matter has been under discussion in President Atchley's Cabinet.

6. Introductions

The following persons were introduced by President Thompson as standins for this meeting:

N. K. Womer for Senator G. H. Worm
C. L. Lane for Senator D. L. Ham
W. A. Phillips for Senator J. L. Young
Ms. Debbie Dunning for Ms. Beulah Cheney, Public Relations
7. **President’s Report** (Attachment II)

President Thompson referred briefly to several items in his report, remarking that the Ad Hoc Summer School Committee (Item 1) was expanded specifically in response to the Faculty Senate’s request. The Committee to Study Clemson House/Highway 93 Crosswalks (Item 4,c) has been asked to come up with specific recommendations. Regarding the Item dealing with the Group Life Insurance dividends, Senator Gowdy asked when the President’s Council will consider the matter and what will be done with this past year’s dividends. President Thompson responded that the dividends for this year will be held and reinvested for the time being, and that it will likely be fall when the Council considers the entire matter.

8. **Old Business**

Resolution FS-80-4-3 **Turn-in of Grade Record Book and Final Examinations** for Faculty Leaving Clemson University Employment, which had been tabled at the April 8 Senate Meeting, was brought before the Senate. Senator Coulter moved that the resolution be passed. The motion was seconded, and the question called by Senator Snipes. The resolution passed by voice vote.

9. **New Business**

Resolution FS-80-5-1 was introduced by Senator Melsheimer who spoke in favor of its passage.

FS-80-5-1

Resolution on Graduate Student Dormitory

WHEREAS the effective conduct of graduate study and the associated research requires that students be on campus during much of the scheduled undergraduate student holidays and between-semester breaks, and

WHEREAS many graduate students find it necessary to stay on campus in dormitories so as to minimize transportation and living expenses, and

WHEREAS the current policy of closing all dormitories during undergraduate breaks unduly interrupts the progress of graduate students towards their degrees, and the conduct of University research programs, and

WHEREAS the recent action to increase dormitory space provides an excellent opportunity for developing a housing policy that can accommodate these needs, be it therefore

RESOLVED by the Faculty Senate that space be allocated for a Graduate Student Dormitory, available on a continuous (12-month) basis, at the earliest possible date.

A motion to pass resolution FS-80-5-1 was made by Senator Melsheimer, seconded by Senator Stevenson, and passed by voice vote with no dissent.

10. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Priscilla M. Kline, Secretary

Absent:
B. R. Smith, R. G. Bursey, L. H. Blanton,
W. Baron, C. A. Grubb, and R. B. Rollin
ATTACHMENT I

FINAL REPORT

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AND RESEARCH FUNDING

K. McDowell
R. Abramovitch
J. Bennett
S. Buckner
D. Ham
S. Hays
P. Kline
A. McCracken
G. Means
W. Owens
P. Woodside
PREFACE

On May 8, 1979, the Faculty Senate moved unanimously that "an Ad Hoc Committee composed of members of the Faculty Senate Research Committee, the Office of University Research, the Office of Grants and Contracts, and other interested faculty; all to be chosen by the Chairman of the Faculty Senate Research Committee, be formed and commissioned to review and recommend ways of assisting the research efforts of faculty from all segments of the University."

On November 19, 1979, Senator Keith McDowell was appointed chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee and commissioned to implement the Faculty Senate motion. A committee was appointed.

The committee upon reflecting on its mission decided that a more specific charge was needed. Accordingly the committee formulated and accepted the following charge:

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.

To carry out this charge, the committee has met with President Atchley, Dean Hurst, Dean Schwartz, Dean Henningson, and all college deans. Individual members have taken part in a grantsmanship conference and a Department of Defense funding conference held in Washington, D.C., and have met with numerous members of the Clemson faculty who are conducting active, funded research programs. Numerous faculty members (particularly from the Colleges of Engineering and Sciences) have volunteered information to various committee members. Based on this input, the committee feels that it has determined in a large measure what policies regarding research are in effect at Clemson and how they are being
carried out, that it has discovered most of the major problem areas relative to research, and that it has developed recommendations which, if implemented, will significantly improve on a Clemson faculty member's ability to conduct academic research. Many of the recommendations are stated in a manner designed to express appropriate policy or appropriate actions rather than specifying rigid administrative structures. The committee believes that this is a more appropriate format given the current transitional state of the Clemson Administration.

It should be pointed out that although the following report accentuates negative factors, the committee feels that research at Clemson has grown in a very positive way over the last twenty-five years. It is hoped that this report will accelerate the growth and help make Clemson truly a university.
INTRODUCTION

One cannot address the question of the current research situation at Clemson without reflecting upon the University's history over the last twenty-five years. In this period the University underwent a metamorphosis from a small college having a corp of uniformed cadets to a major coeducational university. As one would expect, growth pains have resulted, particularly in the area of academic research. This report addresses some of these growth pains in the following paragraphs; however, first we consider what is meant here by academic research.

Academic research is a very elusive concept that is not easily defined, primarily because of the diversity across the disciplines in what faculty do or should do as professionals. In the context of this report, it will be assumed that the meaning of academic research is clear within a given college, although it will vary from college to college.

The growth of academic research in the colleges has been very uneven over the years with some colleges (such as Agriculture) having a mature program while others (such as Education) are in their infancy. This growth pain or imbalance must be considered and factored in as one reads this report.

In considering the obvious growth of academic research at Clemson, one is led to inquire as to the historical forces which brought this about. This committee believes that to an overwhelming extent this growth is due to the increasing professionalism of the faculty.

Historically speaking, the University has long supported in principle the notion of academic research. In practice, however, there has been a very real lack of commitment, particularly with respect to providing essential funding. Indeed, in several cases we have created new programs for a variety of reasons without providing start up funds or even continuing funds. The net result in recent years has been a net loss in funding to essential units. Academic research is particularly hard hit when this occurs. Perhaps it is time for the University to retrench, reconstitute and develop to the fullest the programs we now have.

Although more can be said about the growth pains of Clemson and their effects on academic research, enough has been pointed out to provide the context for considering the current problem areas and how they might have arisen. This report will now deal with these areas.
PROBLEM AREAS

The committee has identified a number of significant problem areas. Each will be dealt with in turn and a specific recommendation made.

1. **Office of University Research**

The Office of University Research (OUR) received the most criticism of any area that the committee investigated. The criticisms fell into several categories:

a) OUR discourages the submission of proposals, primarily by adopting an adversarial role in dealing with faculty.

b) OUR doesn't know what is going on in Washington.

c) OUR is weak in its knowledge of grantsmanship.

d) OUR doesn't know what a given faculty member is doing in research and makes no effort to selectively inform one of possible funding.

e) OUR is slow and sometimes intransigent in dealing with unusual or new funding formats.

The preparation of a proposal requires a major investment of time and effort on the part of a faculty member. Many times faculty simply do not have sufficient time or in some cases the expertise to do the kind of job required. This is especially true of new, inexperienced faculty and the occasional proposal writer. Having the usual amount of human pride, they are mortified and angered when OUR criticizes and points out in exacting detail the problems with their proposal. For many this pairs an aversive stimulus with the grant effort and therefore retards the pursuit of outside funding. Many also feel that OUR even adopts unnecessarily an adversarial role toward faculty submitting proposals. Certainly this tends also to discourage one. In essence it's the "who needs that kind of hassle" syndrome.

On the positive side, funding agencies (NSF and NIH) informed the committee that nearly 50% of unsolicited proposals are rejected purely on the basis of a "mechanical" error; i.e., wrong forms are used, budgets don't add up, and the like. OUR is doing the faculty a great service in screening proposals for these flaws. In fact Clemson faculty members who have a record for being funded were virtually unanimous in praising OUR for successfully carrying out the editorial function.

* Some of the criticisms are not substantiated by hard evidence; however, since they were voiced by many segments of the Clemson faculty, we are compelled to address them in this report.
The committee feels that the Clemson faculty as a whole needs to be better educated in the realities of grantsmanship. Many of the clashes with OUR would disappear with well informed faculty. Nonetheless, if one subtracts these positive factors from the negative, one is still left with the fact that OUR adopts an adversarial role. The committee believes that such a managerial style is dysfunctional and that much better OUR/faculty relations would obtain if OUR would portray an image of "How can we help you."

Research faculty must recognize that grantsmanship is primarily the responsibility of the individual faculty member. It is unrealistic to expect OUR to routinely provide one with information about funding specifically directed to one's research area or in essence to write one's proposal. Although this kind of thing is done at some universities, it is very expensive and should not be implemented at Clemson at the present time. On the other hand OUR should be expanded to the point that it can effectively provide training in grantsmanship through visits to Washington, seminars, and university wide grantsmanship conferences.

One complaint that the committee found repeatedly expressed was the inertia (or slowness) of OUR and the Administration in general. These complaints were of two types: first, proposals have failed because deadlines could not be met due to OUR's slow response time. Second, proposals have been inordinately slowed because of a failure on the part of the Administration (including OUR) to accept and/or work with new funding formats, concepts, and programs or grant programs which have mandated low indirect costs. The committee found that there is a diversity of opinion on this matter in that many have obtained all the cooperation required while others have found the Administration lacking.

There are several possible reasons why OUR and the Administration are held in low regard by some. First, the faculty members themselves are at fault in that they are in actuality unwilling to do what has to be done to obtain funding and hence blame all problems on OUR directly and other offices indirectly. Grantsmanship programs should significantly reduce this problem. Second, the University does not have a written research policy. Without a clearly defined policy, it is difficult to operate. The committee will deal with this as a separate item. Third, the mission of OUR has never been clearly defined. Fourth, OUR (and in some cases other administrative offices) has been given the
responsibility but not the authority (here we mean delegated authority) to carry out its mission. Such a situation is bound to lead to some of the complaints described, particularly the inertia of OUR. It is difficult to make clearcut decisions when one has neither the delegated authority nor a written policy to buttress one's decisions. Fifth, OUR is a one-man operation with no budget.

In this vein one must question the role of an Office of University Research. Should Clemson have such an office? What should its responsibilities be? Should it have the authority, whether direct or delegated to make decisions affecting research policy? These are complicated questions which affect both the organizational structure of research administration and the day to day operation of securing grants, contracts, etc. and carrying them out. The predominant viewpoint which emerged from the committee's investigations is that a lean but efficient OUR is to be preferred.

Based on our findings, the committee recommends the following:
1. The title "Office of University Research" be changed to "Office of Sponsored Programs."
2. That OSP be placed directly under the Office of the Provost but that a channel of communication with the Vice President for Institutional Advancement be opened.
3. That the responsibilities and authority of OSP be clearly delineated in a written university research policy.
4. That the director be given the responsibility to encourage, facilitate and, where feasible, expedite academic research.
5. That the authority for making required decisions* which affect academic research be vested in the Office of the Provost, subject to approval by the President or Board of Trustees when not covered by university policy.
6. That OSP be expanded.
7. That the University upgrade OSP by providing a budget in addition to salaries and overhead to provide for travel, grantsmanship programs, and other expenditures which will enhance and improve the competitiveness of university faculty vis-a-vis external funding.

* For example, we have in mind required decisions (e.g., can we commit matching funds?) which need to be made quickly in order to expedite the proposal process. Long term policy decisions should be made in concert with appropriate segments of the Faculty.
2. University Research and Sponsored Program Policy

One of the major problems facing Clemson University at the present time in the administration of academic research is the lack of a written university research policy. Although several individual units in the University do appear to have a written policy, most of the decisions affecting research are made in the absence of such a policy. The committee believes that many of the present real and perceived problems are directly related to this absence. On the other hand some faculty members have expressed concern over the possible development of a written research policy believing that it will codify or "chisel in stone" unacceptable rules and regulations and lead eventually to unnecessary bureaucracy.

The committee recommends:

1. That the President's Council in collaboration with the research committee of the Faculty Senate and selected successfully funded research faculty prepare for adoption by President Atchley and the Board of Trustees a university research policy which is comprehensive, lean and flexible and which recognizes the diversity in academic research at Clemson.

2. That a mechanism for periodic review and upgrading of research policy by established and implemented.
3. Centralization of Research Administration

One problem which some individuals pointed out is the lack of a centralized administration for research at Clemson. As one person put it, we are a "bunch of undirected researchers." Clearly, in discussing academic research, there are at least two common modes of operation in a university setting. One, which we will label the "lone wolf" or individual mode, is the more traditional. In this case an individual researcher defines his research and directs his own research group, typically composed of graduate students and research associates but also consisting of the faculty member working alone. This format has served well over the years and must be continued and encouraged.

On the other hand, a second mode, which we label the "institute" mode, is also a common practice at universities. In this case the University through a delegated group directs what is typically described as mission-oriented research.

Advantages accrue to a university which is capable of carrying out both modes in a harmonious fashion. Institutes typically are able to bring in large scale funding and provide, as a spinoff, a stimulating intellectual environment to individual researchers. In addition they make available facilities which might not otherwise be accessible. On the other hand, an institute can not generally be successfully established where a research community of individual groups is lacking. One must have this background of expertise for an institute to flourish.

In considering the creation of mission-oriented institutes there are several cautions which should be kept in mind. First, the institute will invariably be in competition with well funded organizations (national laboratories and industrial labs most notably). Second, universities are historically the home of basic research rather than mission-oriented research. Third, the goals of an institute typically don't match well with educational goals. Fourth, institutes tend to generate a "big bucks" problem, namely, pressure is put on individual faculty to join the team since this is where the money is. Fifth, institutes tend to bring into existence not only a centralized administration for research but also a centralized direction to research.

From the viewpoint of those faculty members actively engaged in their own research programs the lack per se of centralized administration for research at Clemson has not been perceived by those faculty interviewed as a problem. On the other hand most believe that a centralized direction of research would seriously impair individual research programs.

The committee recommends that the University pursue an active program which ensures the continued growth and health of individual as well as University (or institute) and Collegiate research programs.
4. Funding From University Sources

One of the major complaints voiced by virtually everyone interviewed by
the committee was the inadequate funding of essential functions required for
research. This problem manifests itself in a number of ways:

a) Inadequate to nonexistent policy on the use and commitment by the
   University of matching funds. Certainly the creation of a written
   university research policy on matching funds will help all concerned
to plan and better execute this essential ingredient of successful
   funding.

b) Inadequate to nonexistent equipment budgets, particularly for replacement
equipment.

c) Inadequate to nonexistent funding for the maintenance of research
equipment. Much of the equipment at Clemson is slowly falling into
   a state of disrepair for lack of funds.

d) Inadequate to nonexistent recruiting and start-up funds* for attracting
   high quality faculty members to Clemson. Probably the single most
   important factor in building a high quality research effort at Clemson
   is the hiring of the best possible faculty members and other nonfaculty
   professionals. At the present time Clemson is seriously falling behind
   peer institutions in many disciplines in our ability to attract the best.
   This is due to many factors but certainly the lack of research start-up
   funds is a major factor.

e) Inadequate to nonexistent discretionary funds at all levels to help
   smooth out fluctuations in state and federal funding.

f) Inadequate to nonexistent departmental research funds. Many faculty
   members complained bitterly to the committee that it was the lack of
   small scale funding for incidental items that was hurting the most.

g) Inadequate to nonexistent departmental funds for professional development.
   Especially acute here is the shortage of travel funds for attendance at
   professional meetings, the lack of funds to cover publication costs or
   page charges, and the lack of funds for departmental seminar programs.

h) Failure to recognize the need for threshold funding; i.e., most research
   efforts have a threshold of funding below which the effort cannot be
   productively maintained. In many cases threshold funding is not being
   maintained.

* Here we are thinking primarily of investments in new equipment (or the like)
which is not consumable.
The committee recognizes that many of these funding problems originate at the state level and are often due to the lack of a mechanism for carrying money over from year to year for a budget item which oscillates. On the other hand, the University has in some cases failed to provide funding for research related essential functions. As stated in the Introduction, many new programs have been started without adequate funding and have drained resources from other units.

The committee found faculty morale in the area of essential funding of academic research to be particularly low. Virtually everyone is of the opinion that things are only going to get worse given current economic times.

The committee recommends:

1. That appropriate officials of the University carry out a realistic assessment of the funding needed to maintain essential research functions and develop a plan to achieve this funding. This could be done during the coming self study.

2. That appropriate officials of the University initiate a large scale fund drive in an effort to attract private funding for a research endowment (at least, $10 million dollars) to be used to supplement inadequacies in research support when and if needed.
5. **State Personnel and Purchasing Regulations**

To carry out academic research one must have a structure of personnel and purchasing rules and regulations which allow one to operate. There are several facets in this vein which impact on research at Clemson:

a) Faculty release time for both sponsored and unsponsored research. Many deans and department heads pointed out to the committee that the state bureaucracy and paperwork required for releasing a faculty member and hiring temporary teaching help or otherwise allocating faculty time is out of all proportion to that which is necessary. The committee would also point out that there has been a reluctance here on campus to allow release time for unsponsored research. (This can be accomplished by reduced teaching loads.) This type of release time is essential to the health of individual research groups.

b) Temporary or short-time help. Here the ceiling on hiring in concert with the considerable paperwork involved makes for a slow process. In some cases a grant can run out before approval of a position can be had. A streamlining of state personnel laws relative to university personnel is needed.

c) Ceiling on hiring of nonfaculty professionals. Here again grant money is available to hire people but positions may not be forthcoming.

d) Lack of understanding by the State Legislature as to the needs of a university as regards personnel and purchasing.

e) The dual layer of local and state purchasing offices which leads to excessive bureaucracy in the purchase of needed research equipment. Typically a research group needs the equipment yesterday, not six months in the future. The committee feels that the joint action of the local purchasing office plus a state auditing system is sufficient.

The committee recommends that President Atchley along with appropriate officers of the University and the Presidents of other South Carolina institutions of higher learning develop a program to educate the officials of the state government as to the needs of a university in regard to personnel and purchasing regulations as they impact on research and to work toward getting a more efficient and responsive state bureaucracy.
6. **Indirect Costs/Overhead**

The area which appeared to be the least understood by both research faculty and administrative officers was indirect costs/overhead. Indeed, misunderstanding and confusion reigns. The committee believes that most of the problems can be grouped and characterized as follows:

a) Most faculty members do not know how the indirect costs percentage is arrived at and how it relates to the university budget as a whole.

b) Most faculty members do not believe that their department ever receives any of the indirect costs monies. (Of course, 15% was returned this year, but this is a new thing.)

c) Many feel that their departments suffer financially when research is conducted without a return of overhead monies.

The committee recommends:

1. That appropriate University officials prepare a document which explains indirect costs/overhead.

2. That a percentage of indirect costs be returned to those departments which generate the money. (Each department should decide how the money is to be distributed within the department.)
7. Facilities and Services

The inadequacies of the research facilities here at Clemson have been a major topic of discussion for some time. Indeed, the Tiger carried an article several years ago in which the college deans portrayed the facilities as being obselete for the most part. Many prestigious scientific journals have also lamented the decline in funding of new research equipment at the national level. The federal government through NSF is attempting to reverse this trend.

Here at Clemson, notice has been taken of the problem and some plans and programs to improve the situation are being considered; however, it still must be said that a redress of the equipment problem has not substantially occurred.

At Clemson University there are three major service facilities, namely, the library, the computing center, and the physical plant. For the most part all segments of the faculty interviewed by the committee seemed to feel that the library adequately serves our present needs. No complaints of substance were found.

The computing center also serves well as a general purpose facility; however, some problems were described by the research faculty, namely,

a) The computing center is insensitive to researcher's needs.

b) The Computer Advisory Committee should be populated with informed users.

c) A better pedagogic effort should be made in the minicourses taught by the center; that is, talk in plain English instead of computer jargon.

d) There is concern about who gets priority in the scheduling. Should outside local groups who happen to be cash customers get the same priority as a research faculty member?

e) There is a need to develop a distributive network of computers with some being allocated a high priority for research computing.

f) There is a need for a number crunching (long word length) minicomputer for some of the research computing now being envisioned.

At the present time research faculty who need the computer are able for the most part to hold their own against competing groups; however, there are many indications that this state will not continue. A major effort should be made to develop a research computer facility as an adjunct to the present computing center.

The physical plant was criticized by research faculty in two ways: first, it was felt that the current outside bidding system doesn't seem to work. Second,
the costs to departments for work (even trivial work) done by the physical plant are totally out of line. This impacts strongly on research since departments are unable to pay for renovation or upgrading of needed laboratory facilities. A better billing scheme which does not bankrupt departments is needed.

The committee recommends:

1. That a committee be established under the Office of the Provost to compile data on the equipment situation during the coming self evaluation and that a specific plan be developed to upgrade the research equipment at Clemson to the state of the art where feasible.

2. That the University consider establishment of a research computing center as an adjunct to the current facility.

3. That the physical plant budgetary and billing process be made more sensible.
3. **Safety/Handicapped**

A major problem area which is rapidly mushrooming is that of federal intervention through regulation and restrictions on safety in the research laboratory and to providing appropriate facilities for the handicapped. Although these two areas are rather diverse from one perspective, they tend from a bureaucratic viewpoint to impact on research in much the same way. Namely, as a state institution we are required to meet OSHA and HEW standards for safety and for the handicapped. The committee feels there can be little doubt that the decade of the eighties will see a major push by the federal government to force universities into compliance.

To the individual researcher, this means that his research could and probably will fall under a certain amount of government regulation. For example, benzene and/or formaldehyde, which are now listed as carcinogens, are used extensively in research labs. It is probable that their use will be restricted to areas which have adequate fume hoods and ventilation. Clemson at the present time in many research work places is poorly equiped with fume hoods. Thus, either the researcher must give up some research or modify his experiments, or the University must build better ventilation systems. This is only one example of the kind of thing the University and the research community will be facing in this decade. Planning must begin now to deal with what will certainly be a very expensive problem.

The committee recommends:

1. That a committee be created by President Atchley to examine the dual problems of safety and provisions for the handicapped in university research laboratories.

2. That safety experts from industry be brought to Clemson to survey laboratories and prepare a report to the President.

3. That the committee prepare a plan to bring Clemson into compliance with present and expected regulations.

4. That a mechanism be established to inform faculty of their responsibilities to safety and to the handicapped in their research laboratories.
9. Personnel and Financial Administration as they Affect Research

In at least two colleges of the university there is an obvious imbalance between (1) the college's budget for research, (2) the criteria for evaluation of faculty, and (3) the criteria for promotion to the two highest ranks. In one college almost 0% of the budget is for research and 0% of the workload is assigned to research (since faculty typically teach 12 hours, with multiple preparations). Yet, between 20% and 30% of the faculty evaluation is based on publication of research, and publication is the indispensable condition for promotion to the two highest ranks.

In that particular college there is the expectation that research and the publication of research findings are to be accomplished outside the standard work week, during one's "free time." Such a policy is counterproductive for several reasons. First, it relegates the research function to the status of a hobby: an ancillary activity in which one engages on an ad hoc basis, particularly suited to those who are relatively free of family and community responsibilities. Second, the policy violates the managerial principle that a person's evaluation and promotion should be based on the work he is contracted to do within the normal work week. Many faculty work far in excess of that, without complaint, but it is inappropriate to base a major portion of the evaluation and promotion criteria on a function that occupies almost 0% of the college budget and 0% of the workload of the faculty member.

The committee recommends:

1. That the university establish a faculty/administration personnel policy that each person be evaluated and considered for promotion primarily on the basis of the excellence with which he executed his manifest responsibilities, as detailed in a job description.

2. That in each college, the manifest responsibilities of the faculty be in balance with the budget (such that if 25% of the faculty evaluation is based on research, then approximately 20-30% of the budget be allotted to research).

3. That the Vice President for Academic Affairs evaluate the academic deans annually to appraise conformity with the second recommendation, above.

4. That the university personnel policy stipulate that in evaluating the research/publication effort for promotion and personnel evaluation, both basic and applied research be counted, including publication of nonrefereed materials.
10. Miscellaneous

In this section the committee will list other problem areas. Many of these areas are as important as those that were extensively discussed; however, the committee believes that they are self explanatory and do not require specific recommendations. They are as follows:

a) Lack of direct involvement of active research faculty in many university processes which affect their work.

b) Slow communications between off campus faculty and appropriate research administrators, resulting in delays in processing proposals and the like.

c) Lack of graduate students.

d) Lack of adequate support personnel, both technical and clerical.

e) Budgets are increased as a percentage of the previous year with no account taken of the growth of a department.

f) Lack of internal support for unsponsored research.

g) Too large a student/faculty ratio.

h) Faculty salaries are too low.

i) Priorities in building and renovation do not reflect real needs at Clemson.

j) Research facilities are often usurped by undergraduate teaching demands to the detriment of both.

k) The Business Office "cut off" date on purchasing effectively eliminates 1/12 or more of the operating year for the researcher.

l) Lack of a written policy for tenure and promotion for the whole university.

m) Need for legislation to exempt colleges and universities from the grant and contract review processes of the Grant and Contract Review Office of the Budget and Control Board.

n) Need for legislation to exempt colleges and universities from remitting indirect costs to the state general funds for other than research agreements.

o) Lack of a nationwide FTS telephone line to communicate with external agencies.
1. I spoke with Dean Hurst about our concern over the composition of the Ad Hoc Committees on Summer School, and Review of Academic Regulations. He agreed to expand the membership on these committees with each college being represented.

The members of an Ad Hoc Committee to study overall policies on Summer School are:

Dr. Stephen R. Chapman, Chairman, Associate Dean and Director of Instruction
Professor Clarence L. Addison, Associate Professor of Building Sciences
Dr. James E. Matthews, Professor of Elementary and Secondary Education
Dr. William Baron, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering
Dr. Thomas E. Wooten, Alumni Professor of Forestry
Dr. James A. Kimbell, Associate Professor of Accounting and Finance
Dr. Alan Schaffer, Head, Department of History
Dr. Mary Ann Kelly, Associate Professor of Nursing
Dr. H. W. Graben, Professor of Physics
Mr. Jim Roberts, Budget Director
Mr. Reginald Berry, Registrar
Mr. Jeffrey A. Clark, Undergraduate Student
Ms. Karin M. Barto, Graduate Student

The members of an Ad Hoc Committee to Review Academic Regulations are:

Dr. C. A. Grubb, Chairman, Assistant Professor of History
Dr. Larry Bauer, Professor of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
Dr. Norman L. Book, Associate Professor of Building Science
Dr. Gordon W. Gray, Professor of Elementary and Secondary Educ.
Dr. Benjamin Dysart, Professor of Environmental Systems Engr.
Dr. Herbert Brantley, Head, Department of RPA
Dr. James A. Kimbell, Jr., Associate Professor of Acct. & Finance
Dr. R. F. Larson, Head, Department of Sociology
Professor Cynthia Belcher, Assistant Professor of Nursing
Dean H. E. Vogel, Dean, College of Sciences
Dean Farrell B. Brown, Office of Graduate Studies
Dean K. N. Vickery, Office of Admissions and Registration
Ms. Roseann Stone, Undergraduate Student
Mr. Paul A. Giammatteo, Graduate Student
2. Ed Clark and I attended a conference, presented by the American Council of Education, on Revision of the Faculty Handbook. The conference was held on April 22 and 23 in Pittsburgh.

3. The Advisory Committee met on Thursday, April 24. Committee assignments to the standing committees of the Senate were made as were recommendations to Dean Hurst for the University Councils and Committees.

4. The following items were acted upon or information made available at Cabinet meetings during the past month.

April 10 Cabinet meeting

A. Employment under Titles II D and VI of the Comprehensive Employment Training Act within the University will be phased out through attrition. This decision was based on salary restrictions currently imposed by the federal government on CETA employment, unstable funding of contracts, and the administrative overhead associated with the program.

B. The Cabinet approved a recommendation of the Scholarships and Awards Committee to eliminate participation in the National Merit Program as a criterion of eligibility for the award of a Faculty-Staff Scholarship. It was also decided that the stipend should remain at $1500.

C. The Cabinet adopted a report of the Committee to Study Clemson House/Highway 93 Crosswalks. See Attachment A.

April 24 Cabinet meeting

A. A recommendation of the Special Advisory Committee on Names that the Forest and Recreation Resources Building be named Lehotsky Hall in honor of the late Professor Koloman Lehotsky was approved for submission to the Board of Trustees.

April 25 Cabinet meeting

A. A recommendation by the Traffic and Parking Committee to restrict bicycle traffic to roadways was defeated.
May 1 Cabinet meeting

A. It was reported that the Koppers Company Foundation had made an unrestricted grant to Clemson University in the amount of $2500.

B. The report of the Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee was received. A minority report was made by Mr. Ron Herrin. It was suggested in both reports that a Clemson University Group Insurance Committee be established to replace the Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee. This matter and the formation of such a committee will be held until it can be considered by the President's Council. See Attachment B.

5. On Friday, April 25 two members from the College of Nursing AD program addressed the Advisory Committee.

6. At the May 5 meeting of the Educational Council the following recommendations were passed:

   A. Graduate School Admission Requirements for Foreign Students - See President's Report, March 25 meeting

   B. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Alumni Graduate Fellowships. See President's Report for March 25 meeting

   C. Full Time Enrollment for Pre-doctoral Students. See Attachment C.
MEMORANDUM

TO:       President Bill L. Atchley
FROM:     James L. Strom
SUBJECT: Report of Committee to Study Clemson House/Highway 93 Crosswalks

Attached is the report from the committee which was appointed on September 5, 1979, to study the Clemson House/Highway 93 Crosswalks. As directed in your appointment memorandum, we have thoroughly studied the situation and have provided several possible solutions in the report.

The back-up material supporting each proposed solution is filed temporarily in the Campus Master Planning Office in Sikes Hall. This information was too voluminous to attach to this report, but is available for review if required.

The committee put in many hours of work other than at the regularly scheduled meetings. Their diligence and genuine desire to thoroughly investigate every possible solution is evidenced in the attached report.

Copies of the report for Cabinet members are also attached for distribution when appropriate.

JLS:tp

Attachments

xc: All Committee Members
REPORT
of the
COMMITTEE TO STUDY
CLEMSON HOUSE/HIGHWAY 93 CROSSWALKS

February 15, 1980
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Introduction

In September 1979, President Atchley appointed a special committee of Faculty, Staff, and Students to examine the problem of pedestrian safety on Highway 93 in the vicinity of the Clemson House and Sikes Hall. The primary objectives of the committee were to examine the magnitude of the pedestrian safety problem at the existing crosswalks on Highway 93, to investigate the need for short-term improvements that would improve pedestrian safety, and to examine various future actions that could result in a permanent solution to the problem.

The problem of pedestrian safety on Highway 93 is a complex problem that does not have a simple solution. The downhill grade and curving alignment of Highway 93 tend to complicate the pedestrian safety problem. Particular care must be taken that any solution adopted has the ability to significantly improve pedestrian safety at a realistic cost without causing other problems that are just as serious as the original problem.
Committee Action

One of the first actions of the committee was to arrange a meeting with Clemson House resident students to clarify certain rules and responsibilities for safe crosswalk usage. Several members of the committee met with the Clemson House students on September 20 and discussed several aspects of pedestrian safety. A one-page handout covering a description of pedestrian rights and responsibilities taken from the South Carolina Code of Laws and a summary of guidelines for safe pedestrian street crossing prepared by the committee was distributed and discussed. Student suggestions for improving pedestrian safety were solicited for the future consideration of the committee.

Two potential solutions to the pedestrian safety problem that were to be examined by the committee consisted of a pedestrian overpass over Highway 93 and relocation of Highway 93 to a location behind the Clemson House. The consideration of these two alternatives required the collection of data on traffic volumes, pedestrian crossing volumes, vehicle speeds, design criteria, and cost estimates. Consequently, the examination of these two alternatives was assigned as a semester project in a graduate class in Highway Safety Engineering being taught in the Department of Civil Engineering by one of the committee members. A group of graduate students was assigned to collect pertinent data and examine the characteristics of each alternative. Finally, each group presented their results to the committee and provided the committee with various items of data concerning the traffic operations on Highway 93 and pedestrian use of the crosswalks. This information proved to be a valuable source of data for committee consideration.

Another action undertaken by the committee was to request that the Physical Plant conduct a study of lighting in the vicinity of the Highway 93 crosswalks. This action was initiated in response to concerns about inadequate crosswalk lighting for nighttime use expressed by Clemson House residents. Physical Plant personnel took measurements of lighting intensity during the night at several locations in the vicinity of the crosswalks. The results of this study indicated that lighting conditions conform to accepted standards for lighting intensity at pedestrian crosswalks.

Another complaint expressed by Clemson House resident students was the high frequency of vehicle speeds in excess of 25 mph speed limit on Highway 93. The committee urged Campus Security to monitor speed limits more frequently in an effort to obtain a greater degree of speed limit compliance from motorists. Several positive steps have been taken to improve speed limit enforcement. The inherent characteristics of Highway 93 tend to promote travel...
above the 25 mph speed limit. However, with a strong enforcement program for the 25 mph speed limit, vehicle speeds can be restrained to a degree and this can significantly increase the safety at the pedestrian crosswalks.

The committee was also able to obtain the cooperation of the South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation in upgrading the night visibility of the signs used to warn motorists of the presence of the pedestrian crosswalks. The existing unreflectorized overhead pedestrian crossing ahead signs have been replaced with signs made of a reflectorized material to make the signs more obvious to motorists at night. A similar action will be taken with the shoulder mounted pedestrian crosswalk signs as soon as the new signs are available. These changes should increase the visibility of the signs to the motorist and thus be very beneficial in reducing the pedestrian hazard at night.

Alternatives Considered

In considering possible future actions to alleviate the pedestrian safety problem on Highway 93, the committee examined five alternatives. The alternatives included:

I. A pedestrian overpass

II. The relocation of Highway 93

III. Reconstruction of the intersection in front of Sikes Hall into a T-intersection with a four-phase traffic signal

IV. Reconstruction of the intersection in front of Sikes Hall into a T-intersection without signalization

V. An alternative that consisted of no new construction but included the changes in signing and a continued program of speed limit enforcement.

Information on Alternatives I and II was generated by the graduate class as described earlier. A subcommittee was appointed to investigate the intersection reconstruction and signalization alternative (Alternative III). The subcommittee developed a plan for concentrating the traffic movements that now occur at the two intersections into a single T-intersection with a four-phase, fully actuated, traffic signal for traffic control. This alternative would involve widening of Highway 93 in the vicinity of the new T-intersection to provide a left turn lane for traffic entering on Calhoun Street. The traffic signal would have three phases for vehicle movement and a separate phase for pedestrian movement.
across Highway 93. All phases would be actuated by demand, either vehicle or pedestrian.

Once the subcommittee had developed the information on the signalized T-intersection, it became apparent that an unsignalized T-intersection (Alternative IV) should also be considered because it would reduce pedestrian conflicts with vehicles exiting from the existing intersection. Therefore, information on this alternative was also developed for committee consideration.

Committee Analysis and Conclusions

After considerable deliberation and discussion of the operational and safety characteristics, advantages and disadvantages of the various alternatives, the committee reached a consensus on the following points:

1. If the desire of the University is to provide the highest possible level of pedestrian safety, the committee believes that the pedestrian overpass is the only feasible alternative. The overpass would completely separate pedestrian traffic from vehicular traffic. This solution provides the highest degree of pedestrian safety and also minimizes the disruption of vehicular traffic flow on Highway 93.

   In order to achieve a high degree of pedestrian safety with the pedestrian overpass, considerable effort and expense must be expended to ensure that the only possible pedestrian access across Highway 93 is at the overpass. This will require the construction of a barrier (probably on the east side of Highway 93) to restrict pedestrian movement to the overpass. This barrier must be designed and constructed very carefully if it is to perform effectively and not detract from the aesthetics of the area. A considerable design effort will be required to accomplish this task. The cost of the pedestrian overpass and the associated barrier is estimated at approximately $200,000. The costs could increase considerably, depending on the extent of the barrier.

   An aesthetic design for the overpass can be developed that will not detract from the main entrance to the campus.

   If the Clemson House ceased to be used as a dormitory any time in the near future, the need for the pedestrian overpass would be greatly diminished.

2. The committee is not convinced that extensive construction or changes in the present conditions are justified. Although there is considerable potential for vehicle-pedestrian accidents, a reasonable degree of care on the part of the pedestrians
and drivers can minimize this hazard.

The aggressive program of speed enforcement on Highway 93 that has existed for the past several months should be continued to ensure that motorists comply with the posted speed limit.

The effort that was recently made by the committee to obtain reflectorized pedestrian crossing signs at the crosswalks will improve the night visibility of the crosswalks and reduce the hazard to pedestrians at night. Efforts by this committee and the University Parking and Traffic Committee have resulted in half of the signs being installed. The remaining signs will be installed when available.

A study of lighting in the vicinity of the crosswalks was undertaken at the request of the committee and it was determined that the present lighting is in compliance with accepted standards.

Only two pedestrian-vehicle accidents have occurred on Highway 93 over the past several years. Given the safety record over the past several years and recent observations made by members of the committee, the location does not qualify as a high accident location.

Pedestrians presently do not experience any serious delay in finding an acceptable and safe gap in the traffic stream on Highway 93 during off-peak hours. During peak hours, motorists were very prompt to stop and permit pedestrians waiting at the curb to cross.

The pedestrian safety problem on Highway 93 is not significantly greater than other locations on campus or in downtown Clemson.

3. The other three alternatives considered by the committee, which consists of relocating Highway 93 north of the Clemson House, reconstructing the intersection in front of Sikes Hall to form a T-intersection with a traffic signal, and constructing a T-intersection without signalization, do not represent feasible solutions to the problem of pedestrian safety on Highway 93.

The Highway 93 relocation is a very expensive project that does not resolve the problem. The estimated cost of the relocation is approximately $2,100,000.

While pedestrian-vehicle conflicts would be greatly reduced by the relocation of Highway 93, they would not be eliminated because portions of the highway would continue to serve as an entrance to the campus. Also, new problems of pedestrian safety would be created by having the relocated Highway traverse the faculty housing area where small children are present.
In general, the Highway 93 relocation also causes other serious problems such as limiting access to the Clemson House and the Alumni Center. The committee believes that this alternative is too expensive to be seriously considered and that it creates as many problems as it solves.

While a signalized T-intersection would provide a pedestrian phase that could reduce the potential hazard to pedestrians, it is not a completely fail-safe solution. Pedestrians would be required to wait until the pedestrian phase stopped vehicular traffic before crossing Highway 93. There is a high probability that many pedestrians would not be willing to delay their crossing until the pedestrian phase occurred and would cross Highway 93 when the signal was giving a green signal indication to vehicular traffic. The traffic signal will need to have four phases to provide for all the traffic movements, resulting in a maximum cycle length in the range of 90-115 seconds.

Also, the signal could provide a false sense of security to pedestrians that might result in as many accidents as are presently occurring. Pedestrians would not be as cautious and aware of vehicular movements with a signal that provided a pedestrian phase. The geometry of Highway 93 is such that drivers may not be aware of the signal before it is too late to stop for a red signal indication. Consequently, there is no guarantee that serious pedestrian-vehicle accidents would not occur.

The estimated cost of reconstructing the intersection and providing the necessary signalization is approximately $56,000.

The construction of a T-intersection without signalization would provide only a minimal improvement in the situation. The improved geometrics of the intersection and concentrating all traffic movements at one location would improve driver awareness of pedestrians and reduce visibility problems of conflicting traffic movements. The estimated cost of reconstructing the intersection is $41,000. Since the alternate does not provide any significant protection for pedestrians crossing Highway 93, the committee does not believe that this alternate should be seriously considered as a realistic solution to the problem.

Appendix 1 describes in more detail the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative.
APPENDIX 1

I. A Pedestrian Overpass

Advantages:
1. Provides a positive separation between pedestrians and vehicles.
2. Has the potential to enhance the aesthetics of the area.

Disadvantages:
1. Pedestrians must be forced into using the overpass with a physical barrier (probably on the east side of Highway 93).
2. There might be some initial objections to the aesthetics of the overpass and the physical barrier.

Estimated costs: $200,000-250,000
II. The Relocation of Highway 93

Advantages:
1. Eliminates major pedestrian-vehicle conflicts.
2. Separates through and campus traffic.

Disadvantages:
1. Several units of University housing will have to be demolished or relocated.
2. Access problems will be created for the Clemson House, the Alumni Center and three units of faculty housing.
3. Acquisition of three plots of non-University property will have to be made.
4. A major highway facility will be routed through a residential area.
5. Other pedestrian-vehicle conflicts would be caused in different locations.
6. A bridge would have to be built to provide access to the Baptist Student Union and other properties northwest of the Alumni Center.
7. Excessive grades would exist on the proposed highway.
8. Parking for Clemson House employees and student residents of the Clemson House would have to be relocated.

Estimated costs: $2,100,000
III. Signalized T-intersection

Advantages:

1. One 90-degree entrance into Highway 93 should prove safer than two entrances at flat angles.

2. A pedestrian phase to allow pedestrians to cross Highway 93 should increase safety.

Disadvantages:

1. Vehicles and pedestrians would still be crossing at the same elevation and thus the opportunities for accidents would still exist.

2. The intersection of the street leading to the parking lot behind Sikes Hall with Calhoun Street is very close to Highway 93 and traffic may back up to this intersection causing congestion during peak hours.

3. Efficiency of the traffic signal will likely be diminished due to the close proximity of the two intersections.

4. Pedestrians may not be willing to wait for the pedestrian phase.

5. Pedestrians crossing on the pedestrian phase may have a false sense of security.

6. Pedestrians not waiting on the pedestrian phase and crossing on other phases will not receive the courtesy stop by vehicles because motorists will have the right-of-way.

Estimated costs: $56,000
IV. Unsignalized T-intersection

Advantages:
1. Driver awareness of pedestrians would be enhanced at the intersection.
2. Reduces visibility problems of conflicting traffic movements.

Disadvantages:
1. Pedestrian safety is not significantly improved with this alternative.
2. The width of the street would be increased to five lanes thus forcing pedestrians to cross an additional lane.
3. Pedestrians would tend to cross the highway at other points than the intersection because it would be inconvenient to walk to the intersection.

Estimated costs: $41,000
V. Existing Intersection and Crosswalks with Improved Signing and Continued Speed Enforcement

Advantages:

1. With changes in signing and improved speed enforcement, this alternative offers a level of pedestrian safety, without construction, comparable to the other alternatives (with the exception of the pedestrian overpass).

Disadvantages:

1. There is no separation of vehicles and pedestrians and the potential for pedestrian-vehicle accidents will continue to exist.

Estimated costs: Minimal
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Bill L. Atchley, President

THROUGH: Mr. Melvin E. Barnette, Vice President for Business and Finance

THROUGH: Mr. T. H. Hinton, Assistant Vice President-Financial Management

FROM: Ron Herrin, Director of Payrolls and Employee Benefit Programs

SUBJECT: Minority Report - The Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee Recommendations Concerning Prudential Group Life Insurance Program

As Director of Payrolls and Employee Benefit Programs, and because I am in total disagreement with the limitations of Item 3, Scope, of Recommendation #1 and all of Recommendation #2 made by the Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee, the following is submitted as information and as a recommendation for your consideration:

A. The Clemson University Group Life Insurance Program was initiated to expand and improve the total package of fringe benefit programs offered to Clemson University employees. The master contract was not issued to the participants in the program, but to Clemson University. It was signed for Clemson University by Mr. Melvin E. Barnette as Vice President for Business and Finance. The University has the responsibility to secure and make available to its employees well-rounded programs of Health, Life, Disability, Savings, and other payroll deduction programs. Having assumed these responsibilities, the University must also make sure these programs fulfill the purposes for which they were originally intended, for both the University and the University's employees.

B. Recommendation:

1. Organization

That a permanent committee be established and be referred to as the Clemson University Group Insurance Committee to replace the Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee.
MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. Bill L. Atchley

April 10, 1980

2. Composition

That the committee be composed of nine (9) members (three (3) permanent members and six (6) appointive members), the Chairman being appointed and serving at the pleasure of the President of Clemson University.

Permanent Members (3)

a. Director of Payrolls and Employee Benefit Programs

b. Chairman of the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee

c. Assistant Director of Personnel or other staff member whose primary duties include assisting: (1) University employees who anticipate retirement and (2) retired former employees.

Appointive Members (6)

These appointments shall be made by the President of Clemson University and be representative of the Faculty and Staff (approximately one-third and two-thirds respectively). Initially, two members will be appointed for three year terms, two members for two year terms, and two members for one year term. Thereafter, committee replacements will be appointed for three year terms, except appointments that are made to complete an unexpired term of a member of the committee.

3. Scope:

The Clemson University Group Insurance Committee shall be charged with the responsibility of investigating and studying various group-type insurance programs as dictated by need and availability and/or requested by the President of Clemson University. In each case a report of its findings and recommendations shall be made to the President for his information and appropriate disposition. This Committee shall also make recommendations to the President concerning any distribution of income in excess of expenses on all group-type insurance programs. The final decision in each case is reserved to the President of the University.

In my opinion, the general policy of the Committee should be that some portion of the premiums paid that are in excess of expenses be used (not necessarily each year) to establish and build a contingency reserve equal to two years annual premiums. During the process of building the contingency reserve to the desired goal, some dividends could be returned to the participants in proportion to the total annual premiums paid by each participant. After the desired reserve is established, each year the Committee should recommend to the President one or
more of the following alternatives: (1) Purchase additional term Life Insurance coverage with no increase in premium to the participants. (2) Refund the excess premiums to the participants in the form of cash dividends. (3) Some combination of items (1) and (2).
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Bill L. Atchley
President

FROM: Ron Herrin
Chairman, Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee

SUBJECT: Recommendations of the Group Life Insurance Committee Concerning Prudential Group Life Insurance Program

The Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee held an open meeting January 24, 1980, at 1:15 p.m. We presented the April 30, 1979, final accounting report for the Prudential Group Life Insurance Program and received comments and questions from the participants present (approximately 50) concerning the program.

As a result of several Committee meetings and the open meeting, the Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee makes the following recommendations, with a majority but not with unanimous approval:

Recommendation #1

A. Organization:
That a permanent committee be established and referred to as the Clemson University Group Insurance Committee to replace the Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee.

B. Composition:
That the committee be composed of nine (9) members (three (3) permanent members and six (6) appointive members), the Chairman being appointed and serving at the pleasure of the President of Clemson University.

1. Permanent Members (3)
   a. Director of Payrolls and Employee Benefit Programs
   b. Chairman of the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
c. Assistant Director of Personnel or other staff member whose primary duties include assisting: (1) University employees who anticipate retirement and (2) retired former employees.

2. Appointive Members (6)

These appointments shall be made by the President of Clemson University and be representative of the Faculty and Staff (approximately one-third and two-thirds respectively). Initially, two members will be appointed for three year terms, two members for two year terms, and two members for a one year term. Thereafter, committee replacements will be appointed for three year terms, except appointments that are made to complete an unexpired term of a member of the committee.

3. Scope

The Clemson University Group Insurance Committee shall be charged with the responsibility of investigating and studying various group-type insurance programs as dictated by need and availability and/or as requested by the President of Clemson University. In each case, a report of its findings and recommendations shall be made to the President for his information and appropriate disposition.

Recommendation #2

That an organization of participants, with a Steering Committee, be formed in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, Chapter 17, Section 53, "Organization of a Permanent Society" (copy attached) for each participating (dividend-paying) group-type insurance program instituted at Clemson University. The purpose of the participant organization, for each such program, will be to make decisions regarding the disposition of premiums paid in excess of expenses and to make recommendations to the Clemson University Group Insurance Committee concerning matters related to each specific program.

RH:se
ceeding meeting is set at the previous meeting or is "at the
call of the chair," the entire series of meetings constitutes a
single session.

§ 53. ORGANIZATION OF A PERMANENT SOCIETY

When it is desired to form a permanent society, the organiz­
ers proceed in much the same way as for a mass meeting,
except that the meetings while the organization is being
formed should usually be carefully limited to persons whose
interest in the project is known. For this reason, it may be
desirable to solicit attendance for these meetings by per­
sonal contact or by letter, rather than by public announce­
ment.

First Organizational Meeting

The first meeting, at which the business portion should be
kept brief, sometimes follows a luncheon or dinner. At these
meetings for purposes of organization, the call to order can
be delayed a few minutes beyond the scheduled time, if
desired.

ELECTION OF TEMPORARY OFFICERS, AND INTRODUCTORY
TALKS. When the person designated for the purpose has
called the meeting to order, he announces, "The first busi­
ness is the election of a chairman." As in a mass meeting,
the one who calls the meeting to order can either nominate
a chairman pro tem or immediately call for nominations
from the floor, and the nominees are voted on by voice.
After the chairman pro tem has taken the chair, a secretary
is elected, also as in the case of a mass meeting. (See pp.
457-458.)

The chair then calls on the member most interested in the
formation of the society to provide background informa­
tion, or he himself can make the talk. Others can also be
asked to give their opinions on the subject, but the chair

should not permit any one person to monopolize the
meeting.

ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION TO FORM A SOCIETY. After a
reasonable time for such informal discussion, someone
should offer a resolution proposing definite action. Those
who planned the meeting should have prepared in advance
a suitable resolution, which may be in a form essentially as
follows:

'Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting that a society
for . . . [the object of the proposed society] now be formed [or
"shall now be formed"].

This resolution, when seconded, is stated by the chair, and
is then open to debate and amendment. Such a resolution, it
should be noted, is only a declaration of intention; its adop­
tion does not bring the organization into being, which is
accomplished by the adoption of bylaws and the signing of
the membership roll by those who initially join the society,
as described below. If the meeting is a large one, it is usually
better that, except for a brief statement of purpose, the
resolution be offered before the introductory talks men­
tioned above.

FURTHER BUSINESS RELATING TO ORGANIZATION. After the
resolution to organize the society is adopted, the succeeding
steps generally are:

1) Introduction and adoption of a motion that a commit­
te of a specified number be appointed by the chair to
draft bylaws for the society—and, where incorpora­
tion may be necessary, to consult an attorney as de­
scribed below.

2) Introduction and adoption of a motion to fix the date,
hour, and place of the next meeting (22), at which the
report of the bylaws committee will be presented. If it

*Called the constitution or constitution and bylaws in some organiza­
tions (see pp. 10-12). For factors affecting the appropriate size of this com­
ittee, see page 475.
is impractical to set a time and place for the next meeting, the motion can be that "when the meeting adjourns, it adjourn to meet at the call of the chair."

3) Introduction and adoption of a motion authorizing the committee on bylaws to provide reproduced copies of the completed draft for distribution to all who attend the next meeting. In this connection, persons seeking to form a society should take into account the fact that expenses may be involved, whether or not an organization materializes. Initiation fees or dues cannot be collected or received in the name of a society until its organization, as described in this section, is completed.

Other business before adjournment may include informal discussion of aims and structure of the proposed society—which may serve to guide the bylaws committee. (See also below.)

When the business of the first meeting is concluded and a motion to adjourn is adopted (see pp. 462-463), the chair says either: (1) "This meeting stands [or "is"] adjourned to meet again at ... [the date, hour, and place of next meeting]"; or (2) "The meeting is adjourned to meet again at the call of the chair."

Work of the Bylaws Committee

General principles for guidance in the drafting of bylaws are given in §55. The drafting committee may find it helpful to procure and study copies of the bylaws of other organizations similar to the one being formed, although the possible applicability of their provisions must be carefully evaluated in the light of expected conditions within the new society. The committee may also find it advisable to consult a professional parliamentarian.

If it is expected that the society will own real estate, become a beneficiary under wills, engage employees, or the like, it may need to be incorporated according to the laws of the state in which it is situated. (See pp. 8-9.) In such a case, the bylaws committee should be authorized to have one or more of its members consult an attorney to secure information and advice regarding the legal requirements that must be taken into account in drawing up the society's bylaws. If the society is to be incorporated, the same attorney should draft the charter or other instrument of incorporation, which the committee submits for approval at the second organizational meeting, before the bylaws are considered, unless there is some reason for delay. (See below.)

As indicated above, it is advisable to prepare double-spaced reproduced copies of the proposed bylaws—as drawn up by the committee—for distribution to each person entering the hall for the second organizational meeting. If desired, such copies can be mailed in advance to everyone who attended the first meeting.

Second Organizational Meeting

READING AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES. With the temporary officers elected at the first organizational meeting serving until the regular officers are elected, the first item of business at the second meeting is the reading and approval of the minutes of the first meeting, with corrections if necessary.

CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF PROPOSED BYLAWS. After the minutes are approved the report of the bylaws committee normally is received. If there is a proposed corporate charter, that document is presented first. The assembly can amend the draft of the charter, but any resulting modification should be checked by the attorney, to whom the charter is returned after its adoption, for processing under the legal procedure for incorporation in the particular state.

If there is no proposed corporate charter, the bylaws committee chairman, when recognized for the purpose of presenting the report, begins somewhat as follows:
Committee Chairman: Mr. Chairman, the committee appointed to draw up proposed bylaws has agreed upon the following draft and has directed me to move its adoption. [Reads proposals in full—members following on their own copies—unless the first reading is dispensed with; then moves the adoption of the document, as follows:] Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee, I move the adoption of the bylaws.

No second is necessary, since the motion is offered by a committee of more than one person. Since a complete set of bylaws is commonly considered by article or section (see 28), the chair states the question as follows:

Chair: The question is on the adoption of the bylaws as amended. As many as are in favor of adopting the bylaws, say aye ... Those opposed say no ... [and so on, taking a voice vote in the regular manner].

In case of doubt, the chair should call for a rising vote and, if necessary, direct that a count be made; or a member can call for a division (29), and can move that the vote be counted, as described on pages 41–43. Unlike the case of amending the bylaws of an organization already established (56), the adoption of the bylaws through which a society is brought into being requires only a majority vote. The bylaws take effect immediately upon their adoption. A negative vote on their adoption can be reconsidered, but not an affirmative one.

Recess to Enroll Members. After the adoption of the bylaws, only those who join the society are entitled to vote in further proceedings. At this point, therefore, it is necessary to determine who are members. Immediate admission to membership is contingent upon signing a permanent record sheet provided in advance by the secretary pro tern—to be filed with the original papers of organization. This signature constitutes agreement to abide by the bylaws, and is a commitment to prompt payment of the initiation fee (if there is one) and dues for the first year or other period prescribed by the bylaws. Persons thus signing become "charter members."* The secretary pro tern should record and give receipt

*Sometimes, in forming a society, all who join before a specified date after the actual establishment of the organization are included in the role of charter members.
for payments received from members until the treasurer is elected and takes office.

READING OF THE ROLL, AND ELECTION OF PERMANENT OFFICERS. After the recess the chairman pro tem calls for the reading of the roll of members, and the secretary pro tem does so. The chair then says, "The next business in order is the nomination and election of the permanent officers as prescribed in the bylaws."

The nomination and election processes are as described in §53, the election being by ballot if the bylaws so prescribe, which they usually should. The members for whom one can vote are not limited to nominees, since each member is free to vote for any member who is not made ineligible by the bylaws. After the election is completed, the chair declares the results. Unless a proviso attached to the bylaws (p. 497) prescribes otherwise, the newly elected officers immediately replace the temporary ones.

ANY OTHER ESSENTIAL BUSINESS. When the offices have been filled and the new president has taken the chair, he should call for any business requiring immediate attention. In a new society it is generally important that the president have time to give careful thought to committee appointments after examining the list of members. It is therefore often advisable to provide for an adjourned meeting to complete the organization before the first regular meeting. The president may find it essential, however, to name the chairmen of certain committees, such as the membership or program committees, immediately.

When the business of the meeting has been completed, or when an adjourned meeting has been provided for, a motion to adjourn is in order. If it is adopted, the chair announces the result and declares the meeting adjourned.

Subsequent meetings of the society are conducted as described in §53. For additional information regarding the organization of a federation by a convention of delegates from prospective member societies, see §59.

§54. MERGER, CONSOLIDATION, AND DISSOLUTION OF SOCIETIES

Combining of Societies

DISTINCTION BETWEEN MERGER AND CONSOLIDATION. In cases where two existing societies wish to combine, there are two possible procedures, which are legally distinct:

- In the case of a merger, one of the two organizations continues, while the other loses its independent identity and ceases to exist, since it is merged—that is, absorbed—into the former.

- In the case of a consolidation, two or more organizations each discontinue their independent existence, and a new entity is formed which includes the memberships of the consolidating organizations, continues their work, and assumes their assets and liabilities.

In either a merger or a consolidation, the resulting organization may be given a new name, which may include, for example, elements of the names of each of the combining organizations.

CASES INVOLVING INCORPORATED SOCIETIES. If one or more of the organizations involved in a merger or a consolidation are incorporated, an attorney should be consulted to draw up the proper papers and advise as to all steps necessary to fulfill the legal requirements.

CASES INVOLVING UNINCORPORATED SOCIETIES. If none of the organizations involved in a merger or a consolidation is incorporated, the respective procedures are as follows:

- In the case of a merger, the organization that is giving up its independent identity should adopt a resolution substantially as follows: "Resolved, That it is the sense of the A Society that it be merged into the B Society as of [date] or when such merger shall be accepted by the B Society." For its adoption, such a resolution requires the same notice and vote as for amending the bylaws. (See p. 487.) This resolution should be joined with, or
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dean Victor Hurst
   Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Arnold E. Schwartz
   Dean of Graduate Studies and University Research

DATE: March 13, 1980

RE: Full-time Enrollment for Pre-doctoral Students

For at least five years, the Commission of Higher Education has defined the pre-doctoral student. This is one who holds a bachelor's degree, or equivalent, is working directly toward a doctor's degree and has completed 30 hours or less of graduate study (toward the doctor's degree). As far as FTE considerations go, such students are treated as master's candidates. Thus, in order to be a full-time student, a pre-doctoral student must enroll in nine or more semester hours in an academic semester.

For reasons dealing primarily with administrative programming, we have not implemented this concept. This problem is now resolved and I recommend that beginning August 15, 1980, all pre-doctoral students be required to enroll in nine semester hours in order to receive an assistantship, fellowship, or traineeship. I further recommend that students who possess a master's degree in an area different from that of their doctoral work and who will by-pass the master's degree in that discipline be classified as pre-doctoral students.

I would appreciate this being placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the Council of Deans so that appropriate wording can be placed in the next Graduate School Announcements.

AES: sgb
Call to Order
President Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes for May 13, 1980 were approved as written.

Committee Reports
A. Admissions and Scholarship: Senator Kimbell
Senator Kimbell submitted a report from the Admissions Office entitled Application Procedure - 1980. (See Attachment I.) He asked that all Senators study the report and direct comments to him so that President Thompson can then represent the Senate's position. In answer to a question from Senator Grubb, Senator Kimbell commented on the three-pool system suggested by Jerry Reel:

1st Pool - early acceptance based on high school achievement and SAT scores.

2nd Pool - those applicants between the early acceptance group and the group accepted on the basis of predicted average grade-point achievement at Clemson.

3rd Pool - those students for whom academic success can be predicted on the basis of high school achievement and SAT scores.

Dr. Kimbell indicated that a limited number of spaces will be reserved for superior students who make Clemson their late choice.

Senator Miller mentioned the need for a policy concerning housing assignments for continuing students. Senator Kimbell moved to accept the report as a matter of information. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote with no dissent.

B. Policy Committee: Senator Rollin
1. On or about August 1st Senators will receive the Policy Committee's report on Departmental Governance.

2. In response to the mandate of the State Legislature that colleges and universities must forward a report on personnel performance appraisal and grievance procedures to Columbia, the Policy Committee has undertaken a review of the grievance procedures set forth in the Faculty Manual. Senators are invited to examine the procedures given on pp. 36-39 and 57-59 and forward any suggestions for revisions to Senator Rollin.

3. At the request of Senate President Thompson, the Policy Committee will be examining the Faculty Manual in order
to be able to make recommendations concerning the revision of that document. The Committee requests Senators to review the following pages with special care--20, 21, 33-59--and forward any suggestions for revisions to Senator Rollin.

The Policy Committee would also appreciate receiving names of faculty, not necessarily Senators, who would be interested, able, and willing to consult with the Committee about improvements in the Faculty Manual.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Rollin, Chairperson
The Policy Committee

C. Research Committee: Senator Ham

There was no report.

D. Welfare Committee: Senator Schindler for Senator Quisenberry

Senator Schindler stated that the Welfare Committee, having met with President Atchley in regard to fringe benefits and other items to be considered by the Welfare Committee, will submit a report in the near future.

4. President's Report: (See Attachment II.)

President Thompson noted that the June 1980 meeting was not held because the members attending did not constitute a quorum. He called special attention to several items in his report: (a) the announcement at the Council of Academic Deans meeting that there will be no change in the current policy on endowed professorships, (b) the changes in the composition of the Cabinet, and (c) the resignation from the Senate of Senator Carl Gooding, upon accepting a position at another university. The last item of the report concerned the Fall 1980 pay schedule for faculty with nine-month appointments, a matter which Vice-President Coulter had investigated and on which he was asked to report.

5. Vice-President's Report (See Attachment III.)

After presenting his report, Vice-President Coulter moved that the Faculty Senate instruct the President of the Senate to ask the President of the University to change the first pay date for nine-month faculty for the current year from August 28 to August 18, with subsequent payments on alternate Thursdays. During the discussion, Senator Miller mentioned that the University of South Carolina has faculty appointments of 9, 10, 10½, 11, and 12 months and that a faculty member of a given rank at Carolina may receive a higher salary than a person of the same rank at Clemson because of the difference in the type of appointment. In answer to a question from Senator Melsheimer, Vice-President Coulter explained that his proposal would entail changes only in the internal procedures of the University. The motion to accept the Vice-President's proposal carried by a vote of 14 to 7. Senator Rollin raised the question of whether the Senate might request the publication of a five-year pay schedule.
6. Letters Received

President Thompson reported that he had received two letters: one from Horace Fleming, former President of the Faculty Senate, thanking the Senate for a gift and one from Victor Hurst, former Vice-President for Academic Affairs, thanking the Senate for its support and expressing appreciation for a painting given to him by the faculty. Both letters will be included in the President’s Report.

7. New Business

President Thompson called upon Senator Coulter, who asked the Senate to consider sending salutary letters to the President of the Clemson University Foundation and to the Executive Secretary of IPTAY expressing gratitude for their generous contributions to be used for the initial architectural and engineering studies leading to the creation of a performing arts center for Clemson University. (See Attachments IV and V.) Senator Coulter's motion that the letters be sent was passed by voice vote with no dissent.

Resolution FS-80-7-1 was introduced:

FS-80-7-1

Whereas, the traffic barricades used during the academic year result in a significant amount of additional energy consumption due to lengthened travel routes of many faculty and staff.

Whereas, a great portion of this extra energy consumption could be eliminated if the barricades were left down until after the 8:00 a.m. heavy traffic period and taken down before the 4:30 p.m. heavy traffic period.

Whereas, the barricade schedule could be so modified without significantly decreasing pedestrian safety, since only the 8:00 a.m. and 4:40 class transition times would be affected.

Whereas, the University Traffic and Parking Committee has repeatedly refused to pass favorably on the barricade policy modification suggested above.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests President Atchley to act to establish a new limit of 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. for the time period during which the barricades may be in place.

During the discussion, Senator Coulter expressed the desire to see the barricades removed entirely. Several Senators pointed out that the barricades have served the purpose of providing safety for pedestrians; however, several other Senators suggested using alternative means of reducing the speed of traffic. Senator Gowdy's motion to approve the resolution carried.
8. **Announcements**

President Thompson announced that the orientation program for new faculty members is scheduled for August 15, 1980, from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. He asked for six volunteers to assist with transportation.

The reception for faculty will be held on the 21st and 22nd of August at President Atchley's home. President Thompson urged the Senators to attend this reception in order to meet the new faculty members.

As the three officers of the Senate will be away from Clemson during the last week of July, President Thompson announced that Senator Snipes would be available to consult with Senate members during that period.

9. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Myra Armistead, Acting Secretary

Senators absent:
J. W. Dick
V. L. Quisenberry
C. E. Hood (substitute present)
J. L. Young
W. Baron
J. E. Bennett
J. L. Stevenson
D. L. Ham
P. M. Kline
J. W. Huffman (substitute present)

MA/Im

Enclosures
Background and Priorities - Although admissions and housing are separate entities, they are unified in the minds of most prospective freshmen, their parents, and school counselors. Accordingly, they should be coordinated, as the failure to do so is certain to generate more far reaching criticism than such benefit as can be anticipated from asking students to deal with them independently. Fortunately, an increase in the number of residence halls places available to new students a year hence permits the adoption of a procedure for 1981 that will better answer the critics of recent years, in respect to both the amount of housing provided beginning freshmen and the time allowed for them to apply for admission with housing. An outline of the procedure, followed by some comment on possible areas of concern, is outlined below:

1. New student applications will be mailed on or about September 15, and University housing will be guaranteed to any prospective freshman qualifying for admission and graduating from high school in 1981; provided such student submits an application and complete credentials on or before December 1.

2. Candidates for transfer from other colleges and prospective freshmen who graduated from high school in 1980 or earlier who submit applications during the 15 September - 1 December period will have second priority for new student housing.

3. Thirty-two dormitory places, divided so as to provide equally for each sex, will be reserved for outstanding scholars that might be recruited between December 2, 1980 and April 15, 1981.

4. Should the number of qualified new students applying by
December 1 be less than the approximately 2000 - 2100 residence halls places anticipated for this group, subsequent applicants will be considered on a first come - first served basis, without regard to the priority established for freshmen versus transfer candidates cited in 1 and 2 above.

Comment - Possible areas of administrative concern in implementing this procedure relate to the best approach for selecting freshmen in the event a much larger number than anticipated apply by December 1; how best to allocate the 32 beds reserved for late-applying outstanding students; and the most feasible manner of handling dormitory requests from transfer candidates (and freshmen graduating from high school before 1981) whose numbers almost certainly will exceed the number of places available for this group.

1. Should an unexpected abundance of freshman candidates meeting the now prevailing qualification level apply by December 1, there are several possible means of reconciling the number of applicants to the dormitory places available. The simplest way is to raise the general standard for admission. This would receive widespread faculty support; however, to a greater extent than present, outside pressures for exceptions would be forthcoming from several groups that cannot be ignored -- and to the degree that an increase in the number of exceptions took place, Clemson's creditability would likewise suffer even more.

Another approach might be that of increasing the number of freshman by about 150, such that no transfer students had chance for
housing, and curtail the total number of transfer students to about 400. This would have a beneficial effect on the quality of transfer students -- who are not presently as able as a group as are the freshmen -- but it will have an adverse impact on scheduling. Another method envisions raising the standard required for out-of-state candidates while leaving that for South Carolinians undisturbed. This would receive widespread public support, but the loss of out-of-state fees would have a detrimental effect on our budget.

Perhaps the best plan is one that Admissions can effect only if there is a change in academic policy that presently places no restrictions on a change of major. Assuming such a change, the administration might identify those academic areas in which the University is unique in this State; admit students of the currently prevailing qualification level to these departments; and let the level of competition set the standard for other areas as a function of demand.

2. Since the ultimate decision relating to freshmen is likely to be one that does not affect the number of transfer candidates, it is probable that a greater number of them will apply by December 1 than can be housed. Accordingly, this number should be reduced by lottery, thereby enabling Admissions to use the same filing dates for all applicants. To attempt to use different filing dates would create confusion and possibly require additional help to administer.

3. Based on data relating to the freshmen who applied for Clemson for 1980, it appears that about 60 whose prediction was 3.7 or greater in Admissions Group III were unable to obtain dormitory
accommodations. Although some of this group would have been housed had there been a December 1 filing date, and the yield of enrollees from such students is considerably lower than the seventy percent that pertains overall, this appears to be the proper level of qualification that a late applicant should meet if he is to obtain one of the 32 places reserved for outstanding students.

Summary - The procedure outlined will accomplish several desired goals, as follows:

1. It clearly fixes the filing date for admission with an assurance of housing for those accepted among that group.

2. It places a high priority for housing on the eighteen-year old freshman candidates.

3. It offers alternatives for meeting the contingency that in a given year demand could escalate to the point that all freshmen meeting the minimally desired qualification level might exceed housing availability.

4. It maintains the Clemson tradition of providing first priority for housing to currently enrolled students.
President's Report

1. I discussed FS-80-5-1, Resolution on Graduate Student Dormitory, with Dean Walter Cox. Dean Cox supports this resolution and indicated that the proposed change would be implemented in 1981.

2. Dean Hurst has made available information on tenure at Clemson University (see Attachment A).

3. On Tuesday, June 10th I met with President Atchley and the Welfare Committee. Senator Quisenberry will report on that meeting.

4. I met with the Policy Committee on June 12th to discuss their work on departmental headships.

5. Attached (Attachment B) is a copy of an amendment to the Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976, which deals with the grievance procedures for state employees. This amendment exempts faculty, professional librarians, and academic administrators from the state grievance procedures (see Attachment C and January, '80 minutes for Faculty Senate stand on exemption of faculty from the state grievance procedure). Further, the amendment requires that a formal performance appraisal and grievance procedure be submitted for approval on or before December 31, 1980. I have asked the Policy Committee to develop a performance appraisal and grievance procedure to submit to President Atchley.

It is my interpretation of this law that non-tenured faculty cannot file a grievance for not receiving tenure or if their contract is not renewed. I've requested the Policy Committee to address this issue.

6. On Friday June 13, I met with Dr. David Maxwell and briefed him on Senate activities.
7. At the Council of Academic Deans Meeting on June 23, Dean Hurst announced that there will be no change in the current policy on Alumni Distinguished Professorships and other Professorships.

8. The Cabinet has not met since the last Senate meeting, consequently, there is no report. Meeting dates for the Cabinet have been formalized and will be held on the second and fourth Thursdays of each month. The composition of the Cabinet has changed. Cabinet members are President Atchley, Ben W. Anderson, Melvin E. Barnette, Ed F. Byars, Walter T. Cox, Harry W. Durham (Alternate Secretary), Oscar Lovelace, Joseph B. McDevitt (Secretary), David W. Maxwell, and Stassen Thompson.

9. Senator Carl Gooding has resigned from the Senate. Carl has accepted a position at East Carolina University.

10. I was informed on June 30 that the first pay day for faculty with nine-month appointments would not occur until August 28. I initiated a conversation on this with Acting Provost Jerry Reel and Vice President Melvin E. Barnette. Vice President Coulter has met with President Atchley and Vice President Barnette and will report on this matter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL FACULTY 1979-80</th>
<th>TENURED FACULTY 1979-80</th>
<th>% TENURED 1979-80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest &amp; Rec. Resources</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Mgt. &amp; Textile Science</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4/28/80
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6.5</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest &amp; Recreation Resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Management &amp; Textile Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Muldrow Cooper Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tenured 1980-81</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Act To Amend The Code Of Laws Of South Carolina, 1976, By Adding Section 8-17.60 So As To Establish Procedures To Appraise The Performance Of Employees And Faculty Members At State Funded Post-Secondary Educational Institutions And Establish A Grievance Procedure For Such Employees And Faculty Members; And To Amend Section 8-17-50, As Amended, Relating To Exemptions From The State Employee Grievance Procedure Act, So As To Include Certain Faculty Members At State Institutions Of Higher Learning In The Exemptions.

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

Exceptions
Section 1. Section 8-17.50 of the 1976 Code, as last amended by Act 154 of 1977, is further amended by adding at the end:

“(10) All teaching and research faculty, professional librarians, academic administrators, and all other persons holding faculty appointments at any post-secondary educational institution, including branch campuses, if any, as defined in Section 59-107-10 except the technical education colleges and centers provided for therein.”

Performance appraisal procedure
Section 2. The 1976 Code is amended by adding:

“Section 8-17-60. With respect to the teaching and research faculty, professional librarians, academic administrators, and all other persons holding faculty appointments at post-secondary educational institutions described in Section 8-17-50(10), each such institution shall, subject to the approval of the Personnel Division of the State Budget and Control Board and the Commission on Higher Education, promulgate in writing:

(a) A performance appraisal procedure which shall assure:
(1) annual review and evaluation of such employees;
(2) written findings;
(3) review of findings with each covered employee; and
(4) retention of performance appraisals and written comments of such employee, if any, in a permanent file, with right of full disclosure to the employee.

(b) A grievance procedure which shall at an appropriate stage provide a hearing for such employees before an individual or committee designated for such purpose, at which the employee shall have the right to representation by counsel and the opportunity to present
evidence in his behalf; and which procedure shall include a right to appeal the decision to the governing board of the institution, or a committee designated by the board for such purpose, such appeal to be on the record of the hearing. Discrimination in compensation, promotion and work assignment shall be subjects for consideration by such grievance procedure. Dismissal of tenured or other permanent employees and dismissal prior to the end of an employment contract term shall be only for cause, and shall be subject for consideration by such grievance procedure. Grant or failure to grant tenured status to such employees or non-renewal of employment contracts at the end of the contract term shall not be subject for consideration by such grievance procedure."

Procedures submitted to commission

Section 3. The performance appraisal policy and grievance procedure provided for in Section 8-17-60 of the 1976 Code shall be submitted to the Commission on Higher Education and to the Personnel Division of the Budget and Control Board for approval on or before December 31, 1980.

Time effective

Section 4. This act shall take effect upon approval by the Governor.

In the Senate House the 21st day of May

In the Year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Eighty.

NANCY STEVENSON,
President of the Senate.

REX L. CARTER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved the 22nd day of May, 1980.

RICHARD W. RILEY,
Governor.
ATTACHMENT C

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.
May 10, 1980

Dr. C. Stassen Thompson, President
The Faculty Senate
Clemson University
255 Barre Hall
Campus

Dear Stassen:

Once again, let me thank you and the members of the Faculty Senate for the very beautiful, framed drawing by Joe Young which you presented me yesterday.

The drawing now occupies a very prominent place on my office wall for all to see and enjoy as I do.

If I can ever be of assistance to you and to the Senate, please do not hesitate to call on me. Best wishes for a very successful Senate year.

Sincerely,

Horace Fleming
June 4, 1980

Dr. C. Stassen Thompson
President
Clemson University Faculty Senate
Department of Agricultural Economics
and Rural Sociology
255 Barre Hall

Dear Stassen:

I should like to express to the faculty my gratitude for all that they have done to support me in my office over the past fourteen years. I think that our relationship has been wholesome, open, and carried on in a manner suited to the best interests of Clemson University. My wife and I were indeed touched by the reception given us following the May Faculty Meeting and we are particularly appreciative for the reproduction of the oil on canvas entitled "Landscape with Cattle" which was painted by Louis Robbe (1806-1887).

It is certainly true that I have greatly admired this picture following its hanging in the Board of Trustees Room. The reproduction is now hanging in our den. The picture is important to me three ways: First, it ties me back to my interests as an undergraduate and graduate student and to the seventeen years that I served as a faculty member in the Department of Dairy Science; secondly, it identifies my home with the art collection of Thomas G. Clemson; and thirdly, it will remind me of many meetings of the Board of Trustees, the Cabinet, the Educational Council, various committees and councils, and other groups too numerous to mention.

My sincere thanks then to the faculty for a most rewarding educational experience and for their kind gift upon my retirement.

Sincerely yours,

Victor Hurst, Vice President
for Academic Affairs and
Dean of the University

VH/ep
Vice-President's Report

1. **The August 28th Pay Date:** Several senators and other faculty members have approached both President Thompson and me about hardships which will result from the lateness of the first pay period for the Fall Semester. President Thompson discussed the matter with the Vice President for Business and Finance, the Acting Provost, and others before he left on vacation. Since these conversations failed to fully deal with the matter, I discussed it with President Atchley on Tuesday, July 8. Mr. Melvin Barnette, Vice President for Business and Finance joined us during a lengthy consideration of the situation. The following points should be made and can be discussed further as the Senate sees fit:

   A. There has been no "change" in payroll procedures. Rather, the bi-weekly calendar has been progressing toward the August 28 date for some time. Indeed the calendar dictates an August 27 first pay date for next year.

   B. The bi-weekly pay schedule allows for pay dates for 9-month faculty to begin anywhere between August 16 and August 28. This leaves us with only August 21 this year as an alternate starting date but that would place faculty pay out of sync with other staff pay—an unjustifiably burdensome situation for department heads and the Business Office.

   C. I requested and received opinions as to the legality of pushing the first date back to the 14th of August. The Attorney General's office, the Comptroller General's office and the State Auditing Office all concur that the relevant legislation clearly intends that services paid for by the state be rendered to some extent before payment is made. Further, whereas faculty sign no yearly contracts as such, the "effective commitment" between 9-month faculty and the state runs from August 15 to May 15 (there are several extraneous reasons for this relating to retirement benefits, etc.). Therefore, the earliest pay date under the current bi-weekly system is August 16. Since we are wedded to a Thursday pay day at present, this is impossible unless the day is changed. I could request a pay date of Monday, August 18 instead of Thursday the 16th. The result would be to have the last check fall on December 18 instead of December 31 as currently planned. It might also cause a change in the Spring Semester payroll plan which should be carefully considered. I feel that this would require a vote by the Senate before I or President Thompson proceeded further.

(Cont'd)
D. The current bi-weekly pay system and Thursday date were approved by the Faculty Senate in a special meeting on September 19, 1972. The problem is that for the last five years, the calendar for that system has been such that pay periods began prior to the 21st. This year's calendar is different, but within the basic plan as originally defined.

I would make the following recommendations:

1. The Business Office should prepare a 5-year pay calendar and distribute it to all faculty members for purpose of advanced planning. (Mr. Barnette has agreed to this.)

2. The Welfare Committee should initiate a study of:

   A. Alternative pay days (of the week);
   
   B. Alternative pay calendars which would place the first date as close to August 16 as possible; and
   
   C. Alternative pay systems such as a bi-monthly system like that at U.S.C.

3. All Senators should poll their constituents informally as to their preferences for alternative pay schedules within the current system.
June 13, 1980

Mr. Robert H. Yeargin, President
Clemson University Foundation
P. O. Box 6508
Greenville, S. C. 29606

Dear Mr. Yeargin:

On behalf of the faculty of Clemson University, I wish to express our gratitude for the generous contribution of $125,000 from the Clemson University Foundation to be used for the initial architectural and engineering studies leading to the creation of a performing arts center for Clemson University. The entire Clemson Community looks forward to the completion of this project. It will surely enhance Clemson's already growing reputation as a University of excellence. Without the generosity of organizations like the Clemson University Foundation, such things could not happen.

Sincerely,

C. Stassen Thompson, President
The Faculty Senate
ATTACHMENT V

June 13, 1980

Mr. Joe Turner
Executive Secretary, IPTAY
Jervey Center
Clemson University 29631

Dear Mr. Turner:

On behalf of the faculty of Clemson University, I wish to express my gratitude for the generous contribution of $125,000 from IPTAY to be used for the initial architectural and engineering studies leading to the creation of a performing arts center for Clemson University. It is especially satisfying to see the nation's foremost athletic fund-raising organization devote part of its assets to a function beyond athletics and beneficial to the institution as a whole. This kind of sharing goes a long way toward establishing a true Clemson Community.

Sincerely,

C. Stassen Thompson, President
The Faculty Senate

CST/Im
1. Call to Order

President Stassen Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. He introduced faculty members substituting for the absent Senators, Senator E. C. Hipp, replacing C. W. Gooding, and acknowledged Richard Brooks, Editor of The Tiger. Senator Howard was welcomed back from Sabbatical leave.

2. Minutes from July 22, 1980 were approved with two corrections requested by Senator Kimbell under Item A on page 1 indicating that the report was "from the Admissions Office."

3. Committee Reports

A. Admissions and Scholarship - Senator Kimbell

Meetings are being held one week prior to Senate Meetings at the same time (3:30 p.m.) so that a sense of the Senate can be obtained. Discussion followed concerning whether a policy exists regarding meeting times when all committee members but one can meet, as Senator Howard cannot meet at that time. No clear-cut policy being known by those present, Senator Kimbell indicated the committee will "work it out."

An attempt was made to introduce Wes Kirkland, Student Senate President, who was to speak to the Faculty Senate on a proposal for a fall break. Mr. Kirkland had not yet arrived.

Senator Kimbell stated that new areas or problems in the realm of this committee will be dealt with as they arise.

B. Policy Committee - Senator Rollin

The Committee meets on Wednesday in Room 108, Strode Tower. The next meeting will be 3:00 p.m., September 3.

1. Report on Departmental Governance at Clemson University

Senator Rollin ascertained whether all Senators had received copies of the report on departmental governance and distributed copies to several Senators who had not. He stated that the Committee has received some responses to this report but solicited further responses. He proceeded to address several issues in the report in order to clarify the recommendations therein. It was stressed that, in item 1, regular faculty of a department would determine composition of a departmental advisory committee. In item 9, if the recommendations become policy, there would be a one time only vote of confidence, during which more than 40% of a department must vote nay in order to remove the department head.

Senators were reminded that this report is to be formally discussed at the September Senate meeting.

2. Grievance Procedures.

The Committee, both on its own and with Ben Anderson, has been working on preparation of grievance procedures. Two separate processes are being considered:
a. termination of employment - an adversary/legal situation.
b. complaints other than termination - less legalistic, but may involve formal or informal proceedings.

Communication regarding this matter was welcomed by the committee. President Thompson cautioned that some conclusion on Grievance Procedures must be reached by the next Senate meeting and he urged the dispersing of written materials as soon as possible. The similarity between the proposed procedures and those in the current Faculty Manual was remarked upon by Senator Snipes.

C. Welfare Committee - Senator Quisenberry

Fringe benefits for faculty will be the main focus of the committee this year. Next week they will meet with Ron Herrin regarding the insurance program.

Senator Quisenberry requested a 5 minute meeting with the committee immediately following the Senate meeting today.

D. Research Committee - Senator Ham

The committee will meet Thursday, August 28, to review changes in the Office of University Research, the report of the Provost on research, and the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Report on Research. Ideas from other Senators were welcomed.

Senator Rollin commended the Ad Hoc Committee for its work in compiling the report. Senator Ham indicated this commendation will be passed on to ex-Senator Keith McDowell who coordinated the effort.

E. University Fine Arts Committee - Senator Young recommended the 1980-81 series as worthy of notice.

F. Ad Hoc Committee on Scholastic Regulations - Senator Grubb reported that the committee has not met, but welcomed input from others in addition to himself and Senators Gray and Kimbell. He also asked all Senators to remind faculty in each College that scholastic regulations are being reviewed.

4. Presentation from Student Government

The Admissions and Scholarship Committee has been considering the Student Senate Resolution on a Fall Break, and asked Student Senate President Wes Kirkland to share with the Faculty Senate the students' views. Kirkland was recognized by President Thompson and proceeded to speak on behalf of Student Senate Resolution R-79-80-62 which was passed unanimously in February, 1980. (Attachment A).

A discussion followed which focused on timing of the proposed break, possible consequences to interruptions of laboratory courses, and alternatives such as adding days to the spring semester rather than shortening the fall. President Thompson clarified options for action that could be taken by the Senate in response to this presentation, whereupon it was moved, seconded and passed that the matter be referred to the Admissions and Scholarship Committee.
5. **President's Report** (Attachment B)

The following comments were offered as information:

A. Item 1, August 28, 1980 pay date: The primary difficulty in setting up alternative pay dates was expense.

B. Items 3 and 4, Academic Deans' Meetings: Written materials on academic administration reviewed at these meetings are **not** to be viewed as competing with documents being prepared by the Faculty Senate, according to Provost Maxwell. He has indicated that the Senate should proceed as it sees fit.

C. The Advisory Committee has endorsed a request that Provost Maxwell meet for discussion with the Faculty Senate at the October Meeting, to be followed by some kind of social hour. Provost Maxwell has indicated he will be most happy to meet with the Senate.

Senator Baron volunteered Senator Hester (in his absence) to chair an Ad Hoc Committee for the Social preparations. President Thompson welcomed additional volunteers.

6. **Old Business**

There was no old business brought before the Senate.

7. **New Business**

A. Resolution FS 80-8-1 was introduced by Senator Baron who spoke on its behalf. It's adoption was moved, seconded and passed by voice vote.

   FS 80-8-1
   Revision of the Faculty Manual

   WHEREAS relationships governing the actions, responsibilities and rights of the faculty are constantly under review and are often subject of change therefore

   BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate and the Administration of Clemson University agree that revisions to the Faculty Manual shall, in the future, be considered at the time that such proposals are made. There will, therefore, no longer be a need to revise the entire Faculty Manual at one time.

   IT IS ALSO SUGGESTED that in order to facilitate physical changes in the manual that a new format be prepared so that the entire manual need not be reprinted each time individual changes are made.

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

   FS-80-8-2

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

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

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

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

Submitted by W. Baron on 8/21/80

Discussion focused on item 2, selection of students including how students would be selected, applicability in academic units without identified majors or graduate students, and whether students ought to be on selection committees. It was mentioned that in some past situations it has been a problem getting students onto such committees.

Senator Harris moved that the resolution be referred to the Policy Committee for consideration. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote with no dissent. Senator Baron reiterated that the resolution, if passed, would be a change in the Faculty Manual, and further cautioned that this matter be concluded as soon as possible while other Faculty Manual changes are being made.

C. Several amendments to the Faculty Constitution were proposed by Senator Baron. Procedure for their review was clarified and they were offered as resolutions FS-80-8-3 and FS-80-8-4 that the Faculty Senate accept these amendments. Following brief discussion both resolutions were tabled by voice vote (no dissent) until the September meeting. (See attachments C and D for resolutions signed by petitioning Senators.)

8. Announcements

Once again there occurred discussion on the matter of Senate reports and other materials being construed as action or positions taken by the Senate when they actually represent working papers or recommendations to the Senate. Senator Gray cautioned that all Senators need to be aware of this.
In response to Senator Howard's question as to whether reports are routinely sent to President Atchley, Senator Grubb indicated that in the past major reports have been handled this way.

Several Senators emphasized the importance of labeling reports properly so that they are interpreted as information rather than action. Good communication over all, particularly as the Senate deals increasingly in aspects of university governance, was urged by Senator Coulter.

9. Adjournment

Just prior to adjournment Student Senate President Kirkland distributed copies of the Student Senate Resolution for a Fall Break so that Senators might review it.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Priscilla M. Kline

Priscilla M. Kline,
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

PMK/Im

Absent: Senators J. C. Hester
       E. D. Schultz
       J. E. Bennett (J. N. Gowdy, substitute)
       D. L. Cross (R. Edwards, substitute)
       L. H. Blanton (S. Buckner, substitute)
       B. R. Smith (S. Ulmer, substitute)
"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 eight 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
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The Clemson Student Government
RESOLUTION NO. R-79-80-62
1979 - 1980 Clemson University Student Senate

Date Submitted 2/11/80
Date Approved 2/11/80
FACULTY SENATE

August 22, 1980

President's Report

1. On Thursday, July 24, I met with President Atchley and Acting Provost Jerry Reel to discuss the August 28 pay date. At that meeting I outlined the Senate's position. I subsequently met with and discussed this matter with Mr. Melvin Barnette and Dean Maxwell. Their major concern was the expense involved as outlined in this letter to the faculty. I have asked Senator Quisenberry to bring the matter of alternative pay schedules before the Welfare Committee.

2. At the July 24 cabinet meeting the following information was made available:
   
a. The Commission on Higher Education and the Commissions Facilities Review Team will be on campus September 4.
   
b. The Board of Visitors will be on campus November 9, 10, and 11.
   
c. A new policy on the use of Bowman field for parking was adopted. Future policy will be to restrict the use of Bowman Field for parking, particularly during inclement weather, when parking may be entirely prohibited. In addition, underground power cables and receptacles are to be installed with funding from the Tigerama account. An improved turf management program will also be initiated.

3. A number of issues were discussed at the meeting of Academic Deans on August 4. Among the issues discussed were departmental administration and policy on curriculum development. Dean Maxwell announced that for the present all curricular matters will flow through the current committee structure. He also outlined the responsibilities of the Acting Assistant to the Provost.
4. Vice President Coulter attended the Academic Deans meeting on August 19.

5. I received a letter of resignation from Senator Robert G. Bursey.

6. At the Cabinet Meeting on Thursday, August 14, faculty grievance procedures were discussed. President Atchley requested that the Faculty Senate work with Mr. Ben Anderson on drawing up grievance procedures. Senators Rollin and Huffman were requested to work with Mr. Anderson on the grievance procedures.
Proposed Amendments to the Constitution
and By-Laws of the Faculty and Faculty Senate

Constitution

Article II

Section 4. Officers

Presently: The officers of the Faculty Senate shall consist of a president, a vice-president, and a secretary elected by the Faculty Senate from among its members. The election of officers shall be as provided for in the By-Laws.

As amended: The officers of the Faculty Senate shall consist of a president, vice-president-president-elect, and a secretary elected by the Faculty Senate from among its members. The election shall be as provided for in the By-Laws.

By-Laws

Article II

Section 1. Membership

Presently: Members of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the members of the faculty, voting by colleges or schools, for a term of three years.

As amended: Members of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the members of the faculty, voting by colleges or schools, for a term of three years, except for the president-elect whose term in the Senate will be extended to four years if needed to complete the term of president.

If it is necessary to extend the term of the president elect to four years, the College from which the president elect comes shall delay choosing a successor for one year. The successor shall serve a term of two years.

Faculty Members petitioning for proposed amendment:

[Signatures]
Proposed Amendment to the Constitution and
By-Laws of the Faculty and Faculty Senate

By Laws

Article II

Section 1. Membership

Presently: No member of the Faculty Senate may succeed himself.

As amended: A member of the Faculty Senate may succeed one's self.

Faculty members petitioning for the proposed amendments.

William James
Jim Armstrong
Gordon Gray
Grace J. Johnson
E. Schinder
Stephen J. Welschimer
Donald L. Ham
I. Call to Order
The special session was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by Vice President Ed Coulter in place of President Thompson who is ill. Introductions were made of persons attending for absent senators. The presence of Ms. Beulah Cheney, University Relations, and Mr. Richard Brooks, Tiger Editor, was acknowledged.

II. Announcements
A. Vice President Coulter indicated that two functions this week need representation by the Faculty Senate as President Thompson's illness precludes his attending them. It was requested that Senators available either time contact Vice President Coulter following this meeting.

B. Referring to the recent Clemson Bulletin's report on a 7% personnel but for 1981-82, Vice President Coulter stated that the Administration is pursuing alternatives and no final decisions have yet been made.

III. Special Business
It was announced by Vice President Coulter that the main purpose of this meeting is to consider and take action on two proposed documents prepared by the Policy Committee which are due in Columbia in October. Action today will be reported to the Administration tomorrow. He also thanked Senator Rollin and the Committee for their work.

A. Senator Rollin moved that the Senate recommend Faculty Grievance Procedure I to the Administration for inclusion in the Faculty Manual.

A motion was made, seconded and passed that the Senate form a Committee as a Whole to consider this document, whereupon Senator Rollin presented the Committee's view of the synthesis of various materials to formulate the procedure and explained changes from previous procedure.

Clarification was sought regarding two points. Under Procedure, Part A, the thirty day period following alleged grievance is to allow time for filing a grievance, not necessarily to prepare all related materials. Under Procedure, Part B, regarding the Advisory Committee, Senator Hood pointed out that this duty is not among those listed as responsibilities of the Senate Advisory Committee in the Faculty Manual and would therefore need to be added if the procedure is adopted.

1. The Committee as a Whole was terminated and the Order of Business resumed. Senator Howard moved that the phrase "or moral turpitude" be deleted from Section A, 1, due to a lack of definition of the term. Following a second and discussion, this motion was amended by substituting the phrase "or breach of contract" for the phrase "or moral turpitude." The question was called and the amended motion defeated. The original motion was made again. It was defeated.
2. A motion made by Senator Snipes was seconded and passed that adds a sentence to Section Grievances, paragraph A which reads:

"The burden of proof that adequate cause exists rests with the University."

3. Senator Howard's motion to replace "disability" with "inability" in paragraph B, item 3, was seconded and passed.

4. A motion by Senator Howard to substitute the phrase "conviction of a felony offense within the United States or its territories" for the phrase "infraction of law" in paragraph A, item 1, was defeated.

5. A question of Senate alternates' right to vote was raised. Vice President Coulter ruled that they are serving as chosen alternates and can vote.

6. Senator Howard questioned the wording of Procedure in Paragraph A regarding a faculty member's notification of termination. His proposed amendment to insert the following statement was defeated.

"Notification shall be by certified letter with return.
The notification period shall begin with the signing of the return notice."

7. A motion was offered by Senator Howard, seconded and passed which strikes the phrase "if requested in writing" from both places it appeared in Item L on page 4.

8. Lengthy discussion focused on the possible need for delay in the time table once a grievance procedure was no longer in the hands of the Advisory Committee. A motion was offered by Senator Howard and amended by Senator Melsheimer to add Item R on page 5 so that it reads:

"The Administration may grant a delay in the grievance process if requested by the aggrieved party or his/her legal counsel for reasons of health, death in the immediate family and other matters of a similar debilitating nature."

This motion passed.

9. The motion that the Faculty Senate recommend Faculty Grievance Procedure I, as amended, to the Administration for inclusion in the Faculty Manual passed. (Attachment A).

B. Faculty Evaluation Procedures

Senator Rollin moved that the Faculty Senate recommend Faculty Evaluation Procedures to the Administration for inclusion in the Faculty Manual. After this was seconded, Senator Rollin explained several minor changes made on September 16 by the Policy Committee. Following brief discussion, the motion passed by voice vote with no dissent. (Attachment B).
IV. Announcements

Senators were reminded that a major item of business at the September 23 regular meeting will be to review the Policy Committee's report on departmental governance.

V. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Senators Absent:
C. S. Thompson (substitute present)
D. L. Cross (substitute present)
W. Baron
J. C. Hester
J. E. Bennett (substitute present)
J. E. Schindler
H. F. Senter (substitute present)
J. W. Huffman

PMK/1m
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Respectfully submitted,

Priscilla M. Kline, Secretary
of the Faculty Senate
FACULTY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE I

Coverage:

Any faculty member, including teaching and research faculty, professional librarians, academic administrators, and all other persons holding faculty appointments at Clemson University may file a grievance under this grievance procedure.

Grievances:

(A) Dismissals from employment with the University are grievable under this grievance procedure. A dismissal is the removal or discharge of a faculty member with tenure or of a non-tenured faculty member before the end of the specified term of appointment, from his or her faculty position for cause. Adequate cause for dismissal must be related directly and substantially to the fitness of the faculty member in his or her professional capacity as a teacher or researcher, and may be initiated by any administrator in the chain of supervisory responsibility. The burden of proof that adequate cause exists rests with the University. Causes for dismissal are:

1. Conduct seriously prejudicial to the University through infraction of law or moral turpitude.
2. Repeated or significant failure to perform the duties of the position to which the faculty member is assigned or performance of duty demonstrably below accepted standards.
3. Breach of University regulations having serious adverse effects upon the University.

Action for dismissal of a faculty member must be in writing and must contain a statement of reasons or charges presented to the concerned faculty member, preceded by discussion between the faculty member and the appropriate administrative officer, looking toward a mutual solution.

(B) Termination from appointment by the University of a faculty member with tenure or of a non-tenured faculty member before the end of a specified term of appointment is grievable under this grievance procedure. Causes for termination are:

1. Institutional contingencies such as curtailment or discontinuance of programs, departments, college or schools, or other conditions requiring a reduction in staff.
2. Financial exigencies which are demonstrably bona fide.
3. Physical or mental inability to perform normal duties.

Termination of appointment may be initiated by any administrator in the chain of supervisory responsibility. The faculty member concerned will be given written notice of termination with reasons therefor as soon as possible, but not less than twelve (12) months in advance of termination, or, in lieu thereof, be given severance salary for the twelve-month period. Before termination of appointment is initiated, if based on abandonment of a program or department of instruction, every effort will be made by the administration
to place the affected faculty member in another suitable position. If appointment is terminated before the end of the period of appointment because of financial exigencies or because of the discontinuance of a program of instruction, the released faculty member's position will not be filled by replacement within a period of two years, unless the released faculty member has been offered reappointment and a reasonable time has elapsed within which he or she may accept or decline the position.

Termination for medical reasons will be based upon clear and convincing medical evidence.

(C) A grievance alleging unlawful discrimination in compensation, promotion, and work assignments is grievable under this grievance procedure.

(D) Any grievance based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicap, or status as a disabled veteran or a veteran of the Vietnam era, alleging discrimination prohibited by federal law or regulation, may be filed under this grievance procedure.

(E) In addition to the above, any non-tenured faculty member who alleges that considerations violative of academic freedom significantly contributed to a decision to cease, in any manner, his or her employment with the University, may file a grievance under this grievance procedure. In such a case, the burden of proof rests upon the faculty member.

Procedure:

(A) Any faculty member who desires to file a grievance under this grievance procedure must submit his or her grievance in writing within thirty (30) calendar days after the date the faculty member alleges to have been aggrieved to the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate. If, for example, notification is given that a faculty member will be dismissed for cause, the time period of thirty (30) calendar days begins with the date the faculty member was notified of this action rather than the actual effective date of the dismissal. The grievance must state specifically the parties involved, places and dates (where appropriate) and the relief sought by the faculty member. After the thirty (30) day time period has passed, the faculty member forfeits the right to appeal under this grievance procedure and the action taken shall become final University decision.

(B) If the procedure in Step (A) is complied with, the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate shall call a special meeting of the Advisory Committee within ten (10) calendar days after receipt of the grievance by the Chairperson. A quorum shall consist of five (5) members of the Advisory Committee. If the Advisory Committee determines that the grievance is not grievable under this grievance procedure, the Chairperson shall so notify the faculty member within five (5) calendar days after the decision has been reached, and the matter is closed. If the Advisory Committee determines that the grievance is grievable under this grievance procedure, a hearing date will be set. The Advisory Committee will be the hearing panel with the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee serving as Chairperson of the hearing panel. The Chairperson of the Advisory Committee will give each party to the grievance thirty (30) days notice of the hearing date. The notice shall include:
(1) A statement of the time, place, and nature of the hearing including the procedure to be followed at the hearing;

(2) A statement of the legal authority under which the hearing is to be held, including references to the pertinent statutes and portions of the Faculty Manual.

(3) A short and plain statement of the matters asserted.

(C) The faculty member may waive the hearing by so notifying the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee in his or her grievance petition, in which case the Advisory Committee shall take whatever action is necessary to insure a fair and expeditious review of the grievance and base its recommendation thereon.

(D) A member of the Advisory Committee will remove himself or herself from the case if he or she deems himself or herself disqualified for bias or interest. The faculty member concerned will have a maximum of two challenges without stated cause. If such removals and challenges reduce the membership of the Advisory Committee below five (5), the President of the Faculty Senate will appoint from the membership of the Senate sufficient members to raise the Committee membership to five (5).

(E) The faculty member will be permitted in all proceedings to have and be represented by an academic advisor or counsel of his or her own choice.

(F) All matters pertaining to the grievance shall be kept confidential and the hearing shall be closed to the public.

(G) A verbatim record of the hearing will be taken and a typewritten copy thereof transcribed and made a part of the record.

(H) Both parties will be permitted to offer evidence and witnesses pertinent to the issues, and the Administration will, so far as possible, assist in securing the cooperation and attendance of witnesses, and make available documents and other evidence under its control. Irrelevant, immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence shall be excluded. The rules of evidence as applied in civil cases in the court of common pleas shall be followed. Objections to evidentiary offers may be made and shall be noted in the record. If an objection is made to any evidence being offered, the decision of the majority of the Committee present shall govern. When the hearing will be expedited and the interest of the parties will not be prejudiced substantially, any part of the evidence may be received in written form. Documentary evidence may be received in any form of copies or excerpts, if the original is not readily available.

(I) The Advisory Committee will, at its discretion, grant adjournment to either party to investigate evidence concerning which a valid claim of surprise is made.

(J) Both parties may conduct cross examination of witnesses. Members of the Advisory Committee may ask questions of any party or witness at any time during the hearing.

(K) Findings of fact and recommendations of the Committee will be based solely on the hearing record and submitted to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs of the University. The majority vote of the Committee shall be the recommendation submitted to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs within ten (10) calendar days of the conclusion of the hearing.
(L) The faculty member will be given a copy of the recommendation of the Committee at the time it is forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. A copy of the transcribed record will also be provided as soon as it becomes available.

(M) The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall review the record of the hearing and render a decision in writing within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of the record. The ten-day time limit shall not begin until the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs is in receipt of a copy of the transcribed record. The decision shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law separately stated. Copies of the decision shall be sent to both parties and to the Advisory Committee.

(N) The faculty member may appeal the decision of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs to the President of the University, provided that he or she does so within ten (10) calendar days after receipt of the decision of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The appeal must be in writing.

(O) If appeal is made to the President, he or she shall review the record of the hearing and the decision of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and shall render a decision in writing within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of the request for the review. The decision shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law separately stated. Copies of the decision of the President shall be sent to all parties, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate.

(P) The faculty member may appeal the decision of the President to the Board of Trustees or a committee appointed by the Board, provided that he or she does so within ten (10) calendar days after receipt of the decision of the President. The appeal must be in writing and submitted to the Secretary of the Board of Trustees.

(Q) If an appeal is made, the Board of Trustees, or a committee appointed by the Board, will review the record of the hearing and the decision of the President and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and will render a final decision on behalf of the University. The decision shall be in writing and shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law separately stated. Copies of the decision will be sent to all parties, the President, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate.

(R) The Administration may grant a delay in the grievance process if requested by the aggrieved or his legal counsel for reasons of health, death in the immediate family and other matters of a similar debilitating nature.

Final Decision:

If a grievance is filed in a timely manner under this grievance procedure, the original action taken against the faculty member shall not become final until the appeals process is exhausted and a final decision is rendered on behalf of the University. If the faculty member does not appeal any step of the procedure within the time limits prescribed herein, the last decision rendered shall become the final decision of the University.
Continuation of Duties and Salary While Grievance Pending:

If the action taken against the faculty member involves any type of discontinuance of employment with the University as stated above, the faculty member shall not be removed from his or her University duties until a final decision is rendered under this grievance procedure, unless the faculty member is suspended as stated below under Suspensions. In addition, the salary of the faculty member will continue until a final decision is rendered by the University.

Suspensions:

Until the final decision upon the discontinuance of employment of a faculty member is reached, the faculty member will be suspended, or assigned to other duties in lieu of suspension, only if immediate harm to himself or herself or to others is threatened by his or her continuance. Before suspending a faculty member, pending an ultimate determination of his or her status through the University's hearing machinery, the Administration will notify the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate. Suspension is appropriate only pending a hearing. Salary will continue during the period of suspension. The suspension will take effect immediately.

Protection of Faculty Members and Others Involved in Grievance Procedures:

(A) Each faculty member and any other person involved in grievance procedures shall be free from any or all restraint, interference, coercion, or reprisal on the part of associates or administrators in filing a grievance, in accompanying a faculty member filing a grievance, in appearing as a witness, or in seeking information in accordance with the procedures described herein.

(B) The above principles apply with equal force after a grievance has been adjudicated.

(C) Should these principles be violated, the faculty member is strongly encouraged to bring the facts to the attention of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for appropriate remedial action.
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FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The following procedures supersede those set forth on page 48 of the 1976 Manual for Faculty Members.

FORM 1--EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Purpose. This form is used to record a detailed evaluation of the faculty member by the department head so as ultimately to derive, in systematic fashion, a narrative evaluation of the faculty member's overall performance.

Explanations.
1. Each faculty member's assigned duties and professional objectives for the forthcoming year are listed under the categories of Teaching, Research, Extension, Librarianship, and/or Other Activities so that the individual's total effort equals 100%.
2. In consultation with the faculty member, the department head identifies those specific qualities and factors appropriate and necessary to define adequately the individual's assigned duties and objectives. (See Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation for examples of qualities and factors which might be identified.)
3. In consultation with the faculty member, the department head determines whether some qualities and factors should weigh more heavily in the evaluation than others. Once weightings are established, they may not be changed without prior consultation with the faculty member. The relative importance for each major category used should sum to 100%.
4. The department head's performance evaluation is indicated with a check mark under the appropriate rating description. For each category the overall performance rating is indicated by a number from 1 to 6 corresponding to the appropriate rating description.

FORM 2--PROFESSIONAL DATA SHEET

Purpose. This form is used by the individual faculty member to submit an annual report of professional accomplishments to the department head. This form and any attachments thereto are to be transmitted along with Form 3 (see below) to the appropriate University authorities.

Explanations.
1. To be listed and/or described is the individual faculty member's distribution of effort or work performed, for example: Teaching (courses taught, etc.), Research (projects underway, etc.), Extension (field days, etc.), Librarianship (reference work, etc.), and other activities.
2. Also to be listed and/or described are major goals accomplished during the year. These are the same as, but not limited to, those goals established in consultation with the department head (as described in #2 above).
3. Also to be listed and/or described are such professional activities as workshops or seminars attended, participation in professional organizations, publication of papers not directly associated with assigned duties, etc.
4. Other noteworthy activities of a professional nature are also to be listed and/or described.
FORM 3--EVALUATION SUMMARY

Purpose. This form is used to record the department head's summary evaluation of the faculty member for transmission to the college and to the University administration. This form is an official document which includes both narrative and numerical evaluations. It is to serve the goals of faculty development and improvement and provides, as well, information that is relevant to questions of promotion and tenure and that can be used as a basis for determining merit salary increases.

Explanations.
1. A summary of the faculty member's assigned responsibilities and participation in other activities is set forth.
2. A narrative evaluation describing the individual's effectiveness, emphasizing particular strengths demonstrated, indicating the area(s) in which improvement is desirable, and suggesting ways in which the faculty member can reach a higher stage of professional development, is also set forth.
3. Under "Performance" the department head will check either Excellent, Very Good, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, or Unsatisfactory. The department head will then sign the Evaluation Summary. The department head will also provide the faculty member with a personal photocopy of the Evaluation Summary and an opportunity to discuss it with him or her.
4. A faculty member who does not concur with the evaluation made by the department head shall have ten (10) calendar days to file a disclaimer to the Evaluation Summary with the department head. The disclaimer shall become a part of the Evaluation Summary.
5. The completed Evaluation Sheet, along with any disclaimer and the Professional Data Sheet, are forwarded for review to the appropriate dean. After being reviewed by the dean and the addition of the dean's comments and signature, the Evaluation Summary is to be returned to the department. At this time the individual faculty member is to be provided with an opportunity to examine the reviewed Evaluation Summary and to indicate that it has been read. If the faculty member does not concur with the reviewed evaluation, he/she shall have ten (10) calendar days in which to file a further disclaimer. This disclaimer also becomes a part of the complete evaluation which is to be forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for examination, after which it becomes a part of the individual faculty member's confidential file maintained by the dean of the college, with right of full disclosure to the faculty member.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

September 23, 1980 Senate Chamber

I. Call to Order
Vice President Ed Coulter called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. and obtained permission of the Senate to reorder the agenda by placing New Business before Old Business.

II. Approval of Minutes
Minutes of the August 26, 1980 meeting were approved with deletion of one sentence from the Policy Committee Report, at the request of Senator Rollin who made the report.

III. Committee Reports
A. Admissions and Scholarship - Senator Kimbell
The Committee has considered and taken a position of non-endorsement toward Student Senate Resolution R-79-80-62 on a Fall Break. The consensus was that no academic justification exists for such a break.

Deliberations have begun on scholastic regulations as follows:
1. Catalog statement of student, University, advisors, etc. responsibility for meeting degree and graduation requirements.
2. Continuing enrollment - minimum GPR, probation, etc.
3. Credit loads.

Senator Kimbell indicated that the Committee will consider each regulation found in the catalog and urged anyone with input to let it be known. The Committee's intent is to keep abreast of each issue under consideration by the University Committee on Scholastic Regulations, and to give input whenever indicated.

B. At this time Vice President Coulter recognized the presence of Ms. B. Cheney of University Relations, Mr. Richard Brooks, Tiger Editor, and introduced Mr. Jack McKenzie who will be responsible for Internal News reporting for the University.

C. Policy Committee - Senator Rollin
The Committee is presently working on the third draft of the proposed Grievance Procedure II, that procedure which deals with all grievances other than those culminating in termination. Senator Rollin pointed out that this procedure is therefore likely to affect or be relevant to a much larger percentage of the faculty, he further remarked that as there may be a fine line of distinction between what constitutes the interest or protection of faculty and what is necessary for the operating business of the University, this is likely to be a controversial area. Any views of Senators and faculty are being actively solicited. Persons interested are welcome to attend Policy Committee meetings on Wednesdays at 3:00 p.m. in Room 108 Strode Tower. The next meeting is September 24.
D. Research Committee - Senator Ham

The Committee has met to consider the recently proposed objectives of the Office of University Research. Comments and some objections found by the Committee were given to President Thompson who plans to discuss them at a near future Deans' Council Meeting. Vice-President Coulter remarked that this item is on the agenda for the upcoming Deans' Council Meeting. Senator Ham also reported that the Committee is planning meetings with both Stan Nicholas and Provost Maxwell to discuss the proposed outline of objectives for the Office of University Research.

In response to a query from Senator Worm as to what is occurring with a consulting policy, Senator Ham indicated that the discussion regarding directions for the Office of University Research is a general one thus far but will deal more specifically with such issues that are arising as written requirements for a percentage of time breakdown for persons engaged in research activities, and policies concerning use of University equipment and space in consulting activities. Vice President Coulter reported that this latter item did come up at the September 15 Deans' Council Meeting, at which time he was not present due to schedule conflict. He will contact Senator Ham about this directly as soon as the minutes of that meeting are available.

E. Welfare Committee - Senator Quisenberry

The Welfare Committee met with two members of the Welfare Committee of the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina on September 16, 1980, at Clemson. Topics of discussion included the retirement program, medical and dental coverage, rights of retired faculty members. A second joint meeting will be held in Columbia in late October.

At the direction of President Thompson, the Welfare Committee considered the matter of alternate salary schedules. However, the Welfare Committee is unable to propose any alternatives that it feels would be acceptable to a majority of the faculty.

The Committee is proceeding with an insurance contract investigation.

IV. President's Report (Attachment A)

Vice President Coulter conveyed President Thompson's continued concern with Item 5 in that it was his feeling that action taken at the September 11 Cabinet Meeting did not seem to reflect the concerns of the majority of the faculty. A permanent group life insurance committee will deal with the issues in the future.

In response to Senator Howard's query as to which faculty members are serving on the Committee, Senator Quisenberry stated that this information may not be available as they may not yet have been appointed.

Referring to Item 7, Senator Hester thanked Senator Baron and others for the honor of arranging the social function following the October 21 meeting. He announced that following adjournment the Senate and guests will meet at 206 Mountain View Lane, Clemson, for refreshments and discussion. Maps to this location will be available at that meeting.

Regarding Item 4. d., Senator Hester pointed out that teaching loads are heavy in many areas other than humanities and social sciences. Vice President Coulter offered clarification by indicating it was his understanding that this referred to the expectation for faculty members in those departments to carry a twelve-hour teaching load in addition to research and
scholarly writing, with no reduction or allowance for this. Senator Hester stated that teaching includes many activities in addition to in-class recitation and requested that this concern be conveyed to Provost Maxwell.

VI. Vice President's Report (Attachment B)

Vice President Coulter commented on several items in his report, particularly conveying his interest in President Thompson's health and recovery, and offering apology for any confusion or lack of communication that may occur in the interim. He emphasized the "information provided" status of working papers being reviewed by the Deans' Council (Item 5) and reiterated that such papers are not to preclude Senate discussion or to prejudice the Senate but are provided as information. Item 4 was referred to specifically as demonstrating attempts toward improved communication.

Tenure policy changes (Item 2) have had no official decision but are under discussion. These appear to be the salient points of the current proposal. Discussion followed regarding the enumerated points. Senator Hester questioned whether Item 2. B., increase to seven years minimum time for tenuring a beginning faculty member, is likely to occur. Vice President Coulter and Senator Snipes were of the opinion that Provost Maxwell strongly favors this proposal but indicated that the matter is presently under discussion only and will be referred to the Senate Policy Committee once a statement has been formulated, after which it must still proceed through the usual channels (Cabinet, Board of Trustees) before it would become policy. Senator Howard raised the question as to whether the Faculty Manual can be viewed as a contract in manner analogous to students being considered under "contract" by the University Handbook, in reference to tenure policy in Item 2, D. Vice President Coulter offered the opinion that indeed it could.

VI. New Business

Senator Rollin, on behalf of the Policy Committee, moved Resolution FS 80-9-1: that the Faculty Senate accept the report:

Departmental Governance at Clemson University: A Report of the Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate, for forwarding to the Administration. (Attachment C)

The motion was seconded and lengthy discussion followed. Senator Howard requested definition of "regular faculty" in Part II. Recommendations, Item 1. Senator Rollin offered that the Committee's intent was that this refers to full-time faculty. Vice President Coulter further clarified that at the September 15 Deans' Council Meeting "regular faculty" was defined as those receiving two-thirds pay or more.

A concern of at least one faculty member in the College of Sciences was presented by Senator Schindler: that the departmental advisory committees should have minority representation in departments which have minorities. After brief discussion it was pointed out that this report does not specify or limit advisory committee makeup in any way, but rather recommends creation of such committees by election from within each department.
Senator Hester spoke against the resolution, stating that while past problems may justify actions indicated in the report, he feels it may be too limiting in some ways and could put control in the hands of a few rather than placing responsibility for conduct of departmental business on the entire faculty. Senator Huffman argued that electing colleagues to an advisory body need not dilute faculty interaction or responsibility. Some discussion focused on the timing of this report in reference to a similar document being circulated by Provost Maxwell. Vice President Coulter reminded the Senate that priority of the documents was not the issue; rather, the Senate has been asked to respond to the overall issue of departmental governance, and at this time is to decide on what form that response, if any, will take.

Senators Rollin, Snipes, and Bennett spoke in favor of the resolution to adopt the report and forward it to the Administration. An objection by Senator Howard was raised on the basis of its questionable origin with the AAUP study it cites. He reported findings of inquiry he had conducted into that study and reported finding both the instrument used by AAUP and its study weak. He further read a statement reflecting the response of a meeting of the Recreation and Park Administration Department toward the Policy Committee Report. In summary the response was that the report, if implemented, would "change little" and would constitute a "raid on departmental autonomy" in that it would take away a department's right to indefinitely retain a department head. To these charges Senator Rollin responded that while the instrument used might have been imperfect, 329 faculty and administrators found it adequate to express their views. Every aspect of the proposal was derived from repeated incidents reported as being problematic. He further stated that the Committee views the overall report and its recommendations as supportive of department heads, supportive of collegiality and as an effort toward improving faculty participation in departmental governance and faculty morale.

Senator Hester and others mentioned concerns about a resulting increase in work, specifically paper work. Several Senators reflected opposing opinions on this.

A motion was made by Senator Bennett and seconded by Senator Quisenberry to amend Section II, Item 9 in such a way that a "simple majority vote" would replace the "more than 40%" and a six-month revote would allow a second chance to the department head. After discussion the motion to amend was defeated.

Further discussion focused on the possibilities that recommended actions would create a system more like a chairship system, with more power going to the deans' positions and lessening of likelihood of attracting more qualified department heads. Another concern was whether the report was inclusive enough of various issues affecting departmental governance. Opposing views were expressed with Senator Rollin finally stating that this is an instrument for negotiating. During discussion a move to table the resolution was defeated.

After the question was called by Senator Quisenberry, Senator Howard called for a roll call vote. As this was supported by a sufficient number of Senators, the Secretary conducted a roll call vote. The resolution passed by a vote of 17 for, 9 against. (See Attachment F)
VII. Old Business

A. Resolution FS 80-8-3, Proposed Amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws of the Faculty and the Faculty Senate, was removed from the Table. Senator Hester spoke in favor of its adoption. Senator Howard moved that the last sentence in Article II, Section 1 on membership, be deleted. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote. The question was called, procedure clarified, and the Resolution passed by voice vote.

The proposed amendment, which will be recommended to the faculty at the next University faculty meeting, appears as it now reads in Attachment D.

B. Resolution FS 80-8-4, an additional amendment to the Constitution and By-Laws of the Faculty and the Faculty Senate was brought from the Table. Senator Melsheimer moved that this be amended to delete the existing sentence in Article II, Section 1 which reads "No member of the Faculty Senate may succeed himself." After this was seconded and discussed, this motion was defeated.

Considerable discussion followed regarding the desirability of self-succession, the possibility that this can be left to judgment of the Senators and electing departments and colleges, and the proper wording of the proposed amendment. Senator Gowdy read a supportive statement from Senator Baron who originally introduced the Resolution.

Senator Rollin's motion to amend the resolution to state "Members of the Faculty Senate may succeed themselves," was seconded and passed by voice vote with no dissent.

The question was called. The resolution to recommend this proposed amendment to the Constitution and By-Laws to the faculty was defeated. It was clarified that the proposed amendment will still, according to the Faculty Manual, be brought before the entire faculty for a vote, but that this will be done without the supportive recommendation from Faculty Senate. (See Attachment E.)

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

P. M. Kline, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Senators absent:  
C. S. Thompson, President  
H. M. Harris  
D. L. Cross (substitute present)  
H. W. Webb  
G. W. Gray  
W. Baron (substitute present)  
S. W. Wainscott  
D. P. Miller

PMK/Im
President's Report

1. The following have been added to the Cabinet: H. W. Durham, G. M. Moore, and J. L. Strom.

2. On September 3, I represented the Faculty Senate at a reception for the Commission on Higher Education.

3. The Council of Academic Deans met on September 1. Discussion continued on the working papers on Departmental and College Administration, College and University Curriculum Committees and tenure policy. I have kept the advisory committee posted on these papers and will distribute these papers to the Faculty Senate upon receipt of a final draft. It is my understanding that these are working papers only and do not represent policy. Each will be referred to the Faculty Senate for our input.

   It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously that registration be moved to Littlejohn Coliseum by January 1981. In addition, complaints were made about the lack of enforcement of University parking regulations during the time period August 18-21.

4. On August 25, I attended a meeting of the Educational Policy Committee of the Clemson University Board of Trustees. The following was acted on or information made available.

   a. Mr. T. Kenneth Cribb, chairman of the committee, requested that Dean Maxwell and Dr. Reel review the Board of Trustee's Policy Statements as contained in the manual and suggest needed changes.

   b. Progress in searching for academic administrators in the Colleges of Engineering, Industrial Management and Textile Sciences, Liberal Arts, and Nursing and in the Library was reviewed.

   c. Reports of recent specialized accreditation boards for the Colleges of Architecture, Education, Engineering, Forestry and Recreation Resources, Industrial Management and Textile Sciences, and Nursing were discussed.
d. After these reports, Dean Maxwell discussed his plans for reorganization of academic administration as well as the current promotion and tenure policy. Dean Maxwell cited four areas of grave concern. These were: the state freeze on positions, instructional salaries are not competitive, heavy teaching load, especially in the humanities and social sciences, and operating expenses and equipment funds are low.

5. At the Cabinet Meeting on September 11, the committee reports from the Ad Hoc Group Life Insurance Committee were reconsidered (see President's Report, May meeting). I objected to these reports being reconsidered on the grounds that the Senate had not acted upon these reports since we were under the assumption that this matter was to be referred to the President's Council. I then moved the adoption of the majority report, since this was the one closest to the Senate's Resolution FS79-11-1. The motion died for a lack of a second. The minority report was moved and seconded and was passed. I voted in opposition to the acceptance of this report, pointing out that the faculty and staff had been led to believe that the disposition of surplus funds would be decided upon by the policy holders.

6. A faculty committee has been formed to examine the existing Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire and recommend needed changes. Committee members are: Spurgeon N. Cole, Department of Psychology; Kelly W. Crader, Department of Sociology; and Sam L. Buckner, Department of Education. Dean Maxwell has assured me that the committee's report will be referred to the Faculty Senate for input.

7. Dean Maxwell has accepted our invitation to meet with the Senate at the October meeting. Both Dean Maxwell and President Atchley have accepted our invitation to attend the social function following the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Stassen Thompson
President, Faculty Senate

CST/dhh
ATTACHMENT B

SEPTEMBER 23, 1980

VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. I continue to be "semi-acting" president during the continued illness of Stassen Thompson, who, while not seriously ill, nevertheless remains under a vastly reduced schedule. Whereas he still oversees much of the progress of events of interest to the Senate, I am required to attend critical meetings of the President's Cabinet, the Dean's Council, and others. I remain in close contact with Stassen and will continue to do so until his return to full-time duty (an event which I fervently hope will occur in the very near future).

2. On September 15, the Dean's Council took up the issue of changes in the tenure policy. Whereas the issue is still before the Deans, and will not come to the Senate until next month, I am at liberty to note several possible recommendations in the proposal which we will be considering.

   A. The minimum time for tenuring a previously tenured and/or distinguished faculty member who comes to Clemson should be reduced from the current four years to a more flexible schedule; (e.g.- one year or less).

   B. The minimum time for tenuring a beginning faculty member at Clemson should increase to seven years as a norm.

   C. Instructors should be considered tenure-track faculty and the time spent in that rank should count toward tenure.

   D. Faculty currently employed should remain under the existing tenure policy.

   There are other aspects of the proposal, which will be referred to the Policy Committee, but the above appears to be the heart of the matter.

3. Senator Gordon Gray represented the Senate at the Student Alumni Convention reception on Thursday, September 18th and the subsequent banquet on September 20th.

4. I attended the meeting of the Board of Trustees on September 12th. I was assured of their continued respect for the faculty of Clemson and their desire that we be consulted on major policy changes which will be occurring in the future, specific mention being made concerning an upcoming study of Clemson's Honorary Degree Policy to be conducted by President Atchley.

5. The documents accompanying the agenda and President's Report (Department and College Administration and the Addendum) are for information only. They will have no necessary effect on our discussions of Departmental Governance today. They indicate the opinion of the Dean's Council but are only that at present.

Respectfully Submitted,

Edwin M. Coulter, Vice President of The Faculty Senate
Departmental Governance at Clemson University:
A Report of the Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate

I. BACKGROUND

On 15 January 1980 the Senate referred to the Policy Committee a resolution requesting that consideration be given to means by which the department headship system and possible alternations of that system can be studied, evaluated, and submitted to faculty and administrators for their recommendations.*

This resolution, promulgated by the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors, was the end product of an AAUP symposium on the subject, a survey of Clemson faculty and administrators, and studies by AAUP committees. The conclusion of these deliberations was that "a significant portion of the [Clemson] faculty holds that the headship system merits re-evaluation and reformation." **

The Policy Committee carefully examined the materials supplied by AAUP, made inquiries of its own, and discussed the headship system over a seventh-month period. The consensus to which the Committee came was that the present system could be improved. In the course of its deliberations the Committee also came to the conclusion that the issue of the department headship system could not be divorced from the larger issue of departmental governance at Clemson—thus, the title of this report and Recommendations 1 and 2 (below).

It should be noted that the recommendations which follow and their rationales are to be understood as referring not only to academic departments at Clemson but also to similar academic units. Therefore, where the term "head" is used below it is meant to refer also to directors of academic units similar to departments; likewise, where the term "dean" is used it refers also to any other equivalent supervisory administrator.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That each department shall have a standing Advisory Committee, the composition and membership of which shall be determined by the regular faculty of the department; said committee shall elect its own chairperson annually; said committee shall: formally advise the Head on important matters brought to it by the Head, by department committees, and by individual faculty; receive formal responses to its advisements from the Head; formally communicate to the department the committee's disposition of matters coming before it.

2. That, where the Department Head, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, deems it advisable (as in the case of larger departments), a department shall also maintain other standing committees (for example, on curriculum, on multi-sectioned courses) whose composition and membership shall be determined by the regular faculty of the department; said committees shall forward recommendations to the Advisory Committee and the Head, and shall formally report their actions to the department.

* "A Resolution by the AAUP--Clemson Chapter" (11/7/79), p.1.
** Of the 329 respondents to the AAUP questionnaire, 64.4% "favored significant modification of the present system."
3. That, when a headship appointment is to be made, the Dean of the College, in consultation with the University Administration and the College Faculty—but especially with the faculty of the affected department—shall establish a search-and-screening committee, at least three-fourths of whose members shall be from the affected department.

4. That the search-and-screening committee, in formal consultation with the College Faculty—but especially with the faculty of the affected department—shall compose a job description and promulgate it; that said committee shall receive and evaluate candidates' applications and conduct off-campus interviews where feasible; that said committee shall, in consultation with faculty, conduct on-campus interviews with finalists and submit a short list of candidates to the Dean from which the Dean shall make the headship appointment; that, if the appointment cannot be made by the Dean from said list, the search-and-screening committee may make additional nominations; that, if no other candidates are acceptable to the committee, the search shall be re-opened.

5. That, the Advisory Committee of each department, in formal consultation with the Dean of the College, shall determine department policy with regard to the term of service of its Department Head, within the following parameters: terms of four or five or six years, once-renewable or non-renewable.

6. That department heads shall serve at the discretion of their deans.

7. That, under unusual circumstances, a department's Advisory Committee may receive requests from faculty to evaluate the performance of the Head or may itself initiate such an evaluation in order to consider the question of the continuance of the Head for his or her full term of office: that the Committee shall be free to meet with the Head or in his or her absence, and, if advisable, to make recommendations directly to the Dean of the College.

8. That acting department heads shall be replaced by regular heads within a reasonable period of time.

9. That, at such time as these recommendations should become University policy, each department's newly-constituted Advisory Committee shall conduct a secret ballot of the tenured faculty on the matter of the continuance of the present head in office; that department heads receiving a no-confidence vote of more than forty percent (40%) of those voting shall continue in office no longer than the end of the academic year in which the vote is held; that, in any department in which the Head has held office less than four years, said vote shall be postponed until the Head's fourth year in office; that department heads receiving a vote of confidence shall at that time begin in their terms of service in accordance with Recommendation 5 (above).

III. RATIONALE

**Recommendation 1**

This recommendation constitutes a modification of the present University policy requiring each department head to appoint "a faculty advisory committee"
whose function is to assist the head "in reviewing the qualifications of department personnel" (Faculty Manual, p.48). Some Clemson department heads already view such bodies as standing committees and call upon them for advice in other than departmental personnel matters. The thrust of this recommendation is then that all departments shall have at least one standing committee to assist the head in the handling of matters of consequence to the department.

The term "formal" and its variants which appear here and elsewhere throughout this report are to be understood as referring to communications in writing or in oral presentations at officially called meetings. Thus, an Advisory Committee's recommendations would be communicated to the Department Head in writing and/or at committee meetings to which the Head has been invited. By the same token the Advisory Committee would receive and react to the Department Head's formal responses to its advisements. The committee would also be responsible for keeping open the lines of communication to the department faculty but also from the faculty to the committee.

The nature and functions of the Advisory Committee then in no way abrogate or limit the existing authority and responsibility of the Department Head. Rather, the Committee exists in order to aid the Head in the efficient and effective performance of his or her duties by enabling the Head to share concerns and problems, and to draw readily upon faculty experience and expertise. Further, the establishment of this standing committee should foster collegiality as well as communication within departments.

Recommendation 2

Practical circumstances may dictate that a department should assign some functions performed by advisory committees in smaller departments to other standing committees. Whether such committees should be appointive or elective or a combination of the two, and what their sizes and makeups should be, are best determined by the individual departments on the basis of their judicious assessments of their particular situations.

Again, some Clemson departments already follow the kinds of practices set forth in this recommendation. It is the view of the Policy Committee that such practices can go far towards improving department efficiency, productivity, and morale.

The Policy Committee warmly endorses President Atchley's emphasis upon the importance of communication to a university,* and holds that what is so true for universities is true also for any university's departments. An increasingly professional faculty not only needs to be kept informed about departmental activities, but possesses the academic resources to provide valuable input into the planning, policy-making, and decision-making that determine such activities. Moreover, increasing faculty involvement in department activities can lessen the pressures upon the Department Head, enhance the usefulness of department personnel by delegating responsibilities, and foster esprit d'corps by encouraging faculty interaction and cooperation.

Recommendations 3 and 4

These recommendations constitute modifications of procedures set forth in the Faculty Manual (pp.49-50). Again, both establish practices similar to

*See, for example, the Newsletter (6/2/80
those currently followed by some Clemson colleges. The new emphasis in Recommendations 3 and 4 is upon improving communication and collegiality in the headship selection process by increasing the level of formal consultation among deans, college faculties, and departments.

Recommendation 5

Although the present system, under which department heads can retain their office indefinitely, has served Clemson University adequately in the past, in an era characterized by a rapid increase in the professionalization of the University Faculty, that system has come to exhibit distinct disadvantages. For example, very extended administrative service can have adverse effects upon a department head's teaching and scholarship—to the head's professional detriment and, possibly, to the detriment of the teacher-scholars for whom the head ideally is both a model and a leader.

Reciprocally, a department faculty that is only minimally involved in the very planning, policy-making, and decision-making which most affect their professional lives can become desensitized to the problems and the possibilities of departmental administration. And, on the other hand, they can become demoralized due to a decreasing sense of professional autonomy. Further, the indefinite headship can actively discourage the development of potential leadership within a department and foster apathy and excessive dependence upon the head—all to the detriment of faculty growth and development.

Historically, the indefinite headship has made it difficult for Clemson heads to step aside without awkwardness—or even stigma. It is perhaps even more difficult for a department faculty dissatisfied with its head to attempt to remedy the situation. As the traumas experienced by some displaced department heads should not be underestimated, so should the traumas experienced by faculty in some departments not be minimized. For an individual faculty member to request a dean to consider replacing a department head can be a situation fraught with difficulties and anxiety. And where several faculty might consider taking such an initiative they can be vulnerable to suspicions of collusion and conspiracy.

Recommendation 5 represents an attempt to develop a headship system where orderly change in department leadership can take place and one that is responsive to the diverse needs of Clemson University's widely varying colleges and departments. Under such a system one department, in consultation with the Dean of the College, might conclude that it would be best served by a policy that would accommodate twelve years of the same leadership—the six-year term/once-renewable option. Another department, however, might determine that its particular needs would best be met by regularly scheduled fourth-year changes in leadership—the four-year term/non-renewable option.

In their capacity as administrators, department heads are not subject to the subordinate, peer, and superior evaluations mandated for faculty. The faculty and the Advisory Committee of a department operating under the "once-renewable option" could decide to initiate a formal evaluation of the department's leadership in the penultimate year of the head's term of office. Another department, however, might arrive at a consensus that the renewal of the head's term would be "automatic" unless an official evaluation is requested by department faculty. Deans, of course, would have either option or such options as annual reviews of their department heads open to them.
In the view of the Policy Committee, substantive continuity would be realized through the limited-term headship system because changes in leadership, being scheduled, could be more rationally and deliberately accommodated. Departmental efficiency would rise because sudden, disruptive changes in leadership would be minimized and the orderly transfer of duties could more readily take place. Department morale especially could improve because: potential department leaders would likely become more willing to serve as head than some of them now are—for they would not face the prospect of indefinite service; faculty dissatisfied with their department head would know that a change in leadership—free of strife—was in the foreseeable future; and department heads themselves would be able to step aside with their dignity intact.

The Policy Committee has come to the conclusion that the recent Senate proposal—that department heads be subject to periodic votes of confidence—lacks the advantages of the proposed system. For, built into the vote-of-confidence system are: a probable increase in the politicization of the headship office; an increase in the uncertainties of department leadership; and an increase in the likelihood that the replacement of department heads would take place under a cloud.

It is fully recognized by the Policy Committee that the limited-term system will not be without its demands and challenges. Deans, department heads, and faculty especially will be required to do more thinking about department leadership. Faculty in particular will have to become more informed about and more responsive to the problems, the possibilities, and the limitations inherent in the management of departments. Communications within colleges and departments will have to be improved. Faculty will have to take a more active interest in the administering of their departments. In short, the professionalism of Clemson faculty and the principle of collegiality in the University will both be tested.

Recommendations 6 and 7

The principle that department heads serve at the discretion of their deans is hallowed by academic tradition in the United States and validated by long practice. Deans have perspectives on the performances of department heads that are not available to faculty.

By the same token, however, faculty can have perspectives concerning the management of their departments to which deans have only indirect and incomplete access. This fact, it would seem, and the accumulated experience of faculty manifest themselves in the overwhelming opinion of Clemson faculty (92% in the AAUP survey) that "a department head should be accountable to the faculty as well as to the dean." Such accountability is nowhere stipulated in the present Faculty Manual. It has been argued that such accountability now exists de facto, that department heads could simply not function if there is widespread dissatisfaction among their faculties; but, on the basis of its members' experience and its information, this committee disagrees.

The proposed limited-term system should alleviate problems of serious faculty dissatisfaction with department heads. Where it might not, however, where waiting until a scheduled change in leadership might severely impair a department's effectiveness, Recommendation 7 offers an orderly procedure wherein the continuance of a head in office could be given due consideration with a minimum of tension and animus.
Although, under the present headship system, it is possible for a head to perform to the satisfaction of a dean without also enjoying widespread support among the department's faculty--or even in the face of strong faculty opposition--such a modus operandi undermines department morale and efficiency. Under the system proposed in Recommendations 1-8, communication, consultation, and cooperation among deans, heads, and faculty are fostered. The result, we believe, will be a substantial enhancement of departmental morale, efficiency, and productivity.

Recommendation 8
Self-explanatory.

Recommendation 9
The Policy Committee appreciates that making the transition from the present to the proposed headship system will not be without its difficulties. However, by requiring (for example) that a presently serving department head could be displaced only by a no-confidence vote of more than 40% of the tenured faculty should ensure that heads of smaller departments are protected from small cliques of dissatisfied faculty. In a department with only five or six tenured faculty, for example, at least three no-confidence votes would be required to displace the head.

The Policy Committee is most reluctant to disenfranchise any faculty member. It has concluded, however, that the one-time vote-of-confidence should be restricted to tenured faculty so as to remove the possibility that pressures might be applied to untenured faculty. There may also be a virtue in ensuring that this important decision is made by a department's more experienced faculty.

The timetable outlined in Recommendation 9 should permit an orderly transition from the present indefinite headship system to a limited-term system. By way of conclusion we observe that if the Policy Committee's recommendations are adopted by the Faculty Senate and the University Administration to go into effect on 1 July 1981, the following range of possibilities present themselves:

--departments choosing the six-year term/once-renewable option could maintain their present leadership until 1 July 1994.

--departments choosing the four-year term/non-renewable option could maintain their present leadership until 1 July 1985.

Respectfully submitted,

Myra Armistead
Lloyd Blanton
John Dick
John Huffman
Roger Rollin (Chairperson)
Ellen Schultz
David Snipes
Hugh Webb
George Worm

1 August 1980
Appendix to Policy Committee Departmental Governance Report - For Information Only

Minimum number of tenured faculty constituting "more than 40%" in a department having a given number of tenured faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Department</th>
<th>Minimum for &quot;more than 40%&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5, 6, 7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 11 or 12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 16, 17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 21, 22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23, 24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25, 26, 27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28, 29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30, 31, 32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws of the Faculty and Faculty Senate

Constitution

Article II

Section 4. Officers

Presently: The officers of the Faculty Senate shall consist of a president, a vice-president, and a secretary elected by the Faculty Senate from among its members. The election of Officers shall be as provided for in the By-Laws.

As amended: The officers of the Faculty Senate shall consist of a president, vice-president-president-elect, and a secretary elected by the Faculty Senate from among its members. The election shall be as provided for in the By-Laws.

By-Laws

Article II

Section I. Membership

Presently: Members of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the members of the faculty, voting by colleges or schools, for a term of three years.

As amended: Members of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the members of the faculty, voting by colleges or schools, for a term of three years, except for the president-elect whose term in the Senate will be extended to four years if needed to complete the term of president.

If it is necessary to extend the term of the president-elect to four years, the College from which the president-elect comes shall delay choosing a successor for one year.
By Laws

Article II

Section 1. Membership

Presently: No member of the Faculty Senate may succeed himself.

As amended: Members of the Faculty Senate may succeed themselves.
ROLL CALL VOTE OF THE FACULTY SENATORS ON RESOLUTION FS 80-9-1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armistead</td>
<td>Baron (substitute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanton</td>
<td>Hester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross (substitute)</td>
<td>Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grubb</td>
<td>Melsheimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hipp</td>
<td>Olive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffman</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idol</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimbell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quisenberry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schindler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schultz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

lm
I. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by President Thompson, who acknowledged the presence of Mr. Richard Brooks, Tiger editor, Mr. Jack McKenzie, University Internal Communications editor, and Mr. Oscar Lovelace, Student Body President. Persons substituting for absent senators were introduced, as was Senator Jeff Foltz who was elected to fill the unexpired term of R. G. Bursey.

II. Approval of Minutes
Minutes of the Special Meeting, September 17, 1980, were approved as written.

Minutes of the regular meeting, September 23, 1980, were approved with corrections to the wording on p. 4.

III. Special Discussion
A motion was passed to suspend the rules of the Senate whereupon President Thompson introduced Provost and Vice President of the University, W. David Maxwell. Provost Maxwell opened the floor to an informal question and answer period during which he elaborated on his views regarding issues of interest to faculty.

In response to a question from Senator Baron regarding the Provost's report to the Educational Committee of the Board of Trustees which cited concerns over heavy teaching loads in the humanities and sciences, Provost Maxwell indicated that twelve hours is the norm in those areas according to data available to him. He proceeded to discuss variables in addition to stated credit hour loads which must be considered when colleges are compared. A specific contrast was drawn between large class size in junior/senior level majors' courses in specialized fields such as engineering versus smaller class size in junior/senior level liberal arts courses in which the same faculty also serve non-majors. Surface comparisons too easily overlook other variables. Dr. Maxwell cited the need for careful examination of such factors as appropriateness of teaching methods to content and discipline, and a balance between quality and quantity, when determining rationale for class size. While admitting that the basic and most easily manipulated variable is class size, he indicated there should not be a standard teaching load for all circumstances but there should be a standard method for measuring the workload. He indicated he is fully aware of shortages in teaching faculty. To a specific question Dr. Maxwell responded that he would not raise admission standards to counteract budget problems, and that to cut off a primary funding source such as student fees would serve only to anger the people of the State who are another important source of funds.

Senator Kimbell asked for clarification regarding chain of command for faculty senators representing their constituents. Dr. Maxwell stated the Faculty Senate is the representative body and any issues requiring further action should be channeled directly through the Faculty Senate President.

Concerning the previous University administration's policy of "controlled growth" and whether this will continue, Dr. Maxwell stated that as our resources are not unlimited he does not foresee appreciable growth, although we may continue to "drift slowly" as has been the recent trend.
The proposed seven percent budget cut received its share of discussion with Provost Maxwell outlining considerations that have gone into what he termed an exercise which includes projection of specific means to accommodate the seven percent cut if it occurs. His projection does not make cuts across the board by colleges or departments but instead considers many factors which are largely pragmatic. In academic areas consideration was given to the vulnerability of a given unit to the effects of the cut, enrollment figures, pressure for enrollment, and other extraneous factors. A specific example was given as illustration: in the proposed cutback the Library would not be cut proportionally as compared with other units because it is far behind in funding presently. Dr. Maxwell stated also that in this plan lump sum items representing money rather than positions would be more likely to be cut on the supposition that they would be easier to recover later. He did state that some faculty positions would be cut and when this is necessary would occur first in cases of vacancies, temporary positions, and then first-year faculty. In summary he reminded the Senate that the regular budget has already been submitted, and that while he can speculate as to the outcome of the interplay between the Budget and Control Board's request for a plan in case of the seven percent cut and the Legislature's ultimate action, at this point no one knows for sure what will occur.

Attention was given to faculty involvement and responsibility in academic matters following Senator Coulter's question whether the plan for handling of curriculum matters on the college rather than departmental level is likely to spread to other areas. Provost Maxwell unequivocably stated that it is his belief that academic matters are the province of the faculty; this includes curriculum matters, but also includes such areas as the qualifications of members to be added to the faculty, tenure and promotion, admission of students, and qualification of students for graduation. Although he made clear that admission of students at this time is not under the province of the Provost at Clemson University, nor does he plan any immediate steps to change this, he nonetheless believes that admissions and financial aid should be academic matters. To quote Maxwell, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it," but he will make changes as they seem indicated. Upon questioning, he did not care to speculate on how admissions should occur.

Several specific questions were dealt with directly. Dr. Maxwell stated he is in favor of sabbaticals for faculty and views them as basically an administrative problem in terms of fiscal management. He offered the opinion that the Library could benefit greatly from one-half million dollars per year over the next ten years over and above its regular funding and that it would be ideal if the new director actively solicits outside funding. He suggested practical help could come from faculty in other ways; for example, when departments submit proposals for PhD programs it would help if they don't check "no" when asked if more books are needed.

Further discussion was directed toward implementation of greater faculty involvement in academic areas. Dr. Maxwell clarified the mechanism for faculty input into the curriculum process by stating that College Curriculum Committees will be elected; the chairpersons of each College Committee plus one representative from the Library will comprise the University Curriculum Committee. Asked whether issues of hiring, promoting and tenuring of faculty will be handled by a similar mechanism, Dr. Maxwell indicated that in the case of hiring, faculty should be the judges. Faculty as well as department heads should have input into the promotion and tenure processes. In his opinion then, a Dean may need to rule on conflicting recommendations.
Specific processes may vary among departments and colleges. It is his specific intention that he, as Provost and Vice President, will review all tenure and promotion recommendations individually and will try to achieve a reasonable degree of uniformity while respecting differences among colleges.

A brief discussion ensued on the impartiality and fairness of committees whose membership selection varies from election to administrative appointment. There was no decisive resolution of this issue.

Provost Maxwell expressed strongly held views as to promotion criteria. In his opinion the rank of full professor ought to be awarded to persons who contribute substantive additions to the body of knowledge in which each is expert, and further that this be a necessary but not sufficient criterion for promotion. He views the rank of associate professor as one in which high salary can be earned and from which a faculty member should be able to retire gracefully while not necessarily having contributed substantively to the body of knowledge. While feeling there is no fair, simple, across-the-board answer to assigning values to other aspects of faculty members' responsibilities, he feels that regardless of rank, criteria for promotion and tenure must be based on various weights assigned to the triumvirate—teaching, research, and service. Speaking generally he believes that in strictly academic areas emphasis should be on teaching and research (though committee work and community efforts must be included) while in extension or primarily service areas the service would be most important.

Responding to a question from Senator Senter about deficiencies he may have noted overall, Dr. Maxwell stated that this varies department by department and must be attacked by the Deans. Asked by Senator Worm what he considers characteristics for a dean, Maxwell replied, a good sense of humor, ability to keep perspective, not easily excited, calm," and "not always going off on tangents."

Research efforts, areas for focus, and research funding were discussed at some length. Dr. Maxwell indicated he views Clemson's funded research as being of "modest amount", but did not agree that this should mean we ought to narrow our sights. He gave the opinion that we haven't begun to define the parameters for research in the field of energy but that it's not necessary to limit the efforts in this direction in order to work on others. His value is that more in all areas is better and that we have a long way to go to increase faculty productivity.

Several senators asked about the reshuffling of the Office of University Research and indicated the feeling that no benefits have yet "trickled down." Maxwell responded that he hopes present efforts in this direction are building toward improvement of what has been difficult due to insufficiency of funds. He views a "brokerage operation" as an important function, i.e., balancing funding sources with faculty abilities, and plans to divert funding to the OUR to improve its operation as soon as this is feasible.

A query about Dr. Maxwell's view of the standardized numerical evaluation system for faculty brought forth a response in sympathy with that of numerous faculty: it's "a bit like measuring a sunset." However Dr. Maxwell indicated some system is necessary for this purpose.

Several additional questions or comments focused on specific issues.
Provost Maxwell referred to budget responsibility as having to "rest somewhere." His ideal would include input from faculty, a formal request for budgetary needs initiated by the department head, some "water squeezed out" by the dean, and "squeezed again" by the Vice President. Regarding search committees, it is his stated preference that in the case of administrators, a search committee submit three acceptable candidates, without indicating rank order and the selection then be made by the administration.

In summary Provost Maxwell espoused a philosophy of "planned flexibility," strongly advocating faculty speaking out on issues affecting academic areas. He reiterated that a review system for administrators is already being set up and encouraged faculty participation in the review process. He then concluded the discussion.

IV. Announcements

Faculty Senate President Thompson made the following announcements:

A. Maps are available to Senator Hester's house for the social hour to greet Provost Maxwell immediately following the meeting.

B. The Advisory Committee will meet Thursday, October 23 at 12:15 p.m. in Room 261 Barre Hall.

C. The Policy Committee, especially Senators Huffman and Rollin, were thanked for their efforts in writing the new Grievance Procedures.

D. President Thompson thanked Vice President Coulter for his help during his illness.

V. President's Report and Committee Reports

The President's Report and Committee Reports were distributed in writing to allow time for discussion with Provost Maxwell. See Attachments.

VI. Adjournment

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Priscilla M. Kline, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Senators absent:

D. L. Cross (substitute present)
J. W. Dick
L. H. Blanton
E. F. Olive
D. L. Ham
M. A. Armistead
D. P. Miller
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: C. S. Thompson, President
SUBJECT: Voting Status of Substitutes

It was the consensus of the Advisory Committee that the policy regarding substitutes and alternates as outlined in the Faculty Manual be followed. The manual is not clear on this point but until another interpretation is provided I will adhere to the following:

Only those elected members or their elected alternates shall be eligible to vote. Only elected members or their elected alternates shall be considered for purposes of a quorum. Only those schools or colleges with one regular senate member may elect an alternate.

CST/dh
PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. The following persons were appointed members of the Clemson University Group Insurance Committee:

   **Permanent Members (By reason of position)**

   Mr. Ronald T. Herrin (Director of Payrolls and Employee Benefit Programs), Chairperson

   Dr. Virgil L. Quisenberry (Chairman of the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee)

   Mr. Richard F. Simmons (Assistant Director of Personnel)

   **One-Year Term**

   Ms. Dorothy H. Burchfield, Staff Assistant, Department of Agricultural Engineering 10/1/81

   Mr. Paul K. Gable, Jr., Business and Financial Analyst, College of Agricultural Sciences 10/1/81

   **Two-Year Term**

   Mr. John C. Newton, Director of Auxiliary Services 10/1/82

   Dr. Benjamin M. Hawkins, Assistant Professor of Economics 10/1/82

   **Three-Year Term**

   Mr. Billy S. Nix, Motor Pool Supervisor, Physical Plant Division 10/1/83

   Dr. Charles B. Russell, Associate Professor of Mathematical Sciences and Industrial Management 10/1/83

2. The Advisory Committee met on Thursday, October 4, at which time the following items were discussed:
FACULTY SENATE
PRESIDENT'S REPORT

a. Tenure policy

b. Status of substitutes

c. A Steering Committee consisting of Vice President Coulter, Senator Rollin and myself was approved for appointing Ad Hoc Committees on Tenure Policy, Consulting Policy, and Policy and Procedures on Awarding Honorary Degrees.

d. The distribution of committee reports prior to Senate action was discussed. It was the unanimous decision of the Advisory Committee that the distribution of such reports be left up to the discretion of the President. Until there is Senate action contrary to this, I will follow this recommendation.

3. On Saturday, October 11, I addressed the Student Senate and other student leaders on the relationship between the Faculty Senate and Student Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Stassen Thompson
President, Faculty Senate

CST/dhh
POSICTIONS TAKEN:

1. An upgrading in the Minimum requirements for continuing enrollment is needed.

2. A course drop period of four weeks in duration is timely.

3. A statement of student, faculty, and administrative responsibilities should be included in scholastic regulations and elsewhere in university announcements. *

ITEMS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

1. Credit load recommendations as they are presently stated in scholastic regulations and the Clemson Student Handbook.

2. Reexaminations
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. Advisors, 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 familiarize himself or herself with all academic requirements for the degree chosen to remain currently informed of such requirements throughout his or her college career, and to be responsible for completing all such requirements in 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.
Report of the Policy Committee

October 21, 1980

1. Prior to the Senate's November meeting, the Policy Committee will provide Senators with its own version of FS-80-9-2 (regarding the participation of faculty in the selection of University administrators). The Committee's version of Senator Baron's resolution will take the form of a recommended revision of the Faculty Manual.

2. Also prior to the November meeting Senators should receive the Committee's proposal for "Grievance Procedures II" --having to do with faculty grievances not arising out of the termination of a faculty member's association with the University.

3. On 15 October the Committee met with Provost Maxwell and had a full and open discussion of matters of mutual concern. Chief among these were: tenure policy; the relation of "Service" to tenure and promotion policies; the University's "chain of command;" and departmental governance.

   Most of the nearly two-hour meeting was focused upon departmental governance. As a result of that discussion, the Policy Committee intends to consider modifications of the nine recommendations contained in its report ("Departmental Governance at Clemson...."), especially those having to do with the proposed "Advisory Committee" and with department heads' terms of service.

   The prospect is that the Committee will continue to be in touch with the Provost on this and other matters and will in the near future report the outcomes of these discussions to the Senate for Senate approval.

4. Interested Senators and faculty are welcome to attend the next meeting of the Policy Committee: Wednesday, October 22nd, 3:00 P.M., Room 205 Strode.

   The agenda:
   --the report on "Faculty Participation in the Selection of University Administrators;
   --"Grievance Procedures II" draft;
   --recommendations concerning departmental governance.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Rollin (Signed)
Chairperson, Policy Committee
Report of the Ad Hoc Committee On Tenure Policy

The committee has met twice and has made significant progress in developing a revised tenure policy for Clemson University. In response to a request from President Thompson, the duties of the committee have been expanded to include a revision of the current procedures for appointments, promotion and renewal of contract. A first draft of these revised procedures is in preparation. The committee's revisions of both current policies will be submitted to the policy committee for consideration at their November 5 meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Huffman
Chairperson, Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure Policy