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FACULTY SENATE ROSTER 1978-1979
(Senate phone - 656-2456)

<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>T. R. Adkins (Sec.)</td>
<td>Entomology &amp; Ee. Zoology</td>
<td>828 Long</td>
<td>3111</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. F. Dickey (V.Pres)</td>
<td>Dairy Science</td>
<td>124 P&amp;AS</td>
<td>3232</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. E. Hood (R)</td>
<td>Agri. Engineering</td>
<td>203 McAdams</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. B. Smith (P)</td>
<td>Agri. Ec. &amp; Rural Soc.</td>
<td>285 Barre</td>
<td>3475</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. G. Turnipseed (W)</td>
<td>Entomology &amp; Ee. Zoology</td>
<td>Edisto Sta.284-2203</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHITECTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. L. Addison (A)</td>
<td>Bldg. Sciences</td>
<td>166 Lee</td>
<td>3081</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. Young (A)</td>
<td>Arch. Studies</td>
<td>159 Lee</td>
<td>3081</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. Walker (W)</td>
<td>Elem. &amp; Sec. Education</td>
<td>108B Godfrey</td>
<td>3482</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. E. West* (P)</td>
<td>Industrial Education</td>
<td>107 Freeman</td>
<td>3447</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. Prince (W)</td>
<td>Elec. &amp; Computer Engr.</td>
<td>20 Riggs</td>
<td>3375</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. J. Komo (R)</td>
<td>Elec. &amp; Computer Engr.</td>
<td>225 Riggs</td>
<td>3378</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Baron (W)</td>
<td>Civil Engr.</td>
<td>212 Lowry</td>
<td>3002</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOREST &amp; RECREATION RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. D. Reamer (R)</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>266B For.&amp;Rec.</td>
<td>3303</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. A. Merrell (P)</td>
<td>Rec. &amp; Park Adm.</td>
<td>281 For.&amp; Rec.</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT AND TEXTILE SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. C. Whitten (A)</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>209B Sirrine</td>
<td>3497</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. H. Worm (R)</td>
<td>Ind. Management</td>
<td>312B Sirrine</td>
<td>3499</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBERAL ARTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. B. Bryant (A)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>608 Strode</td>
<td>3041</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. F. Steirer (Pres.)</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>222 Hardin</td>
<td>3153</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. S. Lambert (W)</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>104A Hardin</td>
<td>3153</td>
<td>1980</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><strong>LIBRARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. A. Fiste (P)</td>
<td>Catalog Department</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3027</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NURSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. S. Hipps (A)</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>438 Nursing</td>
<td>3072</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. B. Burt* (W)</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
<td>117 Kinard</td>
<td>3417</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. E. Fennell * (R)</td>
<td>Math. Sci.</td>
<td>0-222 Martin</td>
<td>3432</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. K. McDowell</td>
<td>Chem. &amp; Geology</td>
<td>114 Brackett</td>
<td>3089</td>
<td>1980</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>D. S. Snipes (R)</td>
<td>Chem. &amp; Geology</td>
<td>210 Brackett</td>
<td>3438</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comm. Chrm. KEY: Admissions and Scholarship (A); Policy (P); Research (R); and Welfare (W). Advisory Committee members are listed in script.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

May 9, 1978

The Senate Chamber

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the April meeting were approved after several minor corrections.

3. Committee Reports

a. Admissions and Scholarship Committee - Senator Edie, Chairman, submitted the following report on his committee's activities for 1978-79:

(1.) Follow-up on the initial work done by the 1977-1978 committee on a minimum major GPR for graduation.

(2.) Follow-up on the publication of the faculty grade summary.

(3.) Compare "in major" versus "out of major" GPR's for various departments.

(4.) Prepare and distribute a faculty questionnaire covering final exam policy (exemption policy, percent of total course grade, cumulative type of exam, etc.).

(5.) Determine to what degree departments use student evaluations in determining faculty evaluations.

(6.) Study departmental policies on student advising.

During the discussion which followed, questions were raised about the practice of marginal students "shopping around" for courses that they believe might increase their GPR's to the minimum required for graduation. Senator Edie pointed out that the minimum GPR in courses that constitute a major would help reduce this practice. In response to a question on the present final exam policy, it was brought out that there must be a written final exam in each course with the exception of laboratory courses. At one time in 1973-74 the Faculty Senate recommended that final exams be made optional; however, this policy was not adopted by the Undergraduate Council. Senator Edie stated that his committee intends to study this problem and determine what deviations in the administration of final exams exist.
b. Policy Committee - Senator West, Chairman, reported that his committee has had an organizational meeting and formed two subcommittees: Constitution - to be chaired by Tom McInnis; Clemson News Service - to be chaired by Senator West. The next meeting is scheduled for May 23.

c. Research Committee - Senator Fennell, Chairman, reported that the Research Committee met on May 3 to consider topics to be worked on this coming year. Problems associated with Research and Equipment Funding, Consulting, and Tenure Policies were mentioned. The committee will follow up the implementation of the proposed copyright policy prepared by last year's Senate and requests that this policy be included in the Faculty Senate Minutes (SEE ATTACHMENT A). In response to a question on the status of this policy, Senator Fennell stated that it is in Adm. McDevitt's office awaiting a legal opinion.

d. Welfare Committee - Senator Burt, Chairman, reported that his committee met just prior to the Senate meeting this afternoon and that it will continue to function as three subcommittees: Retirement System chaired by Steve Melsheimer; Calendar Year Faculty chaired by Senator Mazur; Academic Faculty chaired by Senator Lambert. Other projects under consideration are: an examination of tenure and promotion policies throughout the university; investigation into complaints by students that some faculty members are not functioning as responsibly as they could be; continue evaluation of fringe benefits; investigate how consulting policies vary from college to college throughout the university.

e. Ad Hoc Committees - Faculty Compensation - Senator Burt, Chairman, reported that his committee met just prior to the Welfare Committee meeting this afternoon. The meeting was organizational in character. He announced that each meeting will be publicized in advance at the Senate meetings. The next meeting is scheduled for June 27, 1:30 p.m. in Room 114 Kinard Laboratory. One major item under discussion is the AAUP study on faculty compensation and how Clemson Faculty Compensation compares with ACC, Southeastern, and sister Land Grant Institutions. Also, the make up of "compensation" and fringe benefits will be studied.

At this point Senator Jacobus expressed concern about the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Fringe Benefits which appeared as an attachment to the Minutes of the February 21 Meeting of the Faculty Senate and which were subsequently published in the Clemson University Newsletter, April 15, 1978. This report was placed in the minutes as information only and was not accepted as policy. President Steirer ruled that discussion on this matter was inappropriate at this time and should be held until Old Business.
Ad Hoc Executive Committee - President Steirer reported that this committee has had two meetings, April 25 and May 8 to review, coordinate, and work out committee plans and activities for the coming year. He announced that the Executive Committee will meet at least once per month at lunch on the Monday before each Faculty Senate meeting.

f. University Councils and Committees -
   Bowl Ticket Distribution Committee - Steve Melsheimer reported that a compromise ticket distribution scheme had been devised whereby: (1) initially only faculty/staff season ticket holders will be considered; (2) on first distribution to season ticket holders a maximum of two bowl tickets will be provided to each season ticket holder; (3) the first half of bowl tickets will be distributed according to IPTAY priority of faculty/staff members; (4) the remaining tickets will be distributed by lottery to the faculty/staff not receiving tickets as above.

Traffic and Parking Committee - Senator Burt reported that a subcommittee is developing long range plans for parking throughout the University. He announced that any requests should be routed through this subcommittee.

Undergraduate Council - President Steirer reported that the Powell report had been turned down. No changes were made in the items. Faculty responsibility in developing and creating class syllabi and objectives was left unchanged. The opinion was expressed that the requests were poorly made.

4. President's Report

1. Steve Melsheimer has been appointed to the Welfare Committee at his request and with chairman Burt's concurrence. The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation is now complete with Roger Rollin joining Steve Melsheimer and E. P. Stillwell as non-Senate members. Phil Burt will serve as chairman and other Senators who will serve are Ted Adkins, Alan Grubb and Sam Turnipseed.

2. I still intend to meet with every Senator to talk over problems and issues. Section 504 has slowed me down considerably, but I have talked extensively with ten members so far. In the next two weeks I hope to see everybody else.

3. Many faculty members have shown an interest in the selection of the next President of Clemson and are concerned that the special interests of their particular college and department may not be considered. I intend to ask the Faculty Senators in each college to arrange meetings with groups of Faculty members (by departments or several small departments combined) during the summer. I know of no other way to insure that individual Faculty members will feel that I understand their expectations, desires and concerns than to give them this opportunity. This is important so that I appreciate your cooperation in scheduling these meetings. When you do, please give me several days notice.
4. Vice-President Dickey and I agree that the many issues facing the Faculty, and within the scope of the Faculty Senate, this year are serious enough to warrant special attention. He would like to talk to small groups of Faculty members in much the same fashion as described earlier. These groups should include Faculty Senators and the purpose is to develop dialogues aimed at dispelling some of the misunderstandings that exist between Faculty in different colleges.

Again, we appreciate your cooperation in scheduling these meetings. Give Vice-President Dickey some notice in scheduling.

5. The practice of conducting meetings with their particular constituents has been initiated with some success by at least one college delegation of Senators. I would like to suggest that other colleges follow suit. One of our serious problems is communicating our enthusiasm and concern to all the Faculty. This helps accomplish that end, and, in this year when we hope to get a positive response on the Constitution, that is an important consideration.

6. I plan to sit down with Dean Hurst next week and review the resolutions that were passed last year and either remain in negotiation or need further explanation.

7. The Section 504 Self-Evaluation Steering Committee has submitted the first draft of its report on how to bring Clemson into compliance with the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Darrel Roberts and I have stressed in the section on Academic Adjustments the need for faculty members to receive the specialized training, sensitivity counselling and other assistance that will enable them to do what is expected of them. We have indicated, further, that the Faculty is willing to assume its share of the responsibility for educating handicapped students, but that the primary responsibility should not fall on individual Faculty members.

8. Unless serious objections are raised in the Senate, the next meeting of the Senate on June 20 will be held in Hardin Hall Room 200.

During the discussion following the President's Report, the following items were brought out: President Steirer feels that Item #3 is extremely important. He is willing to talk with each department and would appreciate maximum attendance. The meetings can extend into fall; September 1 is when the screening process begins.

Item #4 should help dispell animosities which might have developed among the Colleges and is designed to unify the faculty, to help develop the new constitution, and to promote the enthusiastic support that the faculty must give the constitution.

Item #7 deals with a very serious problem facing the faculty. There are indications that some colleges are willing to saddle faculty members with the responsibility of complying with Section 504 with little regard to the time and emotional demands which will be required. We need to be sure that the faculty members are not faced with more responsibility than they deserve. The faculty will need help -- financial, et al. -- from the University. President Steirer expressed his displeasure with the simple response that faculty members will do whatever is necessary to comply with the section because faculty members need more support than such simple statements suggest.
Appropriations were discussed and $1.8 million has been requested for physical accessibility only. The University is expected to supply funds for the purchase of specialized equipment. It is anticipated that no Federal money will be utilized. One Senator suggested that the University take the Federal Government to court over this matter. At least one Dean (Vogel of the College of Sciences) has suggested that one of his faculty members submit requests for funds to support innovative research into the problems of teaching handicapped students. Two rather serious questions were raised: (1) Will Clemson University accept the legal and moral responsibilities?, (2) What will the role of the Faculty Senate be in monitoring this?

The following motion FS 78-5-1 was made by Senator Jacobus:

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate invite Adm. J. B. McDevitt, Col. E. N. Tyndall and Dean Sam Willis to attend the next Faculty Senate meeting on June 20 to discuss Section 504.

The motion received a second, and the vote in favor of the resolution was unanimous.

Item #8 generated a spirited discussion on the pros and cons of meeting in the Student Senate Chamber vs. Hardin Hall Room 200. There was some serious objections to the proposal and Senator Fennell made a motion that the Senate move its next meeting to Hardin Hall Room 200. The motion received a second, the question was called, but the motion was withdrawn before a vote was taken. President Steirer announced that since there are serious objections, the meetings henceforth would continue to be held in the Student Senate Chamber.

5. Old Business

a. Constitution - Report

Senator West reported that work on revising the constitution was still in progress and that Tom McInnis is heading up a constitution revision subcommittee of the Policy Committee.

b. FS-78-4-5

At the April meeting this resolution was postponed until the May meeting and an oral report on the subject was to be given by the Welfare Committee. Senator Burt gave an oral report and then moved to table FS-78-4-5 for further study. The motion to table received a second. The vote to table carried but not unanimously.

c. Senator Edie moved that FS-78-4-3, a resolution dealing with Summer Employment of Faculty, be removed from the table [see ATTACHMENT C.] The motion received a second. A discussion followed and the vote to remove from the table passed unanimously. Senator Edie moved that FS-78-4-3 be adopted, there was a second, a short discussion and an unanimous vote of approval.
d. Senator Lambert asked about the status of FS-78-2-2, a resolution dealing with the Affirmative Action Committee [see page 13 of February 21 minutes]. President Steirer stated that the resolution is still under discussion.

e. Senator Burt reported that the Welfare Committee has received several complaints concerning the current Faculty Evaluation procedure. President Steirer reminded the Senate that he (Steirer) is an ex officio member of the committee monitoring faculty evaluations. Dean Landreth is chairman of this committee and questionnaires will be sent out to determine how faculty members feel about the procedures. There is a representative from each college on this committee and if faculty members have complaints or grievances, they should contact their representative.

f. In response to a question by Senator Worm, President Steirer reported on the progress that has been made toward the development of a Faculty Club. Approximately $1400 has been received from faculty members. The Alumni Fund will supply a matching grant in the amount of $5000. If our $5000 can be collected by May 15 or shortly thereafter remodeling can be started in the Tiger Tavern, a Board of Governors can be elected, and decisions can be made on meals and refreshments this summer so that the Club can begin functioning in the fall.

The question on whether the Faculty Senate has give official sanction on the Faculty Club elicited a negative response; however; it was pointed out that Past Presidents Noblet and Edge and Past Vice-President McInnis are serving on the committee. At this time a point of order was raised that the possibility of official sanction should be considered under Old Business.

6. New Business

a. Senator Hester, in Senator Baron's absence introduced Fringe Benefits Resolution FS-78-5-2 and moved its adoption [see ATTACHMENT B]. There was a second and a rather spirited discussion followed. Senator Jacobus presented some major and minor criticisms. Senator Addison responded that the report was not intended to be a final report and that further studies should be made. Senator Burt moved that the resolution be amended to refer the report to the Welfare Committee for further study. Senator Hester was willing to refer it to the Welfare Committee, but he was not willing to eliminate the reference to rejection. Senator Burt agreed to retain the word reject and just add the Statement:

Therefore, be it further resolved that the whole matter of Fringe Benefits be referred to the Welfare Committee for further study.

Senator Hester stated that the Faculty Senate must go on record that it is rejecting it. Senator Whitten asked if we are rejecting the report or are we condemning the fringe benefits? The answer received was "Both."
After the proper agreements, seconds, etc. the question was called and the motion was approved, but not unanimously. [As information the objection had nothing to do with the resolution per se, but was based on the fact that the Senate had not officially accepted the report in the first place. So how could the Senate reject something that had not been accepted?]

b. Senator West introduced a motion to continue the Ad Hoc Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. A lively debate ensued over the wording of the resolution and the committee charge and the motion was withdrawn. After withdrawal efforts were made to draw up a motion from the floor; this too failed and the effort was abandoned.

c. Senator Dillon attempted to introduce a resolution on Graduate Assistant Stipends; however, at this time the quorum was lost and business ceased.

Discussion did continue and this matter was referred to the Admissions and Scholarship Committee.

President Steirer requested that all resolutions be put in writing and submitted to Secretary Adkins at least one week prior to each Senate meeting. Secretary Adkins also requested that Committee Chairmen submit written reports to him at the end of each meeting.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

T. R. Adkins, Jr.
Secretary

Members absent:

D. B. Smith
J. L. Prince
E. M. Coulter
O. S. Hipps
March 16, 1978

MEMO TO: Faculty Senators

FROM: D. H. Van Lear, Chairman of Senate Research Committee

SUBJECT: Revised Copyright Policy Proposal

The Research Committee is sending you under the cover of this memo the attached copyright policy proposal. This is a revised version of the proposed copyright policy that was prepared by the Copyright Committee of the University Research Council and sent to the Senate by Bob Henningson on December 12, 1977.

Our committee realized that there is some feeling throughout the University that there should be no University copyright policy. However, after studying the matter for some months we could see that it was only a matter of time until Clemson would have a policy, either drafted from within or from outside the University. We felt the better alternative was to prepare a copyright policy from within.

In our study of the policy drafted by the University Research Council, we found a number of points which we felt needed either clarification or modification. Several Senators not on our committee, as well as other faculty members, helped us in drawing these conclusions. Some of the revisions that our committee made, and our reasoning, follow:

1. Copyright ownership will be retained by the originator(s). We felt this was important even when the University had an equity in the royalties. The University doesn't really want the responsibility that accompanies ownership of copyrightable materials, but it should share in the royalties in cases where significant support is provided.

2. Joint ownership of copyrightable materials is omitted from our revised version. We felt that this could become a real legal problem and could be avoided by sharing of royalties in appropriate cases, rather than joint ownership of the copyright.
3. We omitted the phrase regarding University imprimatur, i.e., the right to license or approve, because it could infringe on academic freedom.

4. Since copyrights are a legal matter, or at least have legal implications, we felt the University Counsel should be the Executive Secretary of the Copyright Committee.

5. Members of the Copyright Committee should serve non-concurrent terms to insure continuity, and there should be a representative from the Office of Business and Finance, as well as one from the Office of Graduate Studies and University Research, as ex-officio members.

These are some of the major revisions we made. We want to make it clear that this policy states that the originator(s) of copyrightable materials would be the sole owner of the copyright and receive any royalties that result, unless the University provides significant support. The copyright procedures in the policy state how the issue of significant University support is determined.

The Research Committee thinks that this revised policy has removed many of the weaknesses of the original proposed policy, while retaining its strengths. We urge you to study it and be prepared to vote on it at the next Senate meeting.

DHVL: mp

Attachment
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
COPYRIGHT POLICY

Policy Statement

The purpose of the University copyright policy is to foster, enhance, and maintain traditional scholarly incentives for the production of copyrightable materials and for their widest possible dissemination and use. The University desires to provide expertise, facilities, and executive action in support of individual or University consideration and/or effort; to comply with Federal copyright law in the creation and use of copyrightable materials and in the execution and contractual and grant obligations concerning copyrights; and to ensure the equitable distribution of income derived from copyrightable materials in which the University has an equity. Copyrights will be applied for and retained in the name(s) of the originator(s) even though the University has an equity in the royalties. This policy will not be used for censorship or infringement on academic freedom. This policy does not apply to manuscripts or articles that are submitted for publication in journals, reviews, magazines, or newspapers since copyrights to these materials are usually owned by the publishing firm.

Rights of Originator(s) and Clemson University in Copyrights

1. The University acknowledges the privilege of University faculty, staff, and students on their own individual initiative to write or otherwise generate copyrightable materials to which they have the sole rights of ownership and disposition.

2. Where the University provides support of an individual(s) effort resulting in copyrightable materials by contributing significant faculty, staff, or student time, facilities or resources, joint rights to the royalty income are anticipated. Copyright originator(s) will have the primary responsibility for seeking out commercial publishers or developers for the copyright materials. The University Administration and the originator(s) of the copyright materials will jointly agree and sign a contractual agreement with the commercial publisher or developer. Royalty income will be paid directly to the University and the University will retain all royalty income until the University is compensated for the cost associated with the development of the copyright material. (This development cost will be determined by a Copyright Committee when it receives and acts on a copyright proposal).

3. Ownership of copyrightable materials generated as a result of sponsor-supported efforts will generally reside with the supporting agency subject to the specific provisions of the grant or contract. Where projects are expected to generate copyrightable material, formal agreement for disposition of royalties should be reached prior to commencement of the project. A Memorandum of Understanding will be used for internal or on-campus agreements covering ownership, royalties, and other rights of parties. Faculty, staff and students who will execute the grant or contract should be made fully aware of the terms through the Memorandum of Understanding.
Definition of Copyrightable Materials

The following types of material are now, or may be in the near future, subject to copyright and are covered by the University Copyright Policy:

1. Books, journal articles, texts, glossaries, bibliographies, study guides and laboratory manuals.
2. Syllabi, tests, and proposals.
3. Lectures and unpublished scripts.
4. Musical or dramatic compositions.
5. Films, film strips, charts, transparencies, and other visual aids.
6. Video and audio tapes and cassettes.
7. Live video or radio broadcasts.
10. Other materials.

University Copyright Committee

A Copyright Committee will be appointed as set forth (on specified page in Faculty Manual). The functions of the Committee shall be:

1. It shall consider and evaluate each forwarded copyright request and recommend ownership equity and royalty distribution to the University Administration. Where possible, the originator(s) shall be present when their proposal is considered.

2. It shall be aware of and have available copies of the Federal Copyright Law for distribution to any faculty, staff, or student who requests such information.

3. It shall consider written requests from faculty, staff or students for available Copyright Royalty income for use in pursuing publishers or developers for copyrighted materials. This may involve travel by the originator(s) or the hiring of a literary agent for this purpose. Their recommendation will be forwarded to the Administration.

4. Minutes of the Committee meetings shall be recorded and available to those in attendance; however, they would not be published in the University Newsletter since it may not be in the best interest of the originator(s) to do so.

5. The Vice-President for Executive Affairs and University Counsel, an ex-officio member of the Copyright Committee and its Executive Secretary, shall maintain a file of all minutes of Committee meetings, shall keep originator(s) of copyrightable materials informed of the status of their proposals, shall forward all Committee recommendations to the University Administration for action, and shall execute all copyright applications.

Disposition of Proceeds

All copyright royalty income accruing to the University shall be deposited in an auditable University account, not subject to annual closure, to be maintained for assistance in helping University Copyright originator(s) pursue publishers or developers. If such an account is not possible under South Carolina laws, copyright royalty income accruing to the University shall
be deposited in an auditable University account, with an amount budgeted annually to re-establish the account equal to the previous fiscal year ending balance, to be maintained for the above stated purpose.

Copyright Committee

This Committee consists of one faculty member from each academic college, nominated by the dean of the college and appointed by the Dean of the University to serve non-concurrent terms of three years; one undergraduate student and one graduate student, nominated annually by the Student Senate and the Graduate Student Association, respectively; the Vice-President for Executive Affairs and University Counsel, ex-officio, who will be Executive Secretary of the Committee; a representative from the Office of Graduate Studies and University Research, ex-officio; and one representative from the Office of Business and Finance, ex-officio. A faculty member shall be elected annually to serve as Chairperson of the Committee.

Copyright Procedures

The following steps will be taken by Clemson University faculty, staff, students, and administrative units in order to secure a just and fair determination of royalty equity in copyrights:

1. Originator(s) will report the creation or development of copyrightable materials to their department head. The department head and originator(s) mutually decide if the University has an equity in the materials. If they agree that the University does not, the originator(s) may pursue copyright on their own.

2. If the department head feels that the University has provided significant support in the development or creation of the materials, the matter is brought to the college dean. A decision by the dean that the University has not provided significant support allows the originator(s) to pursue the copyright on his own. If the college dean decides that the University has provided significant support, the matter is sent to the University Copyright Committee.

3. The University Copyright Committee will consider and evaluate the matter of significant University support for each copyright request it receives. If the Committee finds that significant support is lacking, the originator(s) is free to pursue the copyright on his own. Otherwise, the Committee will recommend to the University Administration copyright royalty distribution within the guidelines of the University Copyright Policy.

4. The University Administration will endorse or, with written reasons for doing so, request reconsideration by the University Copyright Committee.

5. The individual(s) or administrative unit(s) generating the copyrightable materials will be informed, in writing, of the University Copyright Committee recommendation and the University Administration's endorsement.

6. The originator(s) of the copyrightable material may appeal the recommendation and endorsement, in writing, to a three person panel composed of the originator or his representatives, the Vice-President for Executive Affairs and University Counsel, and a third person agreed to by the first two.
7. If the University Copyright Committee decides the University has equity in the copyrightable materials, the Vice-President for Executive Affairs and University Counsel will apply for the copyright in the name(s) of the originator(s). He should also provide advice, assistance, and guidance to originator(s) in the cases where they are seeking the copyright on their own.

8. A file copy of the copyrighted material will be furnished to the University Copyright Committee at the appropriate time.

9. Prior review of all programs, projects, or activities expected to generate copyrightable materials with full or significant support by the University or a sponsor is recommended so that advance determination of rights, and disposition of royalty income will be made. Such an advance determination may be subject to revision as the program, project, or activity progresses.
ATTACHMENT B

FRINGE BENEFITS RESOLUTION

On February 21, 1978 a report was submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Ad Hoc Committee on Fringe Benefits. This report purporting to review the fringe benefits received by faculty members at Clemson University was accepted by the Faculty Senate without discussion. It was included in the minutes of the February meeting and subsequently published in the University Campus News.

The Fringe Benefit report is divided into two sections; the first dealing with the major benefits, social security, retirement, health insurance and workman's compensation; the second with "apparent fringe benefits". In its report the committee concluded that fringe benefits at Clemson University are competitive with those of other universities with similar characteristics. The committee went on to list "apparent fringe benefits" received by Clemson Faculty. Included in these "apparent fringe benefits" are such items as the use of the University Library, the privilege of buying tickets to concerts, movies and plays, the privilege of being a member of the South Carolina State Employees Association, etc.

After reviewing the fringe benefits report as published in the Clemson Campus News we have concluded that the statements of the committee and their conclusions as described in the report are not supported by facts as contained in the report and in fact misrepresent the fringe benefits received by Clemson Faculty.

We, therefore, call upon the Faculty Senate to support the following resolution:

FRINGE BENEFITS RESOLUTION FS-78-5-2

Whereas the fringe benefits committee's conclusion that the fringe benefits provided to Clemson University faculty are competitive with those of other universities with similar characteristics has not been demonstrated.

Whereas the list of "apparent fringe benefits" describes items which are either:

i) facilities required in an academic environment,

ii) of either little or no cost responsibility to the University, and/or

iii) of little advantage to the majority of the faculty.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate reject said report on Fringe Benefits, and

Therefore, be it further resolved that the whole matter of Fringe Benefits be referred to the Welfare Committee for further study.
Resolution on Conditions of Summer Employment of Academic Year Faculty

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests the University Administration to adopt the Policy Statement on Summer Employment of Academic Faculty developed by the Welfare Committee.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

The academic faculty are professional employees of the University whose base period of employment is the 9-month academic year. As the teaching, research, and public service activities of the University continue through the summer, it is often found to be necessary (sometimes as a contractual requirement) to employ academic faculty for all or part of the summer. The services provided by the faculty in the summer are of the same nature as those provided in the academic year. The employment conditions shall, therefore, be on the same professional basis as in the academic year.

To this end, the University and the faculty member shall enter a formal agreement for employment during the summer (or portion of the summer) for which the faculty member's services are desired. The agreement shall be concluded at the earliest date mutually agreeable to the University and the faculty member, and may be executed separately for distinct tasks or segments of the summer. The general terms of employment shall be as follows:

1. Compensation shall be at a level commensurate with the academic year salary of the faculty member. For summer school teaching, compensation for a full-time load for one session shall be one-sixth of the academic year salary for the previous year. For other duties, the compensation will be based on a daily rate calculated to yield one-third of the faculty member's base pay for the preceding academic year if employment were for the full three month summer period.

2. When the summer faculty member is a continuing employee, rather than a new employee, the fringe benefits accorded shall reflect this status. In particular, the summer faculty employee shall continue his participation in the Retirement System and be entitled to benefits from the Retirement System reflecting this participation. He shall accumulate sick leave credits proportional to employment (adding to maximum sick leave carry over as described by applicable state law) and be entitled to utilize accumulated sick leave credits for scheduled periods of employment (even where not yet commenced). The summer faculty employee shall be provided with reasonable and equitable vacation leave time with pay during the summer (between terms for summer school teaching, and a number of days proportional to period of employment for faculty employed for other duties) and shall receive such legal or declared holidays as fall on a work day during the scheduled employment.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

June 20, 1978

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by President Steirer at 3:31 p.m. Senator Fennell moved that the normal order of business be suspended in order to permit the taking up of Special Reports. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

2. Special Reports

President Steirer noted that the Senate had extended an invitation to Dean Willis and Colonel Tyndall to speak to the Senate concerning the impact on the University and its personnel of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. These gentlemen were present and President Steirer turned the floor over to them. Colonel Tyndall presented a brief history of the development of Section 504 and the early efforts of the university to comply. Dean Willis also made brief comments. Senators asked questions regarding the implementation of this law, and the speakers attempted to answer. This interchange continued for 50 minutes. The speakers were thanked for their presentations.

3. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of May 9, 1978 were approved without change.

4. Committee Reports

a. Admissions and Scholarship Committee - Senator Edie, Chairman, reported as follows:

The Admissions and Scholarship Committee met on June 5 and worked on a first draft of a faculty questionnaire concerning final exams. This questionnaire should be ready for distribution at college faculty meetings on August 21 and the results will be used only for information. Also, the committee is trying to compile lists of courses which the various departments define as a "major" in their program. This work is a continuation of last year's faculty senate effort to establish the
graduation requirement of a minimum GPR in the student's major.

The committee also discussed departmental policies on student advising. It was felt that new faculty should receive some sort of departmental orientation covering student advising and, when faculty are evaluated, student advising duties should have status as least equal to committee assignments.

b. Policy Committee - The Chairman was absent and no one else was prepared to report. President Steier reported that he understood that the work is proceeding well on revising the Constitution, and that it may be ready to submit to the Senate in July.

c. Research Committee - Senator Fennell, Chairman, reported as follows:

The Research Committee met on June 13 with Dean Schwartz. Discussion centered on the following topics: copyright policy, State Classification System, graduate student support, State support of University Research, indirect costs of research, and tenure policy.

d. Welfare Committee - No report.

e. Ad Hoc Committees - No report. Senator Burt, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation noted that the Committee will meet on Tuesday, June 27.

f. University Councils and Committees - No reports.

5. President Report

1. On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I sent a card to Senator Lambert expressing our sympathy in the death of his daughter, Dottie, on June 1.

2. A new senator from the College of Sciences, H. Keith McDowell, has been elected to replace John Jacobus. Also, Senator Ron Dillon will begin new duties on June 23 as Acting Head of the Botany Department. James E. Schindler will replace him while he is on the required leave of absence from the Senate. Senator Dillon had been appointed to serve on the Affirmative Action and Student Relations Committees. He will be replaced by Bob Mazur (Affirmative Action) and Alan Grubb (Student Relations).
3. The Council of Academic Deans met on May 15. They unanimously disapproved four items from Student Senate Resolution No. R-77-78-74 which the Undergraduate Council had accepted. I might add that in each case the Faculty Senate at the April meeting had indicated an unwillingness to accept these proposals. The four are Items G, K, L, and O (please refer to the April minutes for details).

The final draft governing the various Professional Master's Degrees was submitted to the Council and a new format was approved to serve as the guideline for the dual agreements concerning undergraduate transfer to Clemson University with other institutions.

4. The Copyright Policy as revised by the Faculty Senate and submitted in March (FS-78-3-5) will provide the basis for a new draft that will be written by Admiral McDevitt and Ben Anderson. At a meeting on June 12 of these individuals with Dean Hurst and myself, no fundamental objections were raised. The changes will make the distinction between the copyrightable products of work-for-hire and copyrightable work produced in other academic situations sharper and more explicit and will place a ceiling on the amounts of money in the proposed fund for copyright assistance. As a result of this policy the University seems ready to provide more aid for the subvention and subsidization of publications than previously true.

The next step for the Copyright Policy will be review by the Cabinet. I will get an opportunity to look at the McDevitt-Anderson draft and make further comments before it goes to the Cabinet. I am greatly encouraged that the Faculty Senate's version has been so well-received.

5. FS 78-4-2 concerned the Additional Group Life Insurance Option for Nine Month Faculty. Ron Herrin has explained to me that the Prudential Insurance Company will make this option possible if all nine month faculty who are participating in the plan accept it. He believes it is the Faculty Senate's responsibility to persuade the faculty participants to accept the proposed option. I will ask the Welfare Committee to assume this responsibility.

6. The disposition of other resolutions is as follows: (a) FS 77-3-11 Performing Arts Center. Plans have been drawn up and a site picked but the Center is only 11th out of 13 projects on the priority list in the Second Three-Year Phase (1978-1982). (b) FS 77-9-1 Payroll Deductions for Contribution to Alumni and University Foundations. Two questions have been raised. Can the computer do it? Vice-President Barnette is looking at this; if the answer is yes, the second question will be confronted. That is -- whether establishing precedents for types of payroll deductions other than the ones now permitted, IRS, FICA, South Carolina Retirement, South Carolina income tax, and insurance premiums, would be a good idea. (c) FS 78-2-2 Affirmative Action Committee. The charge to the Committee is interpreted by Colonel Tyndall, the Affirmative Action Officer, as not requiring that the Committee be consulted in such matters as the recent Library situation. Dean Hurst has no control over the Affirmative Action Committee. If the Senate wishes, it can rewrite the charge to accomplish what we want -- an active, involved committee that takes Faculty opinion
seriously. (d) FS 78-2-3 Plus and Minus Final Grades. This is in the Undergraduate Council at present. (e) FS 78-2-4 Athletic Ticket Priorities. The Athletic Council is working on this. (f) FS 78-2-5 IPTAY Support of Academic Excellence. IPTAY would have to change its charter to accommodate this. There is no indication that they will. (g) FS 78-4-3 Conditions of Summer Employment of Academic Year Faculty. Dean Hurst is studying it.

7. FS 78-4-1 directed me to meet with faculty leaders of other state colleges and universities. I think it worth noting that only USC has a faculty senate. Winthrop has a defunct organization but I am trying to contact certain individuals.

8. Dean Hurst has asked the Faculty Senate to recommend a new University Marshall to him. With the Senate's approval I would like to appoint a committee of Vice-President Dickey (chairman) and Senators Lambert and Young to make that recommendation for the three year term beginning July 1, 1978.

9. The Faculty Club drive to match the $5000 grant from the Alumni Council has netted $2500. I suggest that those faculty members who are interested in this project begin to sell it to the Faculty. Indications now are that $1500 more will be enough for renovations to begin on the proposed site.

10. I have continued to meet with individual Faculty Senators. Only six remain to be contacted. Not only do I know the individual Senators better but what their concerns and expectations are and how they propose to have the Senate and its officers deal with those concerns.

11. One thing that I have learned is how the Senators from Agriculture are representing their Faculty. They believe that they should represent their Faculty to their Dean as well as in the Faculty Senate. As a result they meet periodically with Dean Anderson and take up a varied agenda in those meetings as well as having a Senator at each department heads' meeting both to gain information and to advocate the faculty point of view. Any Senator from Agriculture can tell you more about what they are doing.

I would simply like to applaud their efforts and suggest that other college delegations might like to introduce similar procedures.

12. A number of departments (14) have accepted my invitation to talk with me about the presidential selection process. I have learned a great deal. The invitation remains in effect and I hope that many departments will take advantage of it.

13. Last fall the decision was made that the Faculty Senate President would represent the Extension staff on the presidential screening and selection committees. This means that on June 27 I will spend the day in Columbia talking with the leaders of the Extension Senate and the Extension Associations. I have also talked with the pesticide regulatory staff and will talk with the livestock regulatory staff in Columbia, both at the request of Dean Anderson.
14. On July 1, Benjamin Anderson will become University Counsel replacing Admiral Joseph McDevitt who will remain Vice-President for Executive Affairs. Ben Anderson will be the individual to consult on legal questions within the University.

6. Old Business
   a. Constitution - Policy Committee had no report. Vice-President Dickey had attended a meeting of the sub-committee on the Constitution and said that he was very pleased with the work to date.
   b. Other Old Business - None.

7. New Business
   a. FS-78-6-1 Resolution on Ad Hoc Committee on Inter-Collegiate Athletics; its adoption was moved and seconded. After brief comments, and with two abstentions, the motion was carried unanimously. A copy of the resolution is attached.
   b. Other New Business - None.

8. Adjournment
   The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William C. Whitten, Jr.
Acting Secretary

Members absent:
T. R. Adkins (substitute present)  W. Baron
C. E. Hood (substitute present)    J. C. Hester (substitute present)
C. S. Thompson (substitute present) H. W. Fleming (substitute present)
J. L Young                        R. S. Lambert (substitute present)
W. E. West
Be it resolved that the Ad Hoc Committee on Inter-Collegiate Athletics be re-established for 1978-79 for the purpose of continuing Faculty Senate efforts to improve Faculty input into athletic affairs through enhanced and clarified operational guidelines for the University Athletic Council.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

July 18, 1978

1. Call to Order

In the absence of President Steirer, the meeting was called to order by Vice President Dickey at 3:35 p.m. Vice President Dickey announced that President Steirer's mother-in-law had passed away recently, and that he had sent a sympathy card in the name of the Senate.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the June meeting were approved after three minor corrections.

3. Committee Reports

a. Admissions and Scholarship Committee - Senator Edie, Chairman, reported as follows:

The Admissions and Scholarship Committee met at 10:30 a.m. on Monday, July 10. The faculty questionnaire on final exam policy was finalized and will be distributed during the next week. Committee members are also contacting individual department heads to obtain statements defining the major courses in various programs.

It was noted that starting in the Spring 1980 graduation, students will have to obtain a 3.4 GPR for graduation with honor, a 3.7 GPR for graduation with high honor and a 3.9 GPR for graduation with highest honor.

The Admissions and Scholarship Committee has agreed to monitor the academic impact of the implementation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Should any faculty have comments or problems created by the implementation of this program, please encourage them to contact a committee member.

Professor Corrine Sawyer is invited to the next admissions and scholarship committee to discuss Clemson's honors program. The next committee meeting will be August 1 at 3:30 p.m. in the library class room.

b. Policy Committee - Senator West, Chairman, reported as follows:

The policy committee recommends approval of the Revision of The Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University as circulated by T. McInnis. The committee recognizes that a meeting with Dean Hurst prior to the submission of this revision of the Faculty Senate is needed, and recommends that this meeting be scheduled as soon as possible.
The policy committee also reviewed a proposed resolution dealing with the faculty evaluation procedures at the July 6 meeting. It is the committee recommendation that the resolution be accepted, but that it may be best addressed through your discussion of the problem with Dean Hurst prior to Senate action.

The policy committee chairman is collecting supporting information relative to item #6 of your June President's Report (FS-78-2-2) and will circulate to the policy committee for study prior to an August 1 meeting.

At this time a discussion ensued on the definition of a quorum at the general faculty meetings. Senator Burt announced that he was introducing a Constitutional Amendment, Bylaws, Article 1, Section 2. Quorum, signed by five faculty members (See ATTACHMENT A).

c. Research Committee - Senator Fennell, Chairman, had no report.

d. Welfare Committee - Senator Burt, Chairman, reported that the Welfare Committee has had two meetings. Faculty salary-compensation and the rejected FS-78-4-3 were topics of discussion.

A discussion ensued on FS-78-4-2 concerning 9-month faculty being able to obtain Group Life Insurance coverage based on their salary converted to a 12-month equivalent. It was the consensus of the Senate that the 9-month faculty should be polled to determine if they wish to have this additional coverage. It was pointed out that a majority vote in favor would mean that all who are participating would have to take the coverage based on $\frac{12}{9}$ of their salary. They would still be eligible for the low option and the one-half of $\frac{12}{9}$ salary option. It also was pointed out that this was a requirement of the insurance company, because of the possibility of adverse selection if it were on a strict voluntary basis. Secretary Adkins was asked to convey the Senate's feelings to Ron Herrin [NOTE: Secretary Adkins reports that the poll will be conducted after August 15 when 9-month Faculty return to the campus].

e. Ad Hoc Committees - no reports.

f. University Councils and Committees - no reports.

4. President's Report

1. The Screening Committee is now complete.

   Board of Trustees
   W. Gordon McCabe, Chairman
   D. Leslie Tindal, Vice-Chairman
   Paul W. McAlister, ex officio

   Faculty
   Hugh H. Macauley
   William F. Steirer, Jr.
The actual screening of candidates will begin in September. Meetings to determine procedures will be held in August.

2. The Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics has been appointed with your approval. Senator Hester will serve as chairman. Members will be Senators Thompson and West and non-senators Steve Melsheimer and Rich Saunders.

3. FS 78-4-3 concerning summer employment for nine month faculty has been rejected by Dean Hurst. His reasons are:
   a. that the pay scale is now an equitable one;
   b. that formal contractual obligations would actually work to the disadvantage of faculty members;
   c. that there seems to be no way to make a leave policy for summer employment both practical and equitable;
   d. that many of the items are already in force.

4. The faculty members of twenty-five departments have described the qualities they are looking for in the new President of Clemson University. I have thus reached approximately half of the departments. I am looking forward to listening to the other half.

5. I will be away July 24th through July 29th and August 1st through 13th. Contact Vice-President Dickey if you need the Faculty Senate to be informed or become involved.

The following motion concerning Item 3 was made by Senator Baron: It is requested that President Steirer report in more detail why FS 78-4-3 was rejected. The motion received a second and was passed unanimously.

5. Old Business - none

6. New Business -
   a. FS-78-7-1 Resolution on Faculty Evaluation Process was postponed.
   b. Other New Business

Senator Worm moved that the Presidential Screening Committee members be invited to meet with the Faculty Senators for the purpose of discussing their view and the faculty's interests concerning the next President of Clemson University. The motion received a second and was passed unanimously.
Senator Worm moved that the Senate ask President Steirer to prepare and submit to the Senate a summary of his findings on the concerns of the faculty towards the next President of Clemson University. The motion received a second and was passed unanimously.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

T. R. Adkins, Jr.
Secretary

Members absent:

C. E. Hood (V. Carmack, substituting)
D. B. Smith
J. C. Hester (S. S. Melsheimer, substituting)
L. D. Reamer (G. E. Sabin, substituting)
E. A. Merrell
W. C. Whitten
H. B. Bryant (B. N. Skardon, substituting)
W. F. Steirer
E. M. Coulter
O. S. Hipps
J. E. Schindler (J. B. Waide, substituting)
D. S. Snipes
ATTACHMENT A
Bylaws
Article 1, Section 2. Quorum

Replace Section 2. "A Quorum for any meeting of the faculty shall be that number of members deemed necessary by the presiding officer to transact any business."

By Section 2. Quorum. A quorum for any meeting of the faculty shall be 1 more than fifty per cent of the members of the faculty.

[Signatures]

E. P. Stillwell
A. L. W. B.

Max B. Miller
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

August 22, 1978

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by President Steirer at 3:36 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the July meeting were approved after a few minor corrections.

3. Committee Reports

a. Admissions and Scholarship Committee - Senator Edie, Chairman, reported as follows:

The Admissions and Scholarship Committee met at 3:30 PM on Tuesday, August 1. The faculty questionnaire on final exam policy has now been distributed. We would like all senators to urge their college faculty to fill out this short questionnaire and return it by September 15. The results will be meaningful only if a large enough sample is obtained.

Professor Corrine Sawyer met with the committee and discussed the honors program. Clemson has about 200 students in the honors program and Dr. Sawyer is given ¼ time to administer the program and the Scholarships and Awards Committee (Wofford has a ½ time counselor and a full time secretary and U.S.C. has one 2/3 time faculty member with an eleven month contract, a full time administrative assistant and two work study students to administer their program to 300 to 350 students). At Clemson only the math department has a departmental honors counselor.

The honors students would like the university to establish an honors commons room for our honor students to meet. This would also be an excellent place for faculty to meet and exchange ideas with the honor students.

The committee also noted that the required GPR for graduation with honors or the requirements for senior division honors should be described in the graduation program.

Resolutions on these topics will be forthcoming from the committee.

Chairman Edie discussed future committee plans which involve workshops for undergraduate advisors, recruiting, and the admissions policy. It was suggested that the committee study why the admissions process is under the VP for Student Affairs rather than the VP for Instruction.

It was suggested that the Committee review the grading policy on self-paced instruction as compared with regular instruction. It was pointed out that a student can take a module over and over and when it is passed he gets an A.
b. **Policy Committee** - Senator West, Chairman, reported as follows:

The revisions of "The Constitution of the Faculty" as prepared by the Faculty Senate Policy Committee are presented for review by the Faculty Senate. This document is planned as an agenda item for the Faculty Senate in September, 1978. Senators are urged to forward comments, questions, and suggestions concerning this document to W. West (3447) or T. McInnis (3452) prior to September 15, 1978.

**Items under study:**

The charge statement for the Affirmative Action Committee is being studied by a sub-committee chaired by Senator Fiste. Senators and Faculty with suggestions for action on this committee are urged to contact Senator Fiste.

The policy statement dealing with "Faculty Participation in the Selection of Academic Administrators" is being reviewed.

The "Section 504 Self Evaluation Steering Committee Report on Academic Adjustments" is being reviewed.

During the discussion on this report, Senator Baron pointed out that a selection committee is appointed with no input from the faculty, and he stated that this was not an appropriate procedure.

c. **Research Committee** - Senator Fennell, Chairman, reported that the Committee met on August 17 and is continuing to study research support (how research funds are administered across the University), consulting, and tenure policies.

d. **Welfare Committee** - In the absence of Chairman Burt, Senator Lambert stated that there would be no report. A question on the poll concerning additional group life insurance option for nine-month faculty (FS-78-4-2) was answered by Secretary Adkins: The poll will be conducted by Mr. Ron Herrin's office as soon as information on eligible faculty can be generated by the computer.

(Secretary's Note: A majority of the nine-month faculty who have signed up for the insurance program must vote in the affirmative for the program to be approved.)
e. Ad Hoc Committees

University Marshal Committee - Chairman Dickey reported that he has received nominations from colleges which have not supplied a University Marshal in the past, and that his committee will be meeting in the near future to make a recommendation.

f. University Councils and Committees

Traffic and Parking Committee - President Steirer stated that the barricades will probably be erected again on Palmetto Blvd. The University now has permission to do with it what they want. It seems that Palmetto Blvd. was under state jurisdiction, and that the University did not have permission to put up barricades (the barricades were challenged in traffic court by a student motorcyclist).

Athletic Council - Vice-President Dickey attended the Athletic Council meeting on August 7, and his report appears as Item #8 under President's Report. Questions were raised on IPTAY-Faculty/Staff priority and on reallocation of seats for students. The Senate was referred to Item #8, point d which concerns committee to study ticket priorities.

Educational Council - Vice-President Dickey attended the meeting of the Educational Council and reported that the anticipated total enrollment is approximately 11,400 with approximately 10,500 on the main campus; there has been a change in the Presidential Screening Committee -- Because of illness W. Gordon McCabe, Jr. has resigned as Chairman of the Committee (Secretary's Note: Mr. McCabe passed away August 26) and Mr. Thomas McTeer, Jr. will serve as Chairman; the Committee wishes to dispell all rumors that there is a frontrunner for President; The 1979-80 budget is due September 15; a policy on the new retirement age regulation is being developed by the Administration (it will be based on evaluation of performance, and the deadline for the policy is January 1).

4. President's Report

1. I thank Senators Grubb, Lambert, McDowell, and Schindler, Secretary Adkins and Vice-President Dickey for their invaluable aid with Faculty Orientation on August 17.

2. Because of illness W. Gordon McCabe, Jr. has resigned as Chairman of the Presidential Screening Committee. Thomas McTeer, Jr. will serve as Chairman.

3. The faculty consensus on Presidential qualifications follows. The list includes the qualifications stipulated by the Board of Trustees along with my comments based on my understanding of faculty desires.

   Background

   (a) Be a recognized scholar or person with an academic background. (Unanimous agreement—no sentiment whatsoever for anyone lacking such qualities)
(b) Preferably hold an earned terminal degree. (An earned Ph.D. seems to be mandated)
(c) Understand fully the teaching, research and public service functions of the University. (Yes!)
(d) Understand the role of public-supported universities. (Yes!)
(e) Understand fully the unique role of a land-grant university. (More emphasis is placed on this by faculty in Agriculture and Forestry)
(f) Be fully sensitive to the needs and desires of students. (The Faculty preferred to leave the expression of this to students)
(g) Articulate well and expand on the University's problems, accomplishments and future goals. (This is a high priority)
(h) Be able to educate all of the University's constituencies on the development of the institution. (High priority)
(i) Be a well seasoned and effective administrator or executive in either the private or public sector. (Other qualifications seem more important)
(j) Be able to set goals and move toward them with a firm pace. (Considered a primary part of the job)
(k) Have astute political sense. (Faculty think each individual should have basic instincts for this, but not necessarily the experience)
(l) Be able to provide a good evaluation of results. (Setting policy a primary responsibility for President)
(m) Be an excellent planning leader. (Same as 1)

**Personal Qualifications**

(a) Ability to coordinate all academic activities of a large university. (Faculty would prefer coordination of academic affairs be responsibility of Dean of the University)
(b) Ability to gain full recognition from the faculty, students and trustees as an effective academic and administrative leader. (Important)
(c) Ability to make persuasive presentations to the various governmental agencies, the Legislature and the numerous constituencies of the University. (Faculty feels that this can be learned)
(d) Potential to make a significant contribution to the development of higher education in South Carolina. (What's good for Clemson is good for higher education in South Carolina)
(e) Ability to attract and retain recognized scholars as members of the faculty. (Faculty doesn't see this as his/her function save in setting overall tone)

(f) Capability of securing gifts and grants for the University that permit it to do those unique things that make for a great learning and research center. (Important)

So what do faculty members want? In order of priorities -- Faculty members want an individual with an earned Ph.D. with a teaching and research background. The next President should be a two-way communicator who as an administrator is secure enough to surround himself/herself with strong people who are delegated enough authority to do their jobs well.

The next President should be able to educate the people of South Carolina about Clemson's public service as a land grant institution. He/she should exercise strong leadership in determining policy and establishing a positive public image.

The next President should have some administrative experience, but need have no experience in dealing with legislatures provided it is obvious that he/she is able and willing to learn what is needed to function in this area. Finally he/she should be a cautious innovator who does not tinker with the academic excellence that the Faculty feels already exists.

The Faculty does not want an individual who will expand the University's enrollment or even physical plant so much as one who will expand its horizons.

4. Ed Merrell has resigned from the Faculty. He was the Senate's representative on the Site and Landscape Development Committee. I need a volunteer.

5. I, also, need a volunteer for the appointment to the University Union Board. Butch Trent has asked me several times to make that appointment, but I can find no takers. Please volunteer.

6. Vice-President Dickey and I will be visiting the Experiment Stations on August 29 and 30.

7. I have attempted to contact the President of the University of South Carolina faculty without success. I will continue trying. No other faculty organizations exist at public institutions.

8. Vice-President Dickey attended the Athletic Council on August 7. Matters of interest to the Faculty are:

   (a) Bowl ticket priorities have been established.

       1. Official party comes first.

       2. Total season ticket sale is determined by adding IPTAY, Faculty/Staff, and average student attendance without non-student dates.
3. Each group will receive the number of tickets equal to the percentage of total regular season tickets sold in that group.

4. A. Faculty/staff. 50% will go to IPTAY-Faculty/staff, distributed according to current IPTAY priority list. 2 or more season tickets equal 2 bowl tickets. 1 season ticket equals 1 bowl ticket. Tickets remaining go to B. IPTAY members may go to IPTAY pool for more tickets.

B. Faculty/staff. Non-IPTAY Faculty/staff will have access to 50% plus remainder from A for season ticket holders. Number of tickets to be purchased same as A. If insufficient tickets available, availability will be determined by lottery.

(b) Faculty priority for Season Tickets extended to August 1.

(c) Voted to ban umbrellas and umbrella hats in stadium.

(d) Appointed a committee to study ticket priorities in response to Faculty Senate motion. The chairman will be Billy Edge. Members will be Todd Lankford, Bobby Joe Skelton, Ray Noblet, Jerry Reel, and Bill McLellan.

(e) Athletic department budget in black with income of $3.5 million. IPTAY raised $1,507,125.22 in 1977-78. Every sport is funded in scholarships to full level allowed by NCAA and AIAW. HEW has not contacted Clemson about Title IX, but it is believed Clemson is in compliance. Any problems will be resolved as quickly as they become known.

A discussion followed. Senator Young disagreed with the way in which Item #3 f under Background was presented. The change was made to reflect his criticism. President Steirer reported that the Presidential Screening Committee declined the invitation to meet with the Faculty Senate. It is the wish of the Committee to continue to isolate the screening procedures from all outside pressure. It was moved and seconded that the material on the Presidential Screening Committee be accepted as information and that the Senate move on to the next item of business. The motion was passed unanimously.

5. Old Business

a. The floor was declared open for discussion on the Amendment to the Bylaws printed in ATTACHMENT A, page 5 of the July 18 minutes which would change Article 1, Section 2, Quorum. To get the matter on the floor, Senator Snipes moved acceptance of the Amendment, and Senator Hester provided the second. The motion to accept failed by a 30 to 1 vote.

b. Senator Baron referred to page 3 of the July 18 minutes and asked why FS-78-4-3 was rejected. President Steirer stated that Dean Hurst will present fuller documentation of his case at a later date.
6. **New Business**
   There was none.

7. **Adjournment**
   The meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

T. R. Adkins, Jr.
Secretary

Members absent:

D. B. Smith (Agriculture)
J. J. Komo (Engineering)
E. A. Merrell (Forest and Recreation Resources) Resigned
P. B. Burt (Sciences)
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

September 19, 1978

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by President Steirer at 3:36 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

Senator Fennell, Chairman of the Research Committee, moved for deletion of paragraph 2 under 3c. Research Committee concerning consulting policies. He stated that his committee is studying consulting policies in detail in all colleges, and that discussion at this time is premature. The motion to delete was approved unanimously.

3. Special Reports

President Steirer introduced Dean of Extension Sam Willis. Dean Willis explained that the Board of Trustees of Clemson University established within the Clemson University Foundation a permanent endowment of not less than $1,000,000.00 to be known as the Robert Cook Edwards Endowment for Excellence in Science and Technology, the annual income from which is to be allocated by the Directors of the Foundation upon the basis of recommendations received from the President of Clemson University to include, but not be limited to, recommendations for graduate fellowships, scholarships, professorships, visiting professors, research and public service programs and continuing education, to the end that the excellence of the academic programs of the University will be enhanced, the economic life and well-being of the citizens of South Carolina and the nation will be improved, and the institution will become even more the "high seminary of learning" envisaged by its founder, Thomas Green Clemson. Dean Willis is the Campus Coordinator of the endowment.

President Steirer introduced Past Vice President Tom McInnis who spoke on behalf of The Faculty Club Planning Committee. He reported that approximately 160 have indicated that they are interested in a Faculty Club and have sent in donations of $25 each. He stated that a minimum of 200 individuals are needed to start the club. [Secretary's note: Past President Ray Noblet informed me that the Development office has received 225 donations and that the fund now exceeds $5000.] During a discussion the following points were brought out: A board of directors elected by the membership will run the club and make decisions on its operation; the club will be accessible to active Alumni and at least 300 members will be needed for a successful club.

4. Committee Reports

a. Admissions and Scholarship Committee - Senator Edie, Chairman, reported that the Admissions and Scholarship Committee met on September 5 and completed work on four resolutions (FS-78-9-1 through 4) which will be introduced under new business. Three of these resolutions deal with strengthening the University honors program.
To date the committee has received over 500 completed questionnaires from faculty on their final exam policies. Tabulation of the results is nearly complete. The next committee meeting will be October 3 at 3:30 PM in the library class room. Mr. Marvin Carmichael, the director of financial aid, will be invited to discuss the availability of student scholarships.

The committee plans to study the new Withdrawal Policy as amended.

b. Policy Committee - Senator West, Chairman, reported as follows:

The Faculty Senate Policy Committee held one full committee meeting, and two sub-committee meetings since the August Senate session. Reports from the Sub-committee dealing with 'Affirmative Action Committee' and 'Faculty Participation in the Selection of Academic Administrators' were reviewed. The committee chairman reviewed the meetings with Dean Hurst, Dean Willis, and President Steirer and their review of the proposed Faculty Constitution Revisions.

The policy committee does not suggest a rewrite of the Affirmative Actions Committee description (page 25, Faculty Manual). Work is underway to rework the policy dealing with 'Faculty Selection of Academic Administrators'. The committee is attempting to determine 'who' are academic administrators, and how selection committees are structured. The Faculty Senate Constitution Revisions will be addressed under Old Business. No report on behalf of the sub-committee on public relations was presented.

c. Research Committee - Senator Fennell, Chairman, stated that the Research Committee did not meet during the past month. Current Studies: Research Support - the committee solicits faculty suggestions on methods to further improve University support of research, contact George Worm, Industrial Management, or Bob Fennell, Mathematical Sciences; Consulting Policy - College Deans are being queried with regard to individual college policies.

Senator Hester asked that the Research Committee request how much overhead is allotted to clerical help.

d. Welfare Committee - No report.

e. Ad Hoc

University Marshal Committee - Chairman Dickey reported that the committee has recommended Dr. Clayton Aucoin, Professor of Mathematical Sciences and Industrial Management, be appointed as the next University Marshal.

f. University Councils and Committees

(1) Undergraduate Council - Senator Hipps reported that on the following matters of concern to the Senate and faculty as a whole were dealt with at the September meeting of the UGC:
Statement of Class policy

Recommendation that each professor prepare a Statement of Class Policy for the students in each course he teaches for distribution in writing to the students at the first class meeting was defeated by the Council after a long discussion. Opposition focused primarily on the legalistic ramifications of having a Written policy requiring teachers to have a policy statement rather than the need for a statement of class policy itself.

FS-78-2-3: Resolution on Use of Plus and Minus Final Grades

Ad hoc committee chaired by Judy Melton and including Gary Powell, Dean Vickery, and Kenneth Darr was appointed by Chairman Green to study resolution. Committee to report at November meeting.

College of Architecture

Proposed changes in nomenclature to include College and Department in course prefix to permit a listing of all College of Architecture courses together in the University Catalog, i.e., CAVA; College of Architecture-Visual Arts. Proposal tabled until October meeting.

(2) Graduate Council - Senator Edie filed the following report:

At the last Graduate Council meeting a number of new graduate courses were approved. Also, a report concerning the implementation of a cooperative education plan for graduate students was discussed.

At the request of the faculty of the College of Agricultural Sciences, a new college policy was discussed. The policy states that only experiment station projects (regardless of the source of support for the students) can be used for thesis or dissertation projects. The Graduate Council made the following statement on the subject:

"The Graduate Council has gone on record in expressing its concern with regard to the policy of Agricultural Sciences concerning research and invites graduate students and graduate faculty to bring to attention any specific cases in which graduate student research is being unduly restricted." Senator Edie requested that this policy be referred to the Research Committee for further study.

5. President's Report

a. As you are well aware the Board of Trustees met this past Thursday and Friday. Several items relating to the Board should be of some interest to you.
(1) The Board passed the following item on Retirement Policy:

Statement: On October 29, 1956, in an Executive Session, the Board of Trustees adopted unanimously a retirement policy which stated in effect that, as of June 30, 1957, persons would normally be retired who had reached the age of 65 during the current fiscal year. Provisions were made whereby individuals could be employed on a year-to-year basis following their having reached the age of 65 during a given fiscal year, but the intent was clear to retire persons at the age of 65.

Due to recent changes in law and judicial holdings, such a policy will no longer be valid after January 1, 1979, inasmuch as it discriminates on the basis of age.

Recommendation of the Executive Committee: That the Board of Trustees rescind, effective January 1, 1979, the retirement policy adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 29, 1956; and that the Administration prepare a new retirement policy for consideration and adoption by the Board of Trustees at its next meeting.

(2) The figures presented below are the figures given to the Board on the academic capabilities of the entering freshmen class.

SAT SCORES OF COLLEGE BOUND SOUTH CAROLINA HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877-78</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*South Carolina Bound Seniors, College Board ATP Summary Report

SAT SCORES OF ENROLLED FRESHMEN AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1977</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1978</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HIGH SCHOOL CLASS STANDING OF CLEMSON ENTERING FRESHMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Top 10 Percent</th>
<th>Top 20 Percent</th>
<th>Top 50 Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>64 %</td>
<td>95 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>35 %</td>
<td>62 %</td>
<td>95 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>62 %</td>
<td>93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>58 %</td>
<td>91 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>32 %</td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>91 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>91 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>27 %</td>
<td>47 %</td>
<td>87 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TEST (SAT) SCORES

National Senior Average Vs. Clemson Entering Freshmen Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clemson Average</th>
<th>National Senior Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) The default rate on Federally-backed Student Loans has recently become a much-discussed item. The Board of Trustees was told proudly that Clemson's program for loan recovery is considered a model by HEW. The national default is 16.8% for 3019 institutions of higher learning, South Carolina's rate is 22.6% (38 institutions) while Clemson has a default rate of only 3.6%.

(4) The Board will next meet on January 12 and 13. With your approval I will invite the Board to a reception on Friday evening, January 12 as we have done the past two years. I will arrange for the funding as well.

b. In April, the Senate directed me to arrange a meeting with appropriate faculty members from all the state-supported institutions of higher education. No mechanism for such a meeting exists, but a start is being made. On October 13, Vice-President Dickey, Secretary Adkins, Senator Baron and myself will travel to Columbia to meet with officers of the USC Faculty Senate. We all hope that the sharing of information and concerns will produce meaningful results.

c. Gordon Howard is the new Senator from Forest and Recreation Resources. Welcome!

d. Thanks are due Senators Young and Whitten for accepting the last two committee assignments open to Faculty Senators. Senator Young will serve on the University Union Board and Senator Whitten on the Landscape and Site Development Committee.

e. A last-ditch drive for membership in the Faculty/University Club is underway. An appeal has been sent to the members of the staff who were determined to be eligible at the last meeting of the Planning Committee in May. Frankly, if this appeal and continued efforts to get faculty members to join don't soon show results the whole matter must be reevaluated. There has been an effort for approximately ten years to get a Faculty/University Club started. Never has that effort come both so close to succeeding and, yet, been further away.

f. Vice-President Dickey and I found the trip on August 29-30 to the Experimental Stations both informative and entertaining. We were able to discuss matters of mutual concern with the faculty members at the stations. The trip that we will take on September 26-27 to Hobcaw should be of equal value.
Your constituents appreciate the time and effort you are now spending on Senate business. Yet the kind of results that we all hope to see the Senate produce will require even more time and effort in committee assignments and preparation than previously the case.

The article which appeared in the press on September 15 reporting that some 400 faculty members (other than Francis Marion College) received raises of 15-35% distorted and misrepresented the salary situation, but the best way of dealing with it is to ignore it. A later article on faculty salaries as information would be valuable.

6. Old Business

a. Constitution - Senator West moved to go into a committee of the whole to consider the Revision of the Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University for not more than one hour. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously. After the one hour period of discussion, the Senate resumed regular business.

b. University Marshal - Vice President Joe Dickey, Chairman of the Committee, moved that Dr. Clayton Aucoin, Professor of Mathematical Sciences, be appointed University Marshal. After a second the motion was approved unanimously.

c. FS-78-4-5 - A discussion ensued on the Student Liability Insurance Coverage Resolution. President Steirer suggested that Senator Hood consult with the Student Senate on the implementation of this resolution.

7. New Business

The following four resolutions were introduced by Senator Bryant from the Admissions and Scholarship Committee:

FS-78-9-1 Honoring Gordon McCabe

Whereas the Board of Trustees of Clemson University has always been one of the University's greatest assets and

Whereas Trustee W. Gordon McCabe, Jr. served the University in the highest tradition as both a member of the Board of Trustees since 1960 and as chairman of the Educational Policy Subcommittee

Therefore, be it resolved that the faculty of Clemson University deeply regrets his passing. His guidance and interest in the University and its academic excellence will be missed.

[The motion to accept was seconded and was approved unanimously.]

FS-78-9-2 Publishing Honors Criteria

Whereas the requirements for graduation with honors, high honors and highest honors will change beginning in the Spring 1980 commencement and
Whereas graduation with departmental honors is a relatively new distinction, be it therefore resolved that the criteria for such honors at graduation should be published in the graduation program.

[The motion to accept was seconded and was approved unanimously.]

FS-78-9-3 Increase time available for Honors Program

Whereas the honors program at Clemson University today has grown to over two hundred undergraduate students and

Whereas the proper administration of this vital program and counseling of these students requires far more than the one-quarter time faculty position originally allotted,

be it therefore resolved that the university should fully support this program by increasing the faculty release time for administration of Clemson University's honor program.

[The motion to accept was seconded and was approved 15 to 12.]

FS-78-9-4 Honors Common Room

Whereas an active honors program both encourages scholarship in the student body and allows faculty to better teach gifted undergraduate students and

Whereas the honor students at Clemson University have requested that an honors common room be established

be it therefore resolved that the Faculty Senate of Clemson University supports the request for a common room in which honor students can meet, study and exchange ideas with invited faculty.

[The motion to accept was seconded but was not approved.]

Senator Hester introduced the following resolution and moved its acceptance:

FS-78-9-5 Endorsement of safety measures taken at pedestrian crosswalk to Clemson House.

Whereas the safety and well being of the University community is endangered by the present pedestrian crosswalk from the Campus to the Clemson House,

Be it hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the radar monitored speed limit enforcement, the efforts of the President of the University in his discussions with the Highway Department, and the proposed short term solution of improved lighting in the crosswalk area, and

Further strongly endorses a near term implementation of a pedestrian crosswalk scheme such as a stoplight(s), bridge(s), or tunnel(s) that will overtly separate pedestrian and automobile traffic.

[The motion to accept was seconded and was approved unanimously.]
Senator Flemming introduced the following resolution for Senator Coulter and moved its acceptance:

FS-78-9-6 Grade distribution

The 1977-78 Grade Distribution Report of the Office of Vice President for the Second Semester lists faculty members by name in reporting the grades given by them without taking into account variables such as the specific hours-to-grade ratios, special internship or activities courses, or the ratio between upper and lower division courses taught in a given semester; and

Whereas the result of ignoring these and other determining variables is often to create a false impression, not only of the real grading standards of the University, but also of the individual professor's own standards; and

Whereas this misinformation may become available to students as well as administrative judges of academic performance with the result of unjust damage to the reputations of professors; be it therefore resolved that

The Faculty Senate (1) deplores the collection and dissemination of the Grade Distribution Report, and (2) wishes to see the practice of collecting this information in the current manner to cease altogether.

[A motion was made by Senator Fennell to submit this resolution to the Admissions and Scholarship Committee for further study and recommendation. After a second this motion was approved unanimously.]

Senator West introduced the following resolution and moved its acceptance:

FS-78-9-7 Retirement Policy

Whereas the Board of Trustees has rescinded the retirement policy established for Clemson University in 1956;

Whereas, the Board of Trustees has directed the Administration to prepare a new and suitable retirement policy for the Board's examination; and

Whereas, that policy will have a profound impact upon the Faculty of Clemson University; Be it therefore, resolved that a sufficient number of faculty representatives, including the president of the Faculty Senate, be included as participants in the process of drafting a new retirement policy; and Be it further resolved, that any retirement policy which will affect the Faculty of Clemson University and be included in the Faculty Manual receive the review and approval of the Faculty Senate.

[The motion to accept was seconded and was approved unanimously.]

Vice President Dickey introduced the following two resolutions and moved their acceptance:

FS-78-9-8 Establishment of Committee on Protocol

Whereas there is need for a faculty standing committee to plan for ceremonial and social occasions in the academic life of the University and to maintain its traditions and symbols
be it therefore resolved that a Committee on Protocol, consisting of
the University Marshal, the college marshals, and the vice president of
the Senate, ex officio, be established to plan Faculty-sponsored social and
ceremonial functions, to cooperate with University administrative officials
in planning inaugural ceremonies, and to make recommendations for the
preservation or modification of University historic and academic traditions
and symbols, and

be it further resolved that, in keeping with the general practice among
universities, a formal inaugural ceremony should be held to install the new
President during the 1979-80 academic year.

[The motion to accept was seconded and was approved unanimously.]

FS-78-9-9 Social events to recognize President
Edward's retirement and welcome the
President-elect to campus.

Whereas President Edwards will retire and his successor will be named
during the present academic year

be it therefore resolved that the Faculty should sponsor suitable social
events before Commencement next May to recognize President Edward's retire­
ment and to welcome the President-elect to the campus.

[The motion to accept was seconded and was approved unanimously.]

Senator Burt, Chairman of the Welfare Committee, introduced the following
resolution and moved its acceptance:

FS-78-9-10 Commendation of Tiger Editor and Staff

Whereas, the Tiger in its recent report of funding in the University has
rendered valuable service to the entire University community,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate commends the Tiger editor and
staff for the timeliness and professionalism of their news coverage.

[The motion to accept received a second and was approved unanimously.]

8. The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

T. R. Adkins, Jr.
Secretary

Members absent:

A. R. Mazur (Agriculture) substitute present
B. R. Smith (Agriculture)
H. F. Senter (Sciences)
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

October 17, 1978

The Senate Chamber

1. Call to Order

A quorum was declared and the meeting was called to order by President Steirer at 3:35 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the September 19 meeting were approved with the following additions under Section 3. Special Reports: in paragraph 1 the addition of the word "scholarships," in the list of allocations of the annual income from the Robert Cook Edwards Endowment for Excellence in Science and Technology; in paragraph 2 the addition of the word "active" to describe Alumni who will have access to the Faculty Club.

3. Committee Reports

a. Admissions and Scholarship Committee - Senator Edie, Chairman, reported that the Admissions and Scholarship Committee met on October 3. Mr. Marvin Carmichael, Director of Financial Aid, and Dr. Jim Strom, of the Office of the Vice President for Development attended and discussed student aid and scholarships.

Dr. Strom handles the agreement preparation for setting up endowed and annual scholarships. The University tries to make new scholarships as unrestricted as possible so the maximum number of students can benefit from them. If faculty are contacted by individuals or companies who wish to establish endowed or annual scholarships, Dr. Strom will assist in preparing the necessary agreements and having them approved and signed by the appropriate University/Clemson University Foundation officer.

The Office of Financial Aid annually publishes a brochure of available financial aid for students (a copy is mailed to each department head). A copy of this brochure can be obtained from the Office of Financial Aid in Sikes Hall. The brochure is also mailed to every high school guidance counselor in the state.

Mr. Carmichael pointed out that any student who wishes to be considered for any scholarship, grant or loan must apply. One form must be filled out while the needs analysis must be completed only if the student wants a needs related scholarship or loan.

Last year about $187,000 in scholarships were awarded. This amounted to 350 to 400 scholarships. More scholarships will be available next year. Five Poole Scholarships are awarded each year. Last year the Alumni Association established the Alumni Merit Scholarship Program and about 27, $250 Alumni Merit Scholarships were awarded. Next year the Alumni Association is doubling its financial commitment to this excellent program and from 60 to 70 Alumni Merit Scholarships will be awarded.

The number of scholarships have at least doubled in the last three years. A $1500 Faculty and Staff Merit Scholarship also exists. This scholarship is funded by our donations.
Other committee business:

1. The committee has completed tabulation of the final exam questionnaire. The results should be ready next month.

2. The committee is still collecting letters from department heads defining major courses in their program. This information is for establishing a minimum major GPR for graduation.

3. The committee discussed the proposed withdrawal policy and resolution FS-78-9-6 and these will be discussed under old business.

4. The committee prepared two resolutions for consideration under new business.

The next committee meeting will be at 3:30 p.m. on November 7 in the library classroom.

b. Policy Committee - Senator West, Chairman, reported as follows:

The Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University revisions have been made by the Faculty Senate Policy Committee, and the committee recommends that the revised constitution be acted upon as part of the November, Faculty Senate Meeting.

Copies of the revised constitution will be circulated at the October meeting of the Faculty Senate. The work sheet that the Policy Committee developed to show how the constitution might apply to on-going Faculty concerns are being prepared for distribution to the Faculty Senate after October 20, 1978.

Dean Hurst has prepared a list of administrative positions in the academic area for which it would be necessary to create search committees in order that the positions might be filled. The Policy Committee has this list under study, and should be able to report any recommendations for Senate action by the November meeting of the Senate. The list was prepared by Dean Hurst at the request of the Policy Committee during the study of the need for revision of the Policy Statement dealing with Faculty Participation in the Selection of Academic Administrators. I anticipate that the list will give the necessary information for a rewrite of this policy statement.

c. Research Committee - Senator Fennell, Chairman, reported that the Research Committee met on Wednesday, October 4, at 3:30 p.m. in Room E202 Martin Hall. Discussion centered on a College of Agricultural Sciences thesis policy which had been referred for further study to the Research Committee by the Senate Representative to the Graduate Council [See page 3, September 19 minutes]. A resolution concerning this policy will be presented to the Senate under New Business.

Responses from College Deans to questions about consulting policy are being reviewed by the Committee.

The Committee requests that the status of the Research Committee in the proposed Faculty Constitution be reviewed.
During the ensuing discussion questions were raised about secretarial allocation in grants, and how research money is distributed throughout the University. One Senator stated that the administration is very cooperative and releases copious amounts of data on the distribution of research money, but the information is very difficult to assimilate.

d. Welfare Committee - Senator Burt, Chairman, stated that the Welfare Committee had not had a meeting. Academic Year and Calendar Year Subcommittee reports are due this month. The final report on the retirement system is due soon. The Faculty Ad Hoc Committee on Compensation will meet Tuesday, October 24 at 1:30 in 114 Kinard Laboratory, and the Welfare Committee will meet at 3:30 p.m. the same day in the Library Classroom.

Senator Fennell asked if there had been any reports on the Tenure Policy. A comment was made that USC had recently changed the minimum time for granting tenure from six to seven years; however, they do have the prerogative of granting immediate tenure if circumstances so warrant. (by comparison - Clemson policy requires a minimum of four continuous years of service.)

e. Ad Hoc - No reports

f. University Councils and Committees - No reports

4. President’s Report

a. The meeting with the USC faculty leaders took place on Friday, October 13 in Columbia. The four Clemson representatives—Baron, Adkins, Dickey, and myself—agreed that it was a fruitful session which initiated a continuing dialogue aimed at sharing data and tactics on welfare issues such as retirement and fringe benefits. Additionally, much of the dialogue focused on problems of university governance. It became readily apparent that the USC faculty possesses all of the legislative authority that the Senate has indicated it would like to possess, so that there was much to learn.

b. The Athletic Council met on October 9 and discussed a number of routine items. Of most interest to the Faculty Senate is a development that meets many of the objections that the Senate has maintained about the Athletic Council. The faculty members are meeting to outline agenda items before Council sessions. With bowl ticket priorities set, other ticket priorities under study by a committee headed by Billy Edge, and ticket prices stable, not many problems unique to faculty members exist right now, but the determination to deal with such problems when they do arise is being established.

HEW’s recent interpretations of Title IX indicate that the emphasis has moved from equal numbers to equal funding. By this interpretation, the revenue-making sports are no longer separated from the others. It is easy to see that such an interpretation, if continued and enforced, would change the nature of college athletics. On another issue, Clemson will continue to support the establishment of the so-called “super conference.”
c. The results of the poll taken to ascertain whether policy holders who are nine-months' employees wish to have the group life insurance based on twelve-months' earnings are in. Few faculty members (faculty members composing that category) bothered to vote and since all non-votes were registered as "no" votes, the option will not take effect. I am sure that the option idea can be raised again, but the Senate should only do so if, through the Welfare Committee, it is prepared to work to see that it is accepted. Of those voting, 75 voted "Yes" and 43 voted "No." This total of 118 represents less than half of the 243 eligible.

d. The committee on monitoring the faculty evaluation system has begun its work. It is too early to say much about the committee's work, but the data have been collected and are being evaluated. The system will remain the same for this year.

e. The report of the Section 504 Self-Evaluation Steering Committee compiled by Darryl Roberts and myself has been at least partly implemented. A committee, on which the Senate President serves ex officio, has been formed to advise handicapped students, to serve as consultants and resource experts for teachers of handicapped students, and to assist faculty in any way possible. The members of the Handicapped Student Advisory Committee are listed below:

Dr. George R. von Tungeln -- College of Agricultural Sciences  
Professor Gordon W. Patterson -- College of Architecture  
Dr. William O. Corder -- College of Education  
Dr. Cecil O. Huey, Jr. -- College of Engineering  
Professor Ann E. James -- College of Forest and Recreation Resources  
Dr. Thomas N. Schapp -- College of Industrial Mgmt. and Textile Science  
Dr. Carol Furry -- College of Liberal Arts  
Professor Mary G. Robinson -- College of Nursing  
Dr. Ralph P. Ashworth -- College of Sciences  
Mr. L. R. Wood -- R. M. Cooper Library  
Dr. William F. Steirer -- President, Faculty Senate  
Mr. Bill Pace -- Housing Office  
Dr. William H. Wells -- Counseling Center (CHAIRPERSON)

f. Nothing has been done about rewriting the retirement policy for the University. I am remaining in contact with Dean Hurst on this matter and am sure that the Faculty Senate has not been ignored.

g. Professor Corinne Sawyer has been granted the three hours of additional release time that the Faculty Senate requested in FS 78-9-3.

h. The story printed in The Tiger of October 6 concerning student records is accurate, but incomplete. No serious problems, legal or ethical, are thought to exist, but the Council of Academic Deans will take up the subject at their October 27 meeting. Any Faculty Senators who have any thoughts on this subject should let me know.

During the ensuing discussion the following points were made: Item c. The poll can be conducted again if the Faculty so desires, and if approved can become effective February 1. The Faculty Senate in April did support the concept of additional insurance for academic-year faculty based on a prorated twelve-month salary.
Item h. Dean Hurst sees no problem concerning student records. We are in full accord with the law.

The Steering Committee for the Robert Cook Edwards Endowment for Excellence in Science and Technology will begin its activities next month. President Steirer has been appointed as the only faculty member on this committee.

The Presidential Screening Committee has blocked off the upcoming weekend to determine the most highly qualified candidates and to request their philosophies. The Screening Committee operates under the rules of total confidentiality with no public statements being made.

Senator Baron asked President Steirer to expand on Item a. and explain what legislative authority USC faculty have. President Steirer stated that USC faculty establishes all policy dealing with the academic side of the university and has the power to see that it is implemented. In response to Senator Coulter's question "Does our Administration know about this?" President Steirer promised that he will ask Dean Hurst if he knows about it and what he thinks about it. President Steirer further stated that this power was at least partially put into the hands of the Faculty by sympathetic administrators. Senator Burt stated that USC has Department Chairmen instead of Department Heads a situation which was changed within the last four years. Senator Baron observed that the USC Faculty supported the change; whereas, the Clemson Faculty has not been able to convince the administration of the value of this change.

5. Old Business

a. Constitution - Senator West reviewed the Revision of The Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University. He specifically pointed out that twenty-five percent (25%) of the Faculty shall constitute a quorum (which would be 250 + faculty members). He urged the Senators to consult with their colleagues and work in earnest on this important document. The Policy Committee is distributing a work sheet to help in making revisions.

Senator Fennell requested that Senator West review the reasons why the Research Committee was eliminated. Senator West responded that most faculty are interested in research, and it did not need to be singled out as an entity unto itself and can be handed across all committees. Senator Fennell protested that it serves as a watchdog committee even though it is relatively inactive.

Senator Snipes moved that under Article II, the Faculty Senate, Section 5, Committees, there be a #6 entitled Research Committee. Senator Howard seconded the motion.
A rather spirited discussion followed during which Senator Fennell stated that the University Research Council had no continuity and research problems can be handled by the Research Committee. Senator Burt stated that he had been told that the Research Committee had never done anything and he asked what its function had been. Senator Hood reported that it was responsible for the Copyright Policy. Senator Grubb suggested that it be handled under the new committee -- Academic Affairs. Vice President Dickey stated that he was in favor of research; however, we have no standing committees that deal specifically with teaching and extension. It was his opinion that it should be combined within another committee. Senator Whitten was of the opinion that the name is not important; what is done is important. At this point Senator Snipes called for the question. The vote to call the question passed unanimously. The vote in favor of adding the Research Committee failed by voice vote.

Senator West reported that the following faculty members have affixed their signatures to the Revision of the Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University:

William E. West          David Fiste
Joseph F. Dickey         Keith McDowell
Daniel B. Smith          William Baron
Edwin M. Coulter         Stephen S. Melsheimer
Horace W. Fleming        John H. Walker

[Secretary's Note: I have in my files the document bearing the original signatures.]

b. Withdrawal Policy - Senator Edie moved that the Faculty Senate go on record favoring the maintaining of support of FS-76-11-1 and stress that the time of withdrawal should be seven weeks instead of six weeks. The motion was seconded by Senator Burt.

During the ensuing discussion, Senator Coulter stated that it hardly seemed worth the effort to change from seven to six weeks and that it should be shortened to three weeks; however, he would be satisfied with four weeks. Senator Coulter moved to amend the motion and change the withdrawal period to four weeks. Senator Edie accepted the amendment; however, Senator Burt as seconder would not accept.

Senator Worm requested that the seven be changed to a four, and at that point Senator Edie withdrew the original motion and Senator Burt withdrew his second. Senator Worm then proposed the following resolution:

FS-78-10-4 - Withdrawal from Class Policy

Whereas, the Faculty Senate wishes to go on record as favoring continued support of FS-76-11-1.

Whereas, the Withdrawal From Class Policy proposed by the Academic Deans is essentially that proposed in FS-76-11-1,

Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate endorse this proposal with the exception that the time allowed for withdrawal be changed from seven weeks to four weeks.

The motion was seconded by Senator Coulter.
A discussion followed: Senator Baron wanted an explanation as to why the change to four weeks. Senator Coulter's reasoning was that a month is ample time for a student to decide whether or not he wishes to stay in a course or bail out. He thinks the change should be substantive and seven to six is insignificant; whereas, seven to four is significant. Senator Baron could still see no reason for changing the policy backwards. An overriding concern seemed to be that standards needed to be raised and such action had to start somewhere.

Senator Howard expressed concern that many courses require a lot of time spent on a one on one basis and much time can be wasted if a student drops at a later date. Dr. Skelton stated that a lot of courses are closed, and that students are denied entrance to a course which later has vacant seats caused by drops. Senator Baron countered that time for dropping still would not solve that problem. Senator Fleming was of the opinion that late dropping disrupted courses when students are paired up as teams. Senator Young stated that he is in favor of the resolution because there are 15 effective teaching weeks and one-fourth of that time is enough to decide to drop. Senator Worm expressed concern that the policy would only affect undergraduates and that another policy might be required for graduate students. It was decided that it covered students, both undergraduate and graduate. At this time Senator Coulter moved the question, Senator Edie seconded, and the motion to call the question passed by voice vote. The motion to approve FS-78-10-4 withdrawal from Class Policy passed by voice vote.

c. Senator Edie moved for the defeat of the introduction of FS-78-9-6 - Grade Distribution (Refer to page 8 of the minutes of September 19, 1978). The motion was seconded by Senator Baron. Senator Coulter, who originally introduced the resolution, apologized that he had to leave before the last meeting was over, and he did not have an opportunity to explain it. He is disturbed over the manner in which the grades are collected and distributed and feels that it produces meaningless statistics, he is not attacking the distribution of grades per se, but he is attacking the report because it is fallacious. Senator Burt wanted to know where it is false. Senator Coulter explained how his seemingly high grades were reported with no accompanying explanation as to the type of course, or the grade to hour ratio. Senator Howard stated that another way to interpret the report is that Senator Coulter must be an excellent teacher. Senator Fleming expressed the opinion that the report should be sent to the affected faculty member. Senator Edie stated that if publication of grades does make a faculty member go back and think about the grades given then it serves a purpose. Senator Grubb stated that grade information is available anyway to department heads. Senator Coulter stated that the report is not structurally sound, and that it creates false impressions. Senator Howard called the question, Senator Burt seconded and the motion to call the question was approved by voice vote. The voice vote on motion to defeat SF-78-9-6 could not be determined so President Steirer called for a division of the house. The results were: 13 votes Aye and 11 votes No, so the motion to defeat carried.

d. Other Old Business

Senator Schindler stated that he wishes to call for reconsideration of FS-78-9-4 (Refer to page 7 of the minutes of September 19, 1978). He was a dissenting voter at the last meeting and he explained that he voted against the motion because of the lateness of the hour. He realizes now
that the Honors Common Room was not intended to be used to promote depth of knowledge but to provide a place to exchange ideas and to develop wider perspectives. Senator Schindler moved for reconsideration and approval. Senator Grubb seconded. During the ensuing discussion Senator Edie stated that we need a way to attract superior students. Vice President Dickey stated that elitism should not be an issue, rather we should be interested in having a place where the good students with common interests can get together for discussions; afterall, we have a dormitory set aside for athletes. Senator Coulter called the question, Senator Worm seconded and the motion to call the question was approved.

FS-77-9-4 Honors Common Room

Whereas an active honors program both encourages scholarship in the student body and allows faculty to better teach gifted undergraduate students and

Whereas the honor students at Clemson University have requested that an honors common room be established

Be it therefore resolved that the Faculty Senate of Clemson University supports the request for a common room in which honor students can meet, study and exchange ideas with invited faculty.

[The motion for reconsideration and approval of FS-78-9-4, Honors Common Room, was passed by voice vote.]

6. New Business

a. Senator Edie moved for approval of FS-78-10-1. The motion was seconded by Senator Whitten. Senator Coulter objected to resolutions being put in this form. He argued that both this resolution and FS-78-10-2 should be placed in the form of letters of endorsement and not in the forms of resolutions. President Steirer stated that Senate recommendations have always taken the form of resolutions but that he would entertain a motion for setting up an ad hoc committee with Senator Coulter as chairman. Senator Coulter moved to table FS-78-10-1; however, Senator Edie withdrew both resolutions and Senator Whitten as seconder concurred.

b. Senator Fennell introduced the following resolution and moved its acceptance:

FS-78-10-3 - Thesis research in College of Agricultural Sciences

Whereas, the administration of the College of Agricultural Sciences has initiated the policy that thesis research for M.S. and Ph.D. candidates must be associated with an approved Experiment Station project, regardless of the source of support of the student,

Whereas, this policy restricts graduate student research and hampers research in areas of current faculty expertise,

Whereas, this policy infringes upon the academic freedom of faculty to pursue ideas without conformity to any orthodoxy of content and method,
Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate considers such policy to be in direct violation of the academic freedom policy as stated in the Faculty Manual, and further

Be it resolved that the University Administration rescind this policy of the College of Agricultural Sciences.

The motion was seconded by Senator Whitten. During the ensuing discussion it was brought out that the resolution originally was submitted to the Research Committee by the Graduate Council Representative. The Research Committee reported that it discussed this policy for a long period of time. The Committee determined that such a policy could deter student and faculty research and is in violation of Academic Freedom as defined in the Faculty Manual (viz. page 33. "A university can fulfill its mission only when its faculty members have academic freedom to pursue knowledge without fear of pressure from sources inside or outside the institution." and "The faculty member is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results,..."; page 34. "The University is a marketplace of ideas, and it cannot fulfill its purposes of transmitting, evaluating, and extending knowledge if it requires conformity with any orthodoxy of content and method").

Senator McDowell asked what the policy is and if it is in writing. Senator Fennell answered in the affirmative and read a letter outlining the policy. The College of Agricultural Sciences Senators were asked their opinion, and they stated that they had met with their College Administration to express their concern with the policy and had lost the battle as they could not persuade them to rescind the policy. Resolution FS-78-10-3 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

c. Senator Edie made the following motion:

That President Steirer be requested to appoint an ad hoc committee (with Senator Coulter to serve as Chairman) to study the mechanism of submitting resolutions which would differentiate the "bread-and-butter" appreciation-type resolutions from those substantive types that request administrative action.

The motion was seconded by Senator Grubb and was approved unanimously by voice vote. President Steirer asked for volunteers and Senator Worm responded.

d. Senator Fennell presented a newspaper article from The Virginia Gazette, Williamsburg, Va. October 11, 1978, entitled "New Data Dramatizes Weakness of William and Mary Faculty Salaries" in which the following statements were published:

"We're low compared to the state, we're low compared to our peer group, we're low compared to the nation, and we're losing ground compared to the public as a whole...William and Mary professors, associate professors, and assistant professors make less than those at any other doctoral granting Virginia institution except full professors at Old Dominion University... Compared to public institutions across the nation that grant doctoral degrees, William and Mary salaries are $2,300 less than the national average for professors; $1,300 less for associate professors; and $900 less for assistant professors. Nationally, William and Mary salaries rank below the 20
percentile in all three faculty ranks. In comparing William and Mary professors' salaries to the 21 benchmark institutions with compensation, only Clemson University and the University of Montana rank lower than William and Mary. In comparing salaries without compensation, Clemson, the University of Montana, Illinois State University, the University of Idaho, and the University of Vermont and State College are ranked lower than William and Mary."

The full list of peer group institutions used to base William and Mary faculty salaries are as follows:

1. University of North Carolina, Greensboro
2. University of Alabama, Birmingham
3. University of Delaware
4. University of Louisville, Kentucky
5. Clemson University (South Carolina)
6. University of South Carolina (main campus)
7. University of Georgia at Athens
8. Northern Illinois University
9. State University of New York at Albany
10. Portland State University (Oregon)
11. University of Nevada, Reno
12. University of Rhode Island
13. State University of New York at Binghamton
14. University of Akron, Ohio
15. University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
16. Illinois State University
17. Indiana-Purdue University at Indianapolis
18. University of Montana
19. University of Idaho
20. University of New Hampshire
21. University of Vermont and State Agricultural College

7. The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

T. R. Adkins, Jr.
Secretary

Senators absent:

Agricultural Sciences
S. G. Turnipseed (T. E. Skelton, substituting)
B. R. Smith

Engineering
J. L. Prince
J. C. Hester (S. S. Melsheimer, substituting)
1. Call to Order

A quorum was declared and the meeting was called to order by President Steirer at 3:35 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the October 17 meeting were approved with minor corrections.

3. Committee Reports

a. Admissions and Scholarship Committee - Senator Edie, Chairman, reported that the Admissions and Scholarship Committee met on October 31 and again on November 14. A resolution concerning reexaminations for graduating seniors was discussed. The resolution (as we have amended it) was supported by the committee. This resolution will be introduced under new business.

A resolution concerning course repeats was also referred to our committee. This resolution asked that the policy allowing students to repeat courses be discontinued. The resolution states that repeating courses discriminates against students who obtain a B or better the first time they take the course. Since the author of this resolution doesn't seem to understand that the student's transcript shows the grade obtained every time a course was taken and every grade obtained is entered in the calculation of the student's G.P.R., the committee recommends that the author research the problem further before introducing a resolution.

Student senate resolution R-78-79-20 (policy for syllabus handouts) was discussed. While the resolution does have some merit it is vague. The first paragraph of the resolution states that the syllabus consists of grading, absence policies and an examination schedule. The last sentence of the resolution states that a syllabus is a course outline. While the committee, as a whole, favors professors distributing grading policies and course outlines at the beginning of the semester, we believe this is a common practice at present and see no need for a formal requirement. In addition some courses do not lend themselves to a formal structure.

Tabulation of the results of the final exam questionnaire are complete and appear below. The committee would like to thank the faculty for its excellent response to this questionnaire.

This questionnaire was prompted by suggestions that there is a lack of uniformity in professors' final exam policies, that many professors in contradiction to University policy do not give exams, and that an unusually large number of students are exempted from final examinations. Much to our surprise, the results of the questionnaire do not reveal any discrepancies or problems or significant deviations. There is in fact, if these results are to be believed, considerable uniformity in final
examination practices; also, of the roughly 500 respondents, a surprisingly high percent of the faculty agreed with the University policy on final examinations. Of the twelve (12) percent of instructors who do not give examinations, most indicated that this was warranted by the special nature of their classes - labs, music recitals, oral language proficiency, etc. Similarly, many of those who favored ending a uniform, university-wide policy on final examinations offered the diversity of classroom needs and experiences as the justification of leaving the decision whether or not to give exams to the professors themselves.

The following questions were tabulated:

2: Do you require a final examination in all courses you teach?
3: Do you require a final examination in some courses but not in others?
4: Do you give written final examinations?
5: Do you give oral examinations?
6: Are your final examinations usually cumulative?
8: Do you grant exemptions for final examinations?
10: Final examinations are now required by the university. Do you agree with this policy?
11: What level undergraduate course do you usually teach?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 yes</td>
<td>75 (83%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>28 (85%)</td>
<td>60 (85%)</td>
<td>21 (91%)</td>
<td>63 (94%)</td>
<td>89 (88%)</td>
<td>21 (91%)</td>
<td>85 (92%)</td>
<td>451 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>15 (17%)</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>11 (15%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>12 (12%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (8%)</td>
<td>64 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 yes</td>
<td>23 (28%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>9 (35%)</td>
<td>14 (24%)</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>7 (13%)</td>
<td>19 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (19%)</td>
<td>28 (35%)</td>
<td>112 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>59 (72%)</td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
<td>17 (65%)</td>
<td>45 (76%)</td>
<td>16 (73%)</td>
<td>47 (87%)</td>
<td>78 (80%)</td>
<td>21 (91%)</td>
<td>53 (65%)</td>
<td>346 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 yes</td>
<td>88 (98%)</td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
<td>32 (100%)</td>
<td>69 (97%)</td>
<td>22 (100%)</td>
<td>67 (100%)</td>
<td>97 (94%)</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
<td>90 (100%)</td>
<td>498 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>14 (3%)</td>
<td>83 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 yes</td>
<td>7 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>27 (26%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>28 (28%)</td>
<td>83 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>80 (92%)</td>
<td>10 (77%)</td>
<td>26 (93%)</td>
<td>68 (91%)</td>
<td>15 (62%)</td>
<td>64 (97%)</td>
<td>75 (74%)</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
<td>71 (72%)</td>
<td>432 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 yes</td>
<td>75 (86%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>23 (72%)</td>
<td>60 (90%)</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
<td>51 (76%)</td>
<td>78 (72%)</td>
<td>22 (96%)</td>
<td>84 (93%)</td>
<td>417 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>12 (14%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>16 (24%)</td>
<td>31 (28%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (17%)</td>
<td>93 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 yes</td>
<td>47 (59%)</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>25 (38%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
<td>30 (45%)</td>
<td>31 (30%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>43 (47%)</td>
<td>199 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>32 (41%)</td>
<td>9 (69%)</td>
<td>25 (78%)</td>
<td>41 (62%)</td>
<td>14 (61%)</td>
<td>37 (25%)</td>
<td>71 (70%)</td>
<td>20 (87%)</td>
<td>48 (52%)</td>
<td>297 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 yes</td>
<td>65 (75%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
<td>24 (80)</td>
<td>54 (77%)</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>50 (76%)</td>
<td>63 (70%)</td>
<td>12 (44%)</td>
<td>66 (73%)</td>
<td>354 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>22 (25%)</td>
<td>9 (64%)</td>
<td>6 (20)</td>
<td>16 (23%)</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
<td>16 (24%)</td>
<td>27 (30%)</td>
<td>15 (56%)</td>
<td>24 (27%)</td>
<td>143 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Admissions and Scholarship Committee is seeking information concerning the effect of requiring undergraduates to have a 2.0 G.P.R. in their major field as well as an overall 2.0 in order to graduate. (This was a regulation that had been attempted to be instituted in past years.) However, each "major area" should be defined for each type of degree to properly validate the Committee's investigations.

Consequently, the Admissions and Scholarship Committee has requested each representative and/or senator to ask each department head in their respective schools or colleges to submit a list of courses which constitute major area courses.

The following is a list of the departments which have submitted such lists:

- Departments of Agricultural Engineering
  - Architectural Studies
  - Building Science
  - Ceramic Engineering
  - Chemical Engineering
  - Civil Engineering
  - Electrical and Computer Engineering
  - Recreation and Park Administration
  - Accounting and Finance
  - Industrial Management
  - Biochemistry
  - Botany
  - Chemistry and Geology
  - Mathematical Sciences

If any of the departments within your college are not listed above, kindly see that the information about "major area" is sent to: C. L. B. Addison, Associate Professor, College of Architecture, or to D. D. Edie, Chemical Engineering, 221 Earle.

The following discussion ensued on professional examinations and their relationship to student grades. The suggestion was made that maybe a university-wide committee is needed to study professional examinations. The question of whose business this is was raised. Senator West asked if we should test value judgements and wondered how these examinations reflect on Clemson University. Senator Snipes stated that we should compare ourselves with the University of South Carolina. Senator Hester stated that there are professional organizations which judge the credibility of a degree, and we are not in the position to judge the quality of some other program. Senator Baron agreed with Senator Hester. Senator Coulter stated that in his area they have sought out weaknesses and corrected them. One Senator indicated that it had been reported that the rate of failure on the professional exam given to graduates of Clemson's College of Nursing has been exceptionally high. President Steirer reminded the senators that the question is "Should we assume the responsibility to look into this problem?" Senator Prince was not sure that we can agree that there is a problem. Senator Schindler recommended that the committee draft a resolution to examine what policies have been established and the success rates of such examinations. He expressed the opinion that he does not think this is a function of the Senate per se, but we should be
instrumental in getting the departments, schools and colleges to look into the problem. The opinion was expressed that maybe students do not know how to take the professional exams and maybe something should be done along these lines. Senator Worm stated that he can support the efforts of departments. Senator Walker stated that the elementary and secondary education department is studying the problems along with NTE and they are looking into how to take these tests. Senator Edie stated that his committee will take these thoughts into consideration.

b. Policy Committee - Senator West, Chairman, stated that the policy committee does not have a formal report for the November Faculty Senate meeting. The committee continues to work on the rewrite of the policy dealing with 'Faculty Participation in the Selection of Academic Administrators' and should be able to report this item out for the December Faculty Senate Meeting.

c. Research Committee - Senator Fennell, Chairman, briefly discussed preliminary research proposals and referred to Dean R. W. Henningson's August 17, 1973, letter which outlined the procedure to be followed when a preliminary proposal is to be submitted to a sponsoring agency. Senator Worm commented that neither signatures nor itemized budget are needed, but they must contain bottom-line figures.

d. Welfare Committee - Senator Burt, Chairman, announced that his committee met on October 24 and that the next meeting is scheduled for November 28. The following subcommittee reports were filed:

(1) Academic Year Subcommittee, Bob Lambert, Chairman.

Activity: (a) to determine policies within the University for promotion and tenure.

Report: All colleges have a mechanism for recommendations with variations from department to department. The most common practice is for departmental committees to advise the department head - the latter recommends these names to the Dean. One college has a college committee. In Agriculture and Engineering recommendations of advisory committee and department heads are reviewed by associate deans or a committee of department heads. Recommendations from deans go to Dean Hurst.

The College of Engineering has established "Promotion Guidelines" which are distributed to its faculty.

(b) this subcommittee is considering the reply on summer school employment.

(2) Calendar Year Subcommittee, Bob Mazur, Chairman

Activity: determination of fringe benefits.

Report: Retirement, 6.8%; preretirement death, .3%; Social Security, 6.05%; Workman's Compensation, .2%; Unemployment, .4%; Blue Cross-Blue Shield, averaging approximately 2%.
(3) Retirement Subcommittee, Steve Melsheimer, Chairman.
This subcommittee has completed its comparison of TIAA-CREF and
South Carolina retirement systems. A draft of the analysis is
complete and the final report, with recommendations, will be made
to the Senate in December or January.

A discussion followed and Senator Baron observed that TIAA-CREF and the
S.C. Retirement benefits are about the same if a person stays in the
SCRs until retirement. Otherwise, if the person does not stay until
retirement he is getting "The short end of the stick." If he leaves
anytime up to 10 years of retirement, he would be better off if he
took his money out of the system and invested it elsewhere.

Senator Hester addressed the option question and asked about the legality
of dual requirements. Apparently, there has been a ruling regarding
this in Texas.

A rather spirited discussion developed over the existence of promotion-
tenure guidelines in the College of Engineering. The blanket statement
was issued that no guidelines exist in the College of Engineering beyond
those published in the Faculty Manual. Another blanket statement was
issued that such a document does exist. Senator Hester stated that it
does not exist. Senator Lambert stated that it does exist and that he
saw it. Senator Baron stated that guidelines do exist. Senator Coulter
raised a point of order that this discussion was supposed to involve the
Welfare Committee report and not Theology.

President Steirer announced that there will be an exchange of information
with USC on retirement and that the study is being conducted in the law
school and they will be in a good position to examine the legality of
the system.

e. Ad Hoc Committees

Faculty Compensation - Senator Burt, Chairman, reported that this
committee met on October 24 and has a draft of its report and recommenda-
tion which is being put in final form. The committee will meet next
Tuesday and the final report will be circulated in order to allow all
senators to study it before meeting.

Salutary Letters - Senator Coulter, Chairman, stated that his committee
consisting also of Senator Worm will file its report under new business.

f. University Committees -

Traffic and Parking Committee - Senator Burt, representative, filed the
following report:

(1) The Committee recommended that a feasibility study be made on building
an overhead walk over Highway 93 in front of Sikes Hall.
(2) Adopted two recommendations

(a) Overhead walks in conjunction with new dormitory (this is to be given consideration any time there is a traffic hazard).

(b) Lower the speed limits between the two traffic lights on Highway 93 (between President's home and Mell Hall).

A discussion followed: Secretary Adkins asked about push-button controlled traffic lights at crosswalks in front of Sikes Hall -- Senator Burt responded that the Committee had looked into this and decided that they would not solve the problem. President Steirer asked if the Faculty Senate is interested in the dramatic changes that will occur in the appearance of the campus if overhead pedestrian-traffic separation devices are constructed on the campus. Senator Hester reminded the Senate that a resolution (FS-78-9-5) is on record endorsing safety measures taken at pedestrian crosswalk to Clemson House (see page 7 of September 19 minutes).

Tunnels were discussed briefly, and it was pointed out that they would not blight the campus; however, there is a resistance to tunnels because they create situations conducive to crimes of violence.

Computer Advisory Committee - Senator Hood, representative, announced that Senator Worm is chairing the subcommittee on long range planning and would appreciate receiving faculty input.

Undergraduate Council - Senator Hipps, representative, reported that the plus or minus grading resolution was rejected for the following reasons:

(1) Student Senate was against it.
(2) Plus or minus grades are not used in other universities in our area.
(3) Institution of plus or minus grades would be costly and is not warranted.

As far as the Withdrawal Policy is concerned, the Council accepted the Dean's compromise proposal.

[The Plus or Minus Grading Proposal and the Withdrawal Policy were referred to the Admissions and Scholarship Committee for further study].

4. President's Report

a. In response to questions from various faculty members, I pass the following information on to you. The quotation is from Section 13 of the 1979 Appropriations Act, p. 71.

E. With respect to the unclassified employees of the universities, colleges, and the State Board of Technical and Comprehensive Education, the authorities of each agency are authorized to determine the total funds required for base increases of 4%, as set forth in paragraphs C and D of this plan, for its unclassified employees as a group and to allot such total among individual unclassified employees without uniformity.
The pertinent parts of paragraphs C and D say this "unless otherwise modified or prohibited by paragraphs E through L of this plan." No such modifications or prohibitions are evident. At this time, the University plans to follow the dictates of the statute.

b. The Council of Academic Deans met on October 27. At that time the entire issue of withdrawal from class was referred back to the Undergraduate Council. It is my understanding that the faculty members on the Undergraduate Council did not support the Senate's proposal. The four week limitation was approved by the Senate by a large margin, and I believe that vote represents the sentiments of most faculty members. If you agree, it is up to you to persuade faculty members to articulate those sentiments to the Undergraduate Council.

c. The subject of payroll deductions being instituted for the University Foundation, Alumni Loyalty Fund and the R. C. Edwards Endowment Fund has been raised again. The capability for this now exists, but the objections that it is too costly to implement and that such payroll deductions establish dangerous precedents still prevail.

d. The Athletic Council has met twice and the members have been briefed on various bowl possibilities (all of which by the time of this meeting are of dubious worth), passed resolutions commending the ACC champion soccer and cross-country teams, and discussed the difficulties posed by the AIAW in regulating women's sports. The Council was asked eventually to determine whether the dual tasks of living up to Title IX guidelines and following AIAW rules are compatible.

e. The Honors Commons Room approved by the Faculty Senate in October is accepted in principle. The drawback is the unavailability of a centrally located room that is appropriate for use as a lounge.

f. Mr. Paul W. McAlister, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, has appointed Mr. T. Kenneth Cribb, Chairman of the Presidential Selection Committee. Fellow Board members, Mr. James C. Self and Mr. Lewis F. Holmes will join Mr. Mike Ozburn and myself on that committee. Mr. McAlister will serve in an ex officio capacity.

The Screening Committee will complete its work on November 27, when it will pass a list of approximately ten names on to the Selection Committee.

5. Old Business

A motion was made by Senator West that the Faculty Senate convene in Executive Session. The motion was seconded by Senator Burt and was approved unanimously by voice vote. After about a half hour the motion was made by Senator West that the Executive Session be closed. The motion was seconded by Senator Worm and was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Senator Burt requested the floor and stated that he wished to add one more item to his Welfare Committee report: His committee will be looking at the problem of developing guidelines for drawing up procedures for selecting a new Vice President for Academic Affairs upon the retirement of the incumbent. He requested suggestions from the Senate.
6. New Business

a. Senator Edie, Chairman of the Admissions and Scholarship Committee, moved that the Faculty Senate approve the following Resolution:

FS-78-11-1

Resolution on Reexaminations for Graduating Seniors

WHEREAS, current regulations on reexaminations for graduating seniors (p. 48, Clemson University, Announcements) infringe upon the affected faculty member's discretion as to whether a reexamination is appropriate or justifiable on an individual basis;

WHEREAS, these regulations constitute administrative interference in grading of students by faculty;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that current University regulations on reexaminations for graduating seniors for purposes of making up grade deficiencies and qualifying for graduation be amended to include the following:

Under "Examination on F received in last semester" (p 47) add to the fourth line of the paragraph:

may (at the discretion of the instructor) stand a special examination on the course provided:

The motion was seconded by Senator Prince. Senator Edie reviewed the current policy on reexamination:

A student in line for graduation at the end of this semester who fails to graduate because of an F on one course taken this semester may stand a special examination under certain conditions on the course after the regular degree date. A senior who qualifies for graduation under this provision will be awarded his degree on the next regular date for the award of degrees.

The resolution was approved unanimously by voice vote.

b. Senator Edie, Chairman of the Admissions and Scholarship Committee, moved that the Faculty Senate reject the Student Senate Resolution (R-78-79-20) policy for syllabus handouts. The motion was seconded by Senator Howard. During the discussion it was brought out that the resolution does have some merit but it is vague. Senator Young stated that the policy would allow no flexibility, would not allow for exigencies, would hamstring artistic courses, would result in more paperwork, and would be a burden to faculty and students. Senator Howard supported Senator Young. Senator Burt stated that faculty members are already supposed to state grading and absence policies.

The vote to reject passed unanimously by voice vote.
c. Senator Coulter, Chairman of Ad Hoc Committee on Salutary Letters, reported that there is nothing in the current Faculty Manual, in either the Constitution or By-laws of the Faculty Senate, requiring that Faculty Senate actions take the form of resolutions exclusively, the Committee moves that the following procedures, concerning the disposition of salutary expressions to persons or bodies relating to meritorious acts toward the University, become operational forthwith, and that these procedures be entered into the minutes for future reference:

1. Any member of the Faculty, the Faculty Senate or any committee thereof may draft a letter of appreciation or other salutary expression directed toward any person or body relating to the University.

2. Such letter may be sent to the President of the Faculty Senate whereupon he will place it on the agenda for the next regularly scheduled meeting under "New Business."

3. Upon its being called, the President will dissolve the Faculty Senate into a "Committee of the Whole" for purposes of discussing and/or amending such a letter.

4. After due consideration, the Faculty Senate will reassemble as a plenary body and vote on the letter as it has emerged from the Committee of the Whole.

5. Should passage occur, the letter shall be sent to the appropriate person or body under the signature of the President of the Faculty Senate indicating that it expresses the consensus of the Faculty Senate. This action shall be recorded in the minutes.

Senator Coulter moved for acceptance of the report and Senator Grubb seconded.

During the ensuing discussion, Senator Burt suggested that the Salutary Letters be referred to the Policy Committee for their action and recommendation rather than to the Senate as a Committee of the Whole.

Senator West complimented the efforts of the Ad Hoc Committee. Senator Coulter stated that the Committee had considered utilizing a standing committee rather than the Committee of the Whole. Senator Hester expressed concern that at a later date we may have a letter of controversy or disagreement which would be rejected, and the utilization of the Committee of the Whole would at least keep the discussion and action out of the minutes and maybe save some embarrassment.

Senator Snipes called the question. The motion to accept the report passed by voice vote. There was one No vote.

d. Senator Coulter moved that an ad hoc committee be formed to consider the possibility of creating, designing, qualifying, and disseminating special certificates of Merit for especially outstanding service to the University. The motion was seconded by Senator West and was approved unanimously by voice vote. Senator Worm will chair this committee and Senator Coulter will serve with him.
e. Senator Hester requested that a committee examine the problem of staggered class schedules. President Steirer referred this problem to the Admissions and Scholarship Committee.

7. The meeting adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

T. R. Adkins, Jr.

Senators absent:

Agricultural Sciences
   S. G. Turnipseed
   B. R. Smith (J. Palmer, substituting)

Liberal Arts
   H. W. Fleming

Library
   D. A. Fiste (Alternate Myra A. Armistead present)
Per Dr. Ted Adkins —— There will not be any minutes for December, 1978.

Reason: There was not a quorum present.

This explanation should appear with bound copies of Faculty Senate Minutes so that persons in the future will understand why there is a gap in the Minutes for 1978-79.

Annette Kesler, Secretary
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the University
January 22, 1979
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

January 23, 1979

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of Minutes

There were no December minutes because of a lack of a quorum at the December 12 meeting.

The minutes of the November 21 meeting were approved with minor corrections.

3. Committee Reports

a. Admissions and Scholarship Committee - Senator Edie, Chairman, reported that the Admissions and Scholarship Committee met on January 9. Work was completed on two congratulatory letters and one resolution. These will be introduced under new business. The following topics were also discussed:

(1). University Class Schedule - Senators Thompson and Grubb volunteered to gather data on University class schedule possibilities. This is in response to the request that we study our present as well as possible alternate class schedule possibilities.

(2). Health Excuse Mechanism for Redfern - We were requested to see if a student health excuse system could be implemented at Redfern. We talked to the staff at Redfern about their health excuse policy. We learned that any student who is admitted to Redfern for overnight treatment receives a certification of hospitalization slip which records time in and time out of Redfern. For any outpatient treatment, the professor can call Redfern and they will confirm the student’s visit as well as any recovery time that the student requires. Written excuses for outpatient treatment were discontinued several years ago because of abuses.

(3). Academic Honesty - Our subcommittee studying academic honesty has written to Auburn, Georgia Tech, V.P.I. and N.C. State to learn their policies and systems governing academic honesty problems.

(4). Mid-semester Grades - Last month we were requested to consider the value of mid-semester grade reports and their possible elimination for upper level undergraduates. After considerable discussion we concluded that if mid-semester grades are not meaningful, it is perhaps the fault of the individual faculty member and not the mid-semester report concept. It was also noted that this mid-semester report creates an incentive for faculty to give exams before the midterm. We cannot, therefore, support the elimination of mid-semester grade reports.
(5). Withdrawal Policy - In 1976 the Faculty Senate passed a resolution requesting that the free drop period for classes be shortened from the present eight weeks to six weeks. This year the Undergraduate Council (at the advice of its own faculty representatives) recommended that it be shortened to seven weeks. At the November meeting the Faculty Senate (by a nearly unanimous vote) indicated that this was still too long a free drop period. Dean Hurst has stated that no change can now be included in next year's catalogue and the Faculty Senate and the Undergraduate Council must agree before he will consider a change.

(6). Clemson University Admission Policy - Mr. W. R. Mattox, Director, Admissions, will be invited to our committee meeting on February 6 at 3:30 pm in the library class room to discuss the University admissions policy.

(7). Identification of Major - The committee is sending out second letters to departments that have not as yet responded to the request for a definition of their major areas needed for each type of degree.

b. Policy Committee - Senator West, Chairman, reported that the Policy Committee met on November 27, 1978, to review the Faculty Manual Policy Statement dealing with "Faculty Participation in the Selection of Academic Administrators." The committee does not recommend a rewrite of the existing policy statement.

The committee has requested and received a list of academic administrators that the Dean of the University considers the policy statement to apply. The policy committee has reviewed this list and believes the list to include current positions considered academic administrative in function.

The policy committee has drafted a memorandum to Dean Hurst from the Faculty Senate (see attachment). The requested action by Dean Hurst will clear up the confusion as to which positions require faculty participation in the selection process.

The policy committee met with Mr. Mel Long, Mr. Ross Cornwell and Mr. Harry Durham on December 19, 1978. This meeting provided discussion of policies (written and unwritten) surrounding the University Public Relations Department and the problems these policies present to the Clemson Faculty.

During the ensuing discussion, questions were raised on the Faculty Manual policy statement regarding publication policies, censorship of faculty publications, and the basic differences between public relations and responsible intellectual publication from an enlightened University faculty.

c. Research Committee - Senator Fennell, Chairman, reported that the Research Committee met on January 10 and discussed the following:

(1). Due to a lack of understanding by Faculty, a review of University consulting policy was undertaken by the Faculty Senate Research Committee. Consulting practices by Faculty are covered by the outside work policy appearing on page 51 of the Faculty Manual and the conflict of interest policy, page 52. The guidelines in the Faculty Manual relate to remunerative part-time work which is mutually beneficial to the University and individual faculty.
To obtain a better understanding of current procedures, the College Deans responded to the following questions:

(a) Does your College have a consulting policy supplementing the policy stated in the Faculty Manual.

(b) Is this policy written and will you provide the Senate with a copy?

(c) Is consulting encouraged within your College?

(d) Do you have any suggestions to improve the statement on the consulting policy in the Faculty Manual?

Recognizing the individuality of each college, the Deans, for the most part, thought that the existing guidelines were adequate. Some Deans thought that additional guidelines were necessary in order to clarify special situations. Within bounds, consulting is encouraged across the University.

The Research Committee appreciates the response to the above questions and recommends that the Deans reiterate their comments in a written memorandum to Department Heads and Faculty in their Colleges.

(2). The administration is considering procedures to standardize employment practices in order to contribute to an effective affirmative action program and ensure that necessary steps are taken to provide, and to document, equal employment opportunity in the filling of all faculty vacancies. President Steirer passed this matter on to the Research Committee for review.

d. Welfare Committee - Senator Burt, Chairman, filed the following report:

(1). The Welfare Committee did not meet in December. The next meeting will be Tuesday, January 30, at 3:30 in the library classroom. There are several items to report on and one resolution which will be introduced under new business.

(2). Retirement subcommittee report - The study of the TIAA-CREF system is complete and will be distributed. Since this is a lengthy report with some subtle points to consider we will not ask for a Senate resolution this month. Instead, I will report that our principal conclusion is that Clemson faculty members should have the option to enroll in TIAA-CREF instead of the South Carolina Retirement System with the University making the same contribution to the employee's retirement that it now does. Since the employee death benefit is a separate item a separate plan will have to be developed for those faculty who elect TIAA-CREF. Similarly, a separate disability plan will have to be provided. We will also introduce a resolution based on the recommendations in the April 18, 1978, retirement Subcommittee report on the South Carolina Retirement System.
3. Academic Year Subcommittee: The rejoinder to the comments of the Dean of the University on the Committee's recommendations concerning Summer school employment is complete and will be distributed. A resolution on this rejoinder will be introduced. (tabled until February).

e. Ad Hoc Committees

(1). Faculty Compensation - Senator Burt reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation has completed its study of compensation (salary plus fringe benefits) for Clemson Faculty. Our study supports the Welfare Committee's initial conclusions presented to the Senate on March 28, 1978. We have found that Clemson faculty members are significantly undercompensated relative to faculty of neighboring southeastern institutions and that this undercompensation has persisted for several years. The final report of the Committee, with recommendations, will be completed and distributed to the Senate this month. Since this is an especially sensitive matter it is imperative that all Senators acquaint their faculty with the findings and recommendations of the Committee in order that a resolution can be introduced at the next meeting.

f. University Committees

(1). University Union Committee - Senator Young, Senate Representative, filed the following report:

The Cultural Committee (a division of the Clemson University Union, Clemson University) is sponsoring a dinner theatre featuring a production of Mark Twain's musical comedy "The Diary of Adam and Eve."

The dinner theatre will be held in Edgar's on Thursday, January 18, 1979. Dinner will begin at 6:00 PM and the play will last until 9:00 PM. There will be a cash bar open beginning at 6:00.

Tickets for the dinner theatre are on advance sale only. The price is $5.00 per person which includes both the buffet and the play. The tickets can be obtained at the Union Program Office (9 AM - 5 PM, next to Information Desk) and will be available through January 17, 1979. There are only a limited number of tickets available.

"The Diary of Adam & Eve is a witty, nostalgic re-telling of the story of Eden. It's the first skirmish in the battle of the sexes, gleefully interpreted by Mark Twain and brought to life on the musical comedy stage. It's family entertainment for all."

The Clemson University Union sincerely hopes that this performance will be an enlightening and entertaining experience.

The following items were discussed: There is a pending consideration of academic seating arrangements in the stadium; four university committees or councils -- The Affirmative Action Committee, The Disciplinary Committee, The Research Council, and The Extension Council have not met during the present academic year -- and the question was raised whether these groups were adequately representing the faculty.
4. President's Report

(1). The Board of Trustees met this weekend. Four items are of special interest.

a. Tiger Brotherhood is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year, and as part of the celebration proposes to beautify the entrance to the campus from Sikes Hall east to Route 76 along both sides of Route 93. The Board approved the idea of turning this area into a park. The action will occur gradually as Tiger Brotherhood raises the money needed.

b. A phased plan for the removal of the prefabs was approved. Once the new housing complex is completed in the fall of 1980 the prefabs will be offered at public sale, as they become available.

c. The low bid was accepted at $3,417,000 to renovate Sirrine Hall.

d. The $62,000 "seed money" for the development of a master plan for a university golf course has been used and the master plan is completed. The whole idea of building such a golf course "has been moved from the back burner to the front burner."

(2). The state has changed its requirements on agency budgetary plans. As a result, Clemson University has developed a five year programmatic plan. This plan is far too complex even to summarize here, but it is a comprehensive statement of program deficiencies and objectives with plans to overcome those deficiencies and meet those objectives, plus a full listing of academic priorities. How accessible the report will be to faculty members I do not know, but it is worth reading carefully and thoughtfully.

(3). The Presidential Selection Committee continues to pursue its objective of narrowing the list of presidential candidates to approximately five names by February 1. Now that the actual interviewing has begun I am as optimistic and confident as I have ever been, and as you know I have been consistently optimistic from the beginning.

I regret my inability to persuade my fellow faculty members that no conspiracy exists and that the selection process as originally outlined has been faithfully followed. The number of rumors to the contrary are legion, and I suppose that we will all just have to accept that.

(4). The size of the small groups of faculty that will enter into dialogues with the Presidential candidates has been established. Each group will consist of five faculty members. I am directed to serve on each group in order to serve as a moderator and to provide continuity. My plans as of this moment are to use Faculty Senators as the faculty members especially making sure that each college will have at least one representative serving in at least one group.

(5). The Faculty Club charter subscribers will meet on January 19 at noon in the Clemson House to elect a Board of Governors. This initial Board of Governors will establish policies on food operation, alcoholic beverages, programs, hours, etc., policies which will largely determine the success of the Faculty Club. It goes without saying that thoughtful participation is imperative.
(6). One of our long-standing requests that payroll deduction be extended to cover various university and community fund-raising efforts has been achieved. Contributions to the R. C. Edwards Endowment Fund, the Alumni Fund, the University Foundation, IPTAY, and the United Fund can now all be made through payroll deduction, when the arrangements are made final.

(7). The R. C. Edwards Endowment Fund for Science and Technology is being organized. I am responsible for coordinating the faculty solicitation. Each faculty member will be personally solicited and asked to pledge for a three year period. The following faculty members have accepted the responsibility of coordinating their respective colleges.

Ray Noblet -- College of Agricultural Sciences
Joe Young -- College of Architecture
John Walker -- College of Education
Charles Hester -- College of Engineering
Larry Gahan -- College of Forest and Recreation Resources
Russell Shannon -- College of Industrial Management and Textile Sciences
Ben Skardon -- College of Liberal Arts
David Fiste -- Library
Thelma Duffee -- College of Nursing
Tom McInnis -- College of Sciences

(8). The Senate and the Faculty thank the Senators who made the reception for the Board of Trustees on Friday evening a success. Opportunities to interact with Board members are infrequent and need to be seized when they arise.

(9). At the Council of Academic Deans meeting on December 18, an extensive discussion of the changes that are occurring in state automobile policies occurred. A new division of the Budget and Control Board, the Motor Pool Management Division, has been established as part of the continuing trend towards centralizing all operations in Columbia. Clemson is trying to maintain its independence in bidding on the next automobile purchase contract, but at this point it still looks as if the state wide contract will mean AMC Hornets are the next cars bought for the motor pool.

(10). At that same meeting the Deans discussed the latest revision of the Graduate Advisory Committee and Major/Research Advisor draft. Because objections were raised to certain phrasing it was tabled, but it will come up again in January. The draft attempts to make explicit what has often been implicit. It outlines the specific duties and responsibilities of major and research advisors and of the advisory committee and limits the naming of major advisors to full-time faculty members who hold positions eligible for tenure while enabling part-time, visiting and adjunct faculty to serve as research advisors.

5. Old Business

a. Senator Edie obatined the floor and stated that the Admissions and Scholarship Committee of the Senate met and discussed the Withdrawal Policy. During the ensuing discussion it was obvious that the Senate still wishes to reduce this period to a shorter time, preferring four weeks. Senator Hester made the following motion:

Be it resolved that the Admissions and Scholarship Committee establish a dialogue with the Undergraduate Council, and if these two groups can not come to some kind of mutually satisfactory agreement on the Withdrawal Policy, then members of the Undergraduate Council are to be invited to appear before the Senate.
Senator Lambert seconded the motion and the Senator unanimously approved it by voice vote.

b. Senator Burt introduced the "Rebuttal to Comments on Faculty Senate Report on Status of Academic Year Faculty Employed in Summer" and "Rebuttal to Comments on Faculty Senate Policy Statement on Summer Employment of Academic Faculty" and moved that the Faculty Senate accept and approve these from the Welfare Committee. The motion was seconded by Senator Lambert.

After a brief discussion, Senator Hester moved to table the motion, after the second the motion to table passed by voice vote (there was one dissenting vote).

c. Senator Worm, Chairman of an Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Interviews presented a set of questions to be used during presidential interviews by faculty and made the motion that they be used by the faculty involved. The motion was seconded by Senator Burt. During the ensuing discussion it was suggested that the Senate should receive these questions as information only. The motion was defeated by voice vote, and the list will be utilized for information only.

6. New Business

a. FS-79-1-1 - On Consulting Policy. Senator Fennell presented the resolution and moved its acceptance. Senator Snipes seconded. After a period of discussion and some modification the following resolution was approved by voice vote:

FS-79-1-1

Resolution on Consulting

WHEREAS consulting activities by Faculty can enhance the prestige of the University and lead to further professional contacts, and

WHEREAS consulting activities provide an opportunity for Faculty to stay current in their field and to bring practical problems to the classroom,

BE IT RESOLVED that Dean Hurst direct the College Deans to issue a memorandum to their Department Heads and Faculty indicating endorsement of the current outside work guidelines on page 51 in the Faculty Manual or any additional clarifying procedures.

b. FS-79-1-2 - On Copyright Policy - Withdrawn by Senator Fennell.

c. FS-79-1-3 - On Being Informed of Professional Test Scores. Senator Edie moved for passage of the resolution. Senator Burt seconded. After discussion, the resolution was approved by voice vote.
On Being Informed of Professional Test Scores

WHEREAS, professional test scores by the students of various universities have attracted widespread publicity throughout the state, and

WHEREAS, one of the measures of the quality of our graduates is their performance on these test scores, and

WHEREAS, it is the duty of the faculty to be accurately informed of the results of their efforts in the education of their students;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the faculty be informed of the collective results of Clemson students on their respective professional examinations both by a dissemination of available data and by a study which would be conducted by the undergraduate council.

d. Other new business

(1) Senator Burt proposed the following resolution FS-79-1-4:

Resolved: The Senate endorses the Budget and Control Board's proposal to increase Faculty salaries for 79-80 by an average of 11%; 6% to be cost of living adjustment and 5% to be merit increases.

The resolution was seconded by Senator Snipes.

During the discussion it was pointed out that there may be some room for misinterpretation, that the increase would barely keep up with the inflation rate, and that it might be a mistake to endorse it at this time. The resolution failed by voice vote.

(2) Senator West moved acceptance of resolution FS-79-1-5 concerning the Clemson University Cheerleading Squad:

WHEREAS, the Clemson University Cheerleading Squad is a valuable asset to the entire University in promoting school spirit and representing the University at various athletic events; and

WHEREAS, the participation of members of this squad in commercial ventures such as advertisements in the media is entirely out of keeping with the role of this squad and calls into question the squad's reputation and role as University representative;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Clemson University call upon the appropriate officials of the University to put an end to all such commercial ventures which have the effect of squad promotion or endorsement of products and/or services offered by non-public, profit-oriented agencies, institutions and individuals.

The motion was seconded by Senator Howard. The ensuing discussion was spirited, and during the discussion it was pointed out that the cheerleaders do not receive compensation for this advertising. After a voice vote, the Chairman declared a division of the house and the motion failed 8 to 12.
(3) Senator Edie moved that the Senate accept two letters of commendation (attached): To Mr. Dave Moorehead, President, Clemson University Alumni Association and to Dr. Jim Strom, Director, Office of Development. The motion was seconded by Senator Worm and was approved by voice vote.

7. The quorum was lost and the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

T. R. Adkins, Jr.
Secretary

Senators absent:

Agricultural Sciences

D. B. Smith
C. S. Thompson (J. W. Hubbard substituting)

Engineering

J. L. Prince
W. Baron

Forest and Recreation Resources

L. D. Reamer

Industrial Management and Textile Sciences

W. C. Whitten

Liberal Arts

C. A. Grubb

Sciences

H. F. Senter
January 12, 1979

Dr. Jim Strom, Director
Office of Development
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29631

Dear Sir:

The Faculty Senate of Clemson University has taken note that approximately four years ago, through the cooperative efforts of the Office of Development of Clemson University and the Clemson University Alumni Association, a Faculty-Staff Merit Scholarship of $1500 for four years was established, and that this scholarship provides a way for non-alumni faculty and staff of Clemson University, as well as alumni, to make unrestricted gifts in support of academic excellence at Clemson University. Therefore, it is the consensus of the Faculty Senate that we should affirm our support of this and similar efforts, and we wish to commend those of you who were instrumental in the establishment of this scholarship and those faculty and staff who have made unrestricted gifts which made this scholarship possible.

Further be assured that the Faculty Senate will urge all faculty and staff of Clemson University to support an increase in the number of Faculty-Staff Merit Scholarships by making gifts to the Clemson University Foundation.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. William F. Steirer, President
For the Faculty Senate
January 12, 1979

Mr. Dave Moorehead, President
Clemson University Alumni Association
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29631

Dear Sir:

The Faculty Senate of Clemson University notes that the Clemson University Alumni Association has recently committed itself to assist in attracting superior students to Clemson University by establishing the Alumni Merit Scholar program and that during the 1977-78 academic year the sum of $5000 was provided as an initial investment in this program. Also, we are pleased that 73 entering freshmen for the 1979-80 academic year have been designated as Alumni Merit Scholars. Therefore, we wish to take this opportunity to commend the Clemson University Alumni Association for your action. Further, we will urge an expansion of this effort by all University organizations interested in academic excellence at Clemson University.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. William F. Steirer, President
For the Faculty Senate
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

February 20, 1979

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

2. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the January 23 meeting were unanimously approved with minor corrections.

3. Committee Reports
a. Admissions and Scholarship Committee - Senator Edie, Chairman, filed the following report:

   1. Withdrawal Period

      On Friday, February 2, the committee met with the faculty representatives on the Undergraduate Council. The undergraduate withdrawal policy was discussed. The overwhelming majority of the Council was in agreement that the drop period should be shortened. After considerable discussion, it became apparent that a four-week withdrawal period would encounter considerable opposition on the Council, but a six-week withdrawal period would be supported by a comfortable majority of the faculty representatives on the Council. We will introduce a resolution on this subject under new business.

   2. Definition of Major

      All department heads have provided the requested information on a definition of major courses within their programs except the following:

      W. P. Williams, Head - Department of Food Science
      R. F. Wheeler, Head - Department of Animal Science
      E. J. Kozma, Head - Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
      M. B. Bishop, Director - Medical Technology Program

      The College of Education has told me that they are working on our request but their response will be somewhat delayed because of the diversity of their programs.

   3. Academic Honesty

      Our subcommittee is studying Clemson University's policies on honesty and has obtained responses from the four Universities that they have contacted. They will present a comparison of the policies at the next Faculty Senate meeting.
4. University Admissions Policy

The committee met with Mr. Mattox of the Admissions Office on February 6. Mr. Mattox told us that Clemson University has no written admissions policy. This is intentional in order to give the Admissions Office maximum flexibility. Admission is based on the predicted performance for the freshman year at Clemson. Although the Admissions Office may set an application cutoff date which may fall as early as the applicant's junior year in high school, most prospective students are not hurt (according to the Admissions Office) because they take the college boards in their junior year anyway. Seventeen hundred freshmen dormitory spaces are available for the fall semester. Eight hundred and fifty off-campus spaces are available. The early cutoff date is imposed because the office has decided that the same admissions standard should be used for on and off campus residents.

As far as our committee could learn, there has never been significant faculty input into the University's admission policies. We will have resolutions to present in this area during future meetings.

During the ensuing discussion, the Senate indicated that it preferred that Senator Edie's Committee proceed with its study on Definition of Major sans the responses from the four departments. Then Senators Baron and Burt expressed concern over the lack of a written admissions policy and the fact that admission to Clemson is based on the junior year of high school. Senator Burt asked if the Admissions Office, in writing a letter to a nonadmitted student, clearly states that the person is not being rejected? Senator Edie suggested that an advisory committee should oversee the admission procedure. Other comments were that the policy seems to be improvised as exigencies require; that the Senate needs to tackle the implementation of admission policies; that it seems that filling the dorms is more important than taking qualified students; that the "policy" seems to make little sense and they can admit anybody that they want; that the faculty does not object to discretionary policy, just to a policy where the concern seems to lie with housing rather than scholarship considerations; and that even the deans have no input into the admissions policy.

Senator Hester suggested that the Faculty Senate go on record recommending that the Faculty Senate and Council of Academic Deans deal collectively with the admissions problem.

The following was introduced as information and not as a resolution:

Academic standards depend to an extent on the number of class sessions in a school term, and the administration should schedule and execute 75-day semesters.
Explanation. Spring Semester 1979 is a 72-day term having 43 class meetings for most three-semester hour courses. Syllabi are commonly structured on 45 class meetings resulting in a scheduled foreshortening. No apparent reason exists in that the term could well have begun on Monday, January 8 rather than on Thursday, January 11 with orientation and registration on January 3, 4, and 5.

In the 1978 and 1979 winter season, classes were cancelled due to the weather. Clemson University is not a commuter college. Faculty and students who cannot attend should endeavor to make up work as in any other missed attendance. The administration should not suspend classes for snowstorms.

b. Policy Committee - No report

c. Research Committee - No report

A discussion did develop and two items were addressed:

1. Copyright policy. Adm. McDevitt will give this his attention now that the presidential search process is growing to a close.

2. Thesis research in College of Agricultural Sciences. The following clarification on the Thesis Research Policy in the College of Agricultural Sciences which resulted from resolution FS-78-10-3 was circulated to Department Heads in that College on January 22, 1979:

Research training is a critical element of M.S. and Ph.D. programs. In general, Experiment Station projects represent the most concentrated research efforts in the College; hence, thesis research will normally be associated with a Station project. Association with a Station project does not say, nor does it imply, that thesis research must be identical to the Station project or that the association must be with the project of the major professor. In addition, research carried out under the support of any formal grant or contract -- public or private -- which has been approved by the department and College represents a potentially suitable thesis research area. It is possible that a legitimate Station project might not provide a suitable basis for thesis research. This decision must be made within the department.

In no way is this policy an administrative attempt to mandate or manage the details of graduate education or to interfere with the unique and essential functions of graduate advisory and examining committees. It is, however, a written policy to ensure a continued practice of supporting a high quality graduate program of which the administration, faculty, and students of this College can be proud.
d. Welfare Committee - Senator Burt, Chairman, presented the "Faculty" Senate Committee Report on TIAA Optional Retirement Plan" [SEE ATTACHMENT A].

Senator Burt asked if he could invite Mr. John Gentry, retired head of the Personnel Department, to address the Senate for 10-15 minutes at the March meeting. Mr. Gentry has researched some special features of the S.C. Retirement System and would like to share his information with the Faculty Senate. The Senate approved this request. (The Senate did recognize the work of former Senator Melsheimer on a voluntary basis.)

e. Ad Hoc Committees - Senator Burt, Chairman, circulated the final report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation [See ATTACHMENT B].

f. University Councils and Committees

Senator Hipps, representative on Undergraduate Council, discussed the problem related to reexamination of graduating seniors. The following points were made during the discussion: Maybe faculty members need to allow reexaminations, and if students fail, they just fail; the question of how many other universities allow reexamination was addressed; it was suggested that the Resolution on Reexamination for Graduating Seniors (FS-78-11-1) be reintroduced. (See page 9 of November 21, 1978 Minutes).

4. President's Report

a. By this time, one-half of you have had the opportunity to enter into a dialogue with one of the presidential candidates while the other half will have the same opportunity later this week. I am glad that every Faculty Senator will have this opportunity because each of you as a representative of your college deserves the opportunity to represent your constituents in this important task. I added Hugh Macaulay to each group because as a member of the Screening Committee his knowledge of the candidates would be useful and because as the elected representative of all the full professors, he should have this chance to represent them.

A number of people and groups suggested alternatives to the procedure adopted, but I rejected them all because of the importance that I attach to the Faculty Senate. It is, after all, the only elected body representing the Faculty and all efforts to enhance its importance in university affairs would come to naught if on this important occasion I would ignore it, and have other people do something that Faculty Senators can do. No assembly can ever gain respectability unless as responsibilities arise, it is given the chance to discharge those responsibilities. From my observation of the first two meetings, you are doing splendidly, and I can not believe any other groups of faculty members would do better.
b. The Alumni Association and Jim Strom of the Development Office have officially thanked the Senate for the Letters of Appreciation we sent last month [Secretary's Note: the originals of these two letters will be attached to the Approved Minutes that will be given to Dean Hurst for filing in the Library Archives].

c. Dean Hurst has responded to FS-79-1-1 (on consulting) by sending the type of request that we asked him to send to all the Deans. On FS-79-1-3 (on information about professional examinations), Dean Hurst agrees that this information would be useful to faculty members. He will accumulate the information himself instead of asking the Undergraduate Council to do so.

d. Elections of officers for 1979-80 will take place on March 27. The Advisory Committee will meet on Thursday, March 8 at 1:25 p.m. in Hardin Hall 121 in order to nominate candidates. I will remind the committee members later, but would like them to arrange their schedules with this time in mind.

e. Elections for new senators will occur in late March and early April. Please think of those best suited to do the kind of job needed. Use your influence in encouraging excellence to be recognized and placed in the Senate.

f. I know many of you are eager to see the copyright policy issue resolved; so am I. Once the presidential selection task is behind him, I am sure Vice-President McDevitt will be able to give it the attention it deserves.

A discussion developed over the University Governance Committee. President Steirer revealed that two reports will be forthcoming from this committee: a majority report from all but one member of the committee; and a minority report from President Steirer. Senator Snipes moved that a straw vote be taken on how the Senate feels about the preamble of the proposed constitution -- specifically the reference to the faculty possessing legislative authority. The motion to support in principle the faculty possessing legislative power or authority passed by voice vote.

5. Old Business

a. Welfare Committee Reply to Dean Hurst on Summer Employment - Senator Burt introduced the following resolution and moved its acceptance:

   FS-79-2-5

   Concerning the Welfare Committee's rebuttals to Dean Hurst's reply to the Senate's Policy Statement on Summer Employment and the Senate's Report on Status of Academic Year Faculty Employed in Summer be it resolved,
   the Senate adopts the Welfare Committee Rebuttals.

   The resolution was seconded by Senator Grubb. [See ATTACHMENT C for Rebuttal to Comments on Faculty Senate Report on Status of
The resolution passed unanimously by voice vote.


c. Report on Faculty Compensation -- Senator Burt moved acceptance of the Faculty Compensation Report [See ATTACHMENT B] and Vice President Dickey seconded. A rather spirited discussion developed during which the following points were made: Senator Baron raised objections about the statement on page 4 item 3 concerning terminal degrees for full professors and that there was no consideration given as to why a greater difference exists at the full professor level than at the associate or assistant professor levels. Senator Burt rebutted Senator Baron's objections by stating that the average compensation at each level should be brought up to the level at the peer institutions. Senator Prince injected that now requirements are higher than just a terminal degree and that we may not be comparing the same types of individuals. Senator Burt stated that the ad hoc committee looked at the AAUP data and asked themselves the question -- Are there any extenuating circumstances here at Clemson? It was decided that we should let the administration point them out if any exist. Senator Snipes expressed concern that a person makes full professor just because of longevity. Senator Fennell commented that the greater discrepancy at the professor level tended to play down the role of the assistant and associate levels. Senator Burt assured the group that there are differences at all levels. Vice President Dickey reminded the group that we are talking about averages -- we are not saying that we are better or worse. Senator Baron expressed the opinion that the average level of each rank could be raised and then within that framework, individual salaries could be considered on a merit basis. Senator Burt stated that it is a numerical matter and we are not saying any group is better than the other; we are suggesting that the average compensation at each rank be examined and adjusted to bring that average up to the level of the peer institutions. Senator Snipes commented that the report says nothing about what a full professor's salary should be: all we are trying to say is how we are being undercompensated. Senator Fleming remarked that the issue at hand is that we are undercompensated, and that the AAUP does in fact feel that this is a matter that the Senate should pursue on behalf of the Clemson Faculty. He assured us that the AAUP supports the Senator's efforts and would like to see the Faculty Senate assume a leadership role in the endeavor. Senator Grubb expressed the opinion that the Faculty Senate is the best body to make recommendations and asked the question, "Why does Clemson appear at the bottom?"
The motion to accept the ad hoc report was approved by voice vote.

d. Report on Administration Positions -

The February 20, 1979, memorandum to Dean Victor Hurst concerning Administrative Positions in the Academic Area for which Search Committees are appropriate was distributed to the Faculty Senate [See ATTACHMENT E]. Senator West moved acceptance, Senator Grubb seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

e. FS-78-4-5 - The Resolution on Student Liability will be reintroduced as FS-79-2-7 under New Business.

6. New Business

a. FS-79-2-1 - Resolution on Class Withdrawal Policy

WHEREAS, the present system of withdrawing from classes does not encourage students to share in responsibility of pursuing academic information early each semester; and

WHEREAS, allowing withdrawal from a course anytime until the last five weeks of classes encourages an air of irresponsibility on the part of the students; and

WHEREAS, some persons register for more classes than they intend to finish each semester so they can choose to remain in those classes for which the best grades seem probable, and thereby occupy class space other students may desire; and

WHEREAS, six weeks in any course should be ample time to allow students to determine if they wish to remain in a course; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the present class withdrawal policy be changed to encompass the following:

a. That the first six weeks of a semester constitute a free drop period. Courses dropped during this period are not recorded on the student's permanent record.

b. That a student enrolled in a class after the first six weeks of classes shall have final grades recorded unless the student withdraws from the University or can demonstrate to the Dean of Undergraduate or Graduate Studies confirmable extenuating circumstances why the student should be allowed to withdraw from that course. Students withdrawing from the University in the last five weeks of classes shall have final grades recorded. Instructors may dismiss a student from class for cause at any time. Students so dismissed during the last five weeks of classes shall receive a grade of "F."
The above resolution was introduced by Senator Edie, who moved its adoption, seconded by Senator Howard, and approved unanimously by voice vote.

b. FS-79-2-2 - Resolution on Proposed Amendment to State Employment Grievance Procedure.

Concerning the proposed amendment to the State Employment Grievance Procedure to exempt teaching personnel from coverage under the State Employee Grievance Procedure in matters relating to tenure and/or retention be it resolved, the Senate requests an explanation from the Administration on the decision to recommend this action to the Council of Presidents.

The above resolution was introduced by Senator Burt, who moved its adoption, seconded by Senator Lambert, and approved unanimously by voice vote.

c. FS-79-2-3 - Resolution to Accept the Welfare Committee's Report and Recommendations for Optional Retirement Plans in lieu of SCRS.

On the basis of the Welfare Committee's study of the benefits of optional retirement systems and,
In view of precedents in other states for the existence of optional retirement plans in addition to state retirement plans, be it resolved,
the Senate recommends that the Welfare Committee's Report and recommendations for optional retirement plans in lieu of the South Carolina Retirement plan be adopted by the Administration.

The above resolution was introduced by Senator Burt who moved its adoption, seconded by Senator Grubb, and approved unanimously by voice vote.

d. FS-79-2-4 - Resolution Concerning Changes in the South Carolina Retirement.

On the basis of the Welfare Committee's report of April 18, 1978, concerning changes in the South Carolina Retirement, to wit,

(1). Provision for inflation protection should be made in the deferred pension payable to the vested employee who terminates prior to being eligible for retirement.
(2). The payout rate should be increased to 2% on salary amounts over $4800.
(3). The state should investigate possibilities of a limited portability in which a person leaving Clemson for another (non South Carolina) state university or vice versa could be immediately enrolled in the new system at no cost and no loss of previous benefits.
(4). Investigations into the feasibility of converting the State System to a non-contributory plan should be undertaken. The tax advantages to the State employees would be quite significant, and no net cost to the state need be involved,
be it resolved,
the Senate recommends that these changes be fought for by the Administration.

The above resolution was introduced by Senator Burt who moved its adoption, seconded by Senator Walker, and approved unanimously by voice vote.

e. FS-79-2-6 - Resolution on Faculty Compensation.

Whereas, the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation has established that Clemson University faculty have been and are significantly undercompensated relative to faculty in peer institutions, be it resolved, the Senate recommends that the Administration implement the plan for amelioration of this undercompensation as contained in the Ad Hoc Committee's Final Report.

The above resolution was introduced by Senator Burt who moved for its adoption, seconded by Grubb, and approved by voice vote.

f. FS-79-2-7 - Resolution on Student Liability Insurance Coverage
(First introduced as FS-78-4-5)

RESOLUTION ON STUDENT LIABILITY INSURANCE COVERAGE

WHEREAS the general liability policy which covers employees of the University does not cover students participating in various activities such as student clubs, fraternities, sororities and intramural sports programs; and

WHEREAS it is not fully clear as to the liability coverage of students involved in assigned laboratory, or field experiences, shop exercises; and

WHEREAS it is in the best interest of the University to provide liability coverage for all student activities sanctioned by the University, be it therefore

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests the Administration to clearly identify the current liability insurance coverage for students and to take immediate steps to obtain student coverage for all University sanctioned activities.

The above resolution was introduced by Senator Hood who moved its adoption and seconded by Senator Burt. During the discussion, Senator Hood pointed out that there are potential dangers when students work on or with floats, food service, laboratories, classroom and when they go out in the state. Senator Hipp asked who would pay for the coverage, and Senator Hood responded by stating that the resolution does not address the problem of how coverage will be obtained.
The resolution was approved unanimously by voice vote.

g. FS-79-2-8 - Resolution on The Provision of Towels and Soap for Laboratories.

WHEREAS the Clemson University Physical Plant currently has a policy of not providing basic items such as paper towels and soap for laboratory areas for teaching and research, and

WHEREAS paper towels and soap are necessities for the cleanliness and well being of students and faculty,

Be it therefore resolved that the University Administration take steps to change this policy.

The above resolution was introduced by Senator Hood who moved its adoption, and seconded by Senator Dickey. During the discussion it was revealed that it is a policy that these items are provided for restrooms only.

The resolution was approved unanimously by voice vote.

7. The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

T. R. Adkins, Jr.
Secretary

Senators absent:

Agricultural Sciences
D. B. Smith
S. G. Turnipseed

Industrial Management and Textile Sciences
W. C. Whitten
G. H. Worm

Liberal Arts
E. M. Coulter

Sciences
H. F. Senter
I. SUMMARY

The difference in the characteristics of the South Carolina Retirement System (SCRS) and TIAA plans is such that no unequivocal comparison of the individual benefits can be made. However, it appears that both will provide very similar pensions for individuals serving to retirement for the interest rate and inflation scenarios of this study. The SCRS plan provides an assured pension level, while TIAA pensions may be slightly better or worse.

The advantage of TIAA to the individual is the fact that he owns the pension accumulation and the right to purchase a retirement annuity with it. Since TIAA is used as the retirement fund vehicle by the vast majority of major institutions of higher learning in this country, the individual can move from one to another without losing part of his pension fund accumulation. He is, thus, not "locked in" to a particular job or institution by his pension fund, and is better able to pursue professional opportunities furthering his professional development. Indeed, this is at least as advantageous to the University as to the faculty member. Development of a vigorous and vital academic program in any field requires the cross-fertilization of ideas which accompanies the addition of new, ambitious faculty to interact with more experienced faculty possessing broader perspective. While the greater mobility offered by the TIAA option will result in some people leaving that we would like to see remain, it will also bring good people to replace them. In general, the programs at all institutions involved, and the professional development of the individuals involved, will benefit in the long run.

The greatest advantage to the University of a TIAA optional retirement plan lies in the area of faculty recruiting, especially of senior faculty. As the most common retirement system in higher education, TIAA is widely known and respected among faculty throughout the country. Many have their retirement accounts with TIAA, and the ability to continue their participation in TIAA would be very attractive to them. The assurance that their pension accumulation would not be forfeited should they depart would also be a considerable attraction to many younger faculty candidates. On the other hand, other individuals will be attracted by the assured benefits of the SCRS plan. The availability of both plans on an optional basis would distinctly strengthen the University position in attracting top-flight faculty to continue its movement toward national prominence.
Finally, there appears to be no significant additional cost to the University in offering the TIAA plan as an option. Thus, the clear conclusion is that appropriate action should be instituted to implement the TIAA plan as an option to the present SCRS retirement plan.

II. Comparison of characteristics of State (SCRS) and Optional (TIAA) Retirement Plans

A. Basic Concepts

State - The South Carolina Retirement System (SCRS) utilizes a formula based on years of service and final average salary (three highest years) to compute a defined benefit. The benefit, or pension, is only indirectly related to the individual's contributions.

TIAA - The TIAA plan provides a pension actuarially based on a defined contribution rate. The pension depends on cumulative contributions, dividend rate (which is variable), and time on deposit. Presently, it also depends on sex, though the actuarial tables may be merged in the future. Thus, TIAA pensions can only be estimated for some economic scenario. The TIAA member is also given the opportunity to invest his pension funds in CREF, an equity investment fund.

B. Vesting and Portability

Definitions - Vesting refers to the right to receive a deferred pension from employer contributions to a pension fund even if employment with the sponsoring company or agency ceases. Portability refers to the right to continue active participation with the same pension fund with more than one employer. It also implies full credit for pension fund accruals even in periods when no contributions are made. Generally, such plans are owned by the individual.

State - Vesting is provided in fifteen years. No provision is made for inflation or interest adjustment between separation and retirement. Consequently, this vesting is of very dubious value if termination is more than ten years from retirement eligibility.

TIAA - Immediate vesting and full portability are provided. The ultimate pension reflects all fund earnings even if no contributions are made for a long period prior to retirement.

*** - This appears to be the pre-eminent advantage of TIAA.
C. Inflation and Cost-of-Living

State - Compensation for inflation is quite good prior to retirement in that the benefit is generally based on the individual's highest salary, which will have at least roughly kept pace with inflation. After retirement, there is a limited adjustment of pension benefits in response to changes in the consumer price index.

TIAA - Compensation for inflation prior to retirement depends on rising interest rates in inflationary times (and thus higher TIAA dividends), and the opportunity to participate in equity investment through the CREF option or TIAA with highly uncertain results, of course. After retirement, the same factors are operative.

*** - Probably an advantage to SCRS in highly inflationary periods.

D. Disability and Death Benefits

State - There is a disability retirement provision in the State system after five years service. The calculation is complex, but the pension would range from roughly 30% of final salary at initial eligibility to about 45% if near retirement with extensive service at Clemson. A death benefit of one year's salary is also provided (along with return of all contributions with interest.)

TIAA - There are no disability or death benefit provisions in TIAA other than entitlement to the full contributions and interest attributable to both the individual and the state, and the prerogative of taking this as an annuity. For the individual with a number of years in the program, the entitlement to the State contributions offsets the one year salary death benefit of SCRS. TIAA offers a separate disability insurance program with excellent benefits at modest cost (less than one per cent of salary). This plan would also be attractive to SCRS members not yet eligible for SCRS disability, or whose SCRS disability income would be inadequate.

*** - An advantage to SCRS in the early years, about equal later, perhaps an advantage to TIAA even later. The TIAA disability insurance would be a valuable addition to Clemson's benefit plans in any event.
E. Tax Treatment

State - All employee contributions are taxed at the time of contribution. Tax on the employer contribution, and on the interest accrued, is deferred until retirement.

TIAA - Generally, such optional plans allow tax deferral on employee contributions. At a contribution rate of 6% and a 33% marginal tax rate, the employee choosing tax deferral would be able to purchase a Supplemental Retirement Annuity with 3% of his salary with no reduction in take home pay. His ultimate retirement pension would then be increased by about 20% (before taxes). Since most of the pension is attributable to employer contributions and interest (and is thus taxable), the after tax income would also increase significantly no matter what his tax bracket.

*** - Clearly an advantage to TIAA.

III. Comparison of Estimated Retirement Benefits

A. Bases - Salary profiles used are 5% and 7% average annual raises. Case studies of recent employees indicate about 7% has been the case over the past 30 years. Generally, higher salary increase rates make SCRS look better, while lower values are favorable to TIAA. In the comparison, the TIAA Plan is assumed to have no CREF component since no reasonable prediction can be made for CREF.

Note
TIAA interest rates are assumed to be fixed at 6% to retirement and 9% after retirement. Actual TIAA rates are variable; currently, the rate is 7.75%. The figures in the following illustrations are abstracted from a report prepared by TIAA for Clemson University, dated August 15, 1978. Copies are available in the Clemson University Personnel Office.
B. Sample Cases

1. Twenty-eight year old serving 30 years, then retiring. What is his pension?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Salary - $16,000</th>
<th>Pension - % of Final Avg. Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIAA Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Salary Average</td>
<td>Salary Increase Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 62,770</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$106,943</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note result is very similar at 5% salary rate, but SCRS is about 25% higher at 7% rate. As discussed in II E., election of tax deferred treatment with TIAA would enhance TIAA pensions significantly, placing TIAA slightly ahead at 5% and modestly behind at 7% salary increase rates.

2. Same twenty-eight year old serves 15 years and terminates to take administrative position at another University. What is his deferred pension at age 65?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Salary - $16,000</th>
<th>Pension - % of Final Avg. Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIAA Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Salary Average</td>
<td>Salary Increase Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 88,324</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$171,085</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the vested pension from SCRS for the 15 years service is only 5 - 8% of the individual's final pre-retirement salary! Indeed, if the employee withdrew his contributions, forfeited the State share, and invested in a bank savings account for the intervening 22 years, he would be better off. With TIAA, on the other hand, he has a deferred pension of 17 to 31% of his final average salary - a significant contribution to his retirement income.
3. Same twenty-eight year old serves to retirement at age 65. What is his pension?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Salary - $16,000</th>
<th>Pension - % of Final Avg. Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Salary Average</td>
<td>TIAA Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 88,324</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$171,085</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions are much the same as Case 1 above. Note again that use of tax deferred option with TIAA could increase those pensions, so that TIAA would be appreciably superior at 5% salary increase rate, and roughly on a par with SCRS at the 7% increase rate.

4. Forty-four year old enters with 16 years service elsewhere. How does TIAA option affect him?

Without listing the detailed calculations, suffice it to say that Illustrations 1 and 3 give a reasonable assessment of the relative pensions he would earn during the balance of his career at Clemson. That is, at 5% annual salary increase the TIAA pension would be somewhat higher, at 7% salary increase the SCRS pension a bit greater. The pension would be about one-third of the final average salary in each case.

5. Case studies from Clemson - recent retirees; SCRS pension versus TIAA based on actual contribution and dividend record.

a. Initial Salary - $2,250 in 1946
   Years of Service - 31
   Final Salary Avg. - $24,540
   Salary Increase Rate - 8.0%
   SCRS Pension - $11,571
   TIAA Pension - $8,867

b. Initial Salary - $4,150 in 1949
   Years of Service - 28
   Final Salary Ave. - $16,072
   Salary Increase Rate - 5.0%
   SCRS Pension - $6,888
   TIAA Pension - $6,722
c. Initial Salary - $5,400 in 1949
   Years of Service - 28.5
   Final Salary Avg. - $30,738
   Salary Increase Rate - 6.9%
   SCRS Pension - $13,907
   TIAA Pension - $9,969

Note that for the two individuals with high salary increase rates SCRS was distinctly superior, while the third case gave almost equal pensions. It should be recognized, however, that during the early years of these careers, the total contribution rate (state plus individual) was appreciably lower than it is at present. This penalizes the TIAA pension (which reflects the money which has been deposited), but not the SCRS plan (which is based on the current benefit rate irrespective of cumulative contributions.) Note also that the advantages of tax deferred treatment were not considered.

*** Based on the information presented above, it is clear that level of pension benefits alone does not provide an unequivocable choice between SCRS and TIAA. SCRS pensions seem to be somewhat higher (if inflation rates remain high) for the employee who remains at Clemson until retirement. However, this comparison is based on a lower interest rate than that currently paid by TIAA, and does not allow for tax sheltered treatment available in optional plans. Indeed, one can make either plan appear superior by altering one's assumptions about interest rates and inflation rates.

IV. Advantage to Clemson and to the Faculty of Having TIAA Option

The really distinct advantage of TIAA is its immediate vesting and complete portability. As TIAA is by far the most widespread retirement plan at American colleges and universities, a faculty member can readily move about in his academic career without adverse effect on the retirement security of himself and his family.

The improved mobility offered by the TIAA plan is important to both the University and the faculty. The vitality of an academic program is dependent on the introduction of new, fresh ideas through new
faculty. For the faculty member, opportunities for advancement, especially into administrative positions, are relatively limited within any single institution. Furthermore, the professional development of the faculty member also depends on interaction with other professionals in his field. While many avenues exist for this (such as sabbaticals), job changes are one of the more important.

The disincentive to change jobs which is given by the lack of portability in the SCRS system is sometimes regarded as an advantage to the institution in that it may help to retain good faculty. However, it will likewise retain faculty who are not so good, or who are unhappy at Clemson and thus not performing at their best capability but who feel "locked in" by the retirement system. Indeed, it can be argued that the exceptionally good faculty member who finds opportunity elsewhere can often negotiate a sufficient salary increase to enable him to disregard the SCRS pension forfeited, while the relatively poorer faculty member cannot and thus remains. Thus, the lack of portability inherent in the SCRS system may act so as to decrease the overall quality of the faculty.

In recruiting of new faculty, especially of experienced individuals for administrative positions or special professorships (endowed chairs, for example), the availability of TIAA would be a strong positive feature for the University. Faculty elsewhere are familiar with TIAA, and are likely to have their retirement account with TIAA. The ability to continue with this plan would be attractive to most such individuals. While younger faculty candidates may be less concerned with retirement, the assurance that they would have the opportunity to retain their accumulated pension fund if they should leave Clemson before retirement would again be an attractive feature.

On the other hand, of course, the assured benefits offered by the SCRS would be an attraction to other individuals coming to Clemson with no thought of leaving before retirement. As pointed out above, in highly inflationary times the SCRS pension levels will keep pace with inflation, while TIAA involves some degree of uncertainty in this matter. The ability to offer both options thus would put the University in a distinctly advantageous recruiting position relative to institutions with but one option.

V. COST TO THE UNIVERSITY

The comparisons presented above assume the same contributions currently made to SCRS by both the individual and the University would also be made to a TIAA optional plan. While dealing with two optional plans rather than a single mandatory retirement plan would certainly increase the administrative overhead, this should be a minimal expense. Thus, the additional cost to the University of offering the TIAA optional plan is expected to be negligible.
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Summary

In its role as South Carolina's land grant institution, Clemson University consistently attracts the best students in the state. In South Carolina, as elsewhere throughout the country, the best students place quality education above all other considerations. In order to maintain and improve the quality of the University's programs it is necessary to retain the expertise of senior faculty and to attract young faculty of high potential.

At present, the quality of Clemson's programs is threatened due to the marked deficiency in faculty compensation relative to comparable institutions in neighboring states. This deficiency, if allowed to continue, must increasingly impair the Institution's ability to acquire and keep highly qualified faculty members and to maintain the standards of its programs. As a consequence, and because competition among universities for the best students is increasing, Clemson's public commitments will inevitably suffer.

As a first step in correcting the deficiency in faculty compensation the University should move to raise the average compensation at each rank to at least the average of the peer institutions as defined in this report. This initial step should be completed in the next two academic years.
I

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation has fully considered the questions raised in the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee's March 18, 1978 report on faculty compensation at Clemson. The results of our consideration support the preliminary report of the Welfare Committee, whose main thrust was that Clemson University faculty are significantly under-compensated at all academic ranks except Instructor in comparison with faculty at peer institutions --- an undercompensation which has persisted over a period of several years.

Accordingly, we recommend:

(1) that the average compensation of Clemson faculty at each rank be brought up to the average level at peer institutions, defined as:
The University of South Carolina, Columbia; North Carolina State University, Raleigh; The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; The University of Georgia, Athens; Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta; The University of Florida, Gainesville; Florida State University, Tallahassee; Auburn University, Auburn; The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; The University of Tennessee, Knoxville; The University of Virginia, Charlottesville; Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg; The University of Maryland, College Park:

(2) that the program to establish parity with the peer institutions be effected in the academic years 1979-80 and 1980-81:

(3) that a progress report on this program be made annually to the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee by the Administration:

(4) that after completion of this program an annual report on compensation at Clemson and its peers be made by the Administration to the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee.
The basis for our study was the data on faculty compensation (salary plus fringe benefits) compiled by the American Association of University Professors and reported annually in The A.A.U.P. Bulletin. Data for the period 1970-71 through 1977-78 were examined. By analyzing such an extended period transient effects on compensation differentials were shown to be unimportant.

A total of thirteen universities comprise the peer group established by the Committee. All are: (1) Category I institutions (a classification made by the A.A.U.P. on the basis of graduate programs in existence); (2) state supported; (3) in Southeastern states.

Comparison of compensation relative to the defined peer group at the various ranks are presented in Table I. It can be seen that the most significant undercompensation at Clemson occurs at the full professor rank. Table II further emphasizes this point by comparing the average increment in compensation accorded full professors relative to associate professors at Clemson and in the peer group. Finally, for reference, Table III presents a comparison of compensation at each rank for Clemson relative to the national average of Category I institutions.

It is of the utmost importance to recognize that full professors at Clemson, as at any reputable university, are expected to be individuals "who have demonstrated outstanding performance in their respective fields" and, in addition, who possess "the terminal degree" and have "at least nine years of relevant experience" (Manual for Faculty Members, Clemson University, 1976; p. 47). Many years of professional training and demonstrated expertise in scholarship, teaching and research are routine requirements for elevation to the rank of full professor. These achievements imply a strong commitment on the part of faculty to higher education, to the university and to the search for knowledge. Simultaneously, a full professor is expected to exercise leadership within the university community and to exert himself courageously
on behalf of the university. To a considerable extent, allowing for differences in professional experience and accomplishment, these remarks describe associate professors. Table II offers evidence that the importance of senior faculty is much more fully recognized at its peer institutions that at Clemson. By comparison, Clemson University's senior faculty—the very faculty on whom much of the Institution's quality, reputation and prestige depend, those whose professional commitment has been most extensive and extended, those who by attainment, performance and seniority merit appropriate compensation—have been and are inadequately recognized.

The effect of inordinately low relative compensation, such as is received by Clemson faculty, is insidious and pervasive. The results can manifest themselves in several ways. New junior faculty are keenly aware that the salary range of senior faculty ranks is ultimately of more importance to them than their starting salaries. They may use a low paying institution as a "training camp", remaining uncommitted to the institution and departing at the first opportunity. At the senior levels the likelihood that highly qualified and accomplished individuals will go where their professional capabilities are better recognized and utilized is enhanced. Many of those who remain, in order to supplement their income, may devote less than full attention to their professional duties. The end result can be an overabundance of uncommitted, minimally qualified faculty members. If such a collection predominates it does not constitute a University.

Like the above economic model, the "Ideal of the University" is relevant to the issue of faculty compensation at all levels. It is one to which all who have knowledge of the history and tradition of higher education must respond. The business of The University is Education in the broadest sense of the creation, conservation and dissemination of knowledge---but The University is not a business. Faculty members are not standardly trained, equally qualified, readily replaceable workers. They are professionals—in their commitments to their disciplines and their institutions, and in their education, authority, responsibility and activities.
They are chosen by their professional peers for their abilities and capabilities, demonstrated and potential, to contribute to the sum which is The University. Clemson University--the Clemson that functions in part through tradition--through the perceptions of alumni, students, friends, and citizens of South Carolina and the nation--is a recognizable, respected and valued entity. Whether it can remain so is the question we address.

In sum, what the Committee has found is that the Faculty of Clemson University, dedicated to serving the needs of a developing state, is and has been under-compensated. Whether such a University can continue to exist and meet the needs of its constituency with such under compensation is doubtful. Clemson faculty see the incomes on which they and their families depend falling significantly below those for peer institutions at the same time academic salaries are decreasing relative to those of the other segments of our society. The cost to morale and, consequently, to program effectiveness, is becoming increasingly substantial. The danger is clear and present: the gains made by South Carolina and Clemson University over the past ten to fifteen years risk being lost or appreciably eroded unless a program to remedy the under-compensation of the Clemson Faculty is quickly effected.

Respectfully Submitted,

Philip B. Burt, Chairperson
Theodore Adkins, Jr.
Charles A. Grubb
Stephen S. Melsheimer
Roger B. Rollin
E. P. Stillwell, Jr.
Samuel G. Turnipseed
# TABLE I
Relative Compensation of Clemson Faculty
(Clemson - Average of Peers)/Clemson (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1970-71</th>
<th>71-72</th>
<th>72-73</th>
<th>73-74</th>
<th>74-75</th>
<th>75-76</th>
<th>76-77</th>
<th>77-78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>-13.8</td>
<td>-15.6</td>
<td>-14.1</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>-10.1</td>
<td>-13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't. Prof.</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Table II
Relative Compensation of Full Professors and Associate Professors
(Professor - Associate Professor)/Professor (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peer</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Table III
Relative Compensation of Clemson Faculty
(Clemson - National Average)/Clemson (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>1970-71</th>
<th>71-72</th>
<th>72-73</th>
<th>73-74</th>
<th>74-75</th>
<th>75-76</th>
<th>76-77</th>
<th>77-78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assoc.</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass't.</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT C

Rebuttal to Comments on Faculty Senate Report on Status of Academic Year Faculty Employed in Summer

1. It is certainly true "that the University may agree with faculty that they could carry out in a manner that is mutually agreeable such functions as teaching, research, or extension, or other duties --" in the summer period. The issue is precisely the nature of such agreements, and whether the University will provide professional conditions of employment in the summer. Summer faculty are continuing employees (their salary is based on their academic year salary for example, and they are required to participate in the South Carolina Retirement System while temporary employees (under four months) are excluded from the SCRS) and this status should be reflected in all aspects of employment conditions.

2. Employment agreements would serve to protect the rights of the faculty to fringe benefits (such as sick leave) due by virtue of state employment. The Faculty Senate proposal specifically states that the agreements would be consummated at a mutually agreeable time. In some instances where the University desires to ensure the services of a faculty member (such as to conduct contract research) it would presumably offer to execute the agreement early in the academic year. Where uncertainties regarding the need for a faculty member's services exist, the agreement would be executed later. Meanwhile, of course, the faculty member might be exploring other opportunities. In any event, escape clauses permitting the University or the faculty member to abrogate the agreement for valid reasons and with reasonable notice would logically be incorporated in any summer employment agreement.

3. During the academic year the maximum teaching load is generally deemed to be four courses per semester. A faculty member is therefore paid 12 1/2% of his yearly salary for each course taught. During the summer a faculty member is paid 7 1/2% of his yearly salary for teaching a single course. Thus, the same course is taught during the summer at a 40% reduction in salary.

It has been suggested that the summer teaching faculty do not have the additional responsibilities that the academic year faculty have, such as advising students and committee assignments, and that this justifies a lower salary. We do not believe this is the case. Many faculty continue to advise students and to keep up with departmental and college responsibilities whether or not they are employed by the University during the summer. However, let us concede that the extra activities are less during the summer than during the academic year and let us then assume that the extra academic year activities are equivalent to one extra course each semester. This then brings the academic year work load to an equivalent 5 courses per semester. A faculty member is thus paid 10% of his academic year salary to teach a single course in the academic year and 7 1/2% of his academic year salary to teach the same course during the summer. The result is a reduction of 25% in salary for the same effort. It is therefore clear that summer teaching faculty are being paid 25% to 40% less to teach in the summer sessions.
As to the number of "free days" available to the teaching faculty during the summer, inspection of the 1978 Summer Calendar indicates that there are 5 net free days between May 16 and August 15 (not 12), a number that is quite consistent with the 4 1/2 or 7 1/2 days of Annual Leave earned by calendar year employees during the summer. It is also consistent with the number of "free days" available to the academic faculty during the academic year.

4. The right to use sick leave when legitimately ill is earned by the employee; written summer employment agreements would protect this right fully as applied to summer employment.

5. Clearly, the current policy is that summer faculty do not earn "annual leave." In fact the Faculty Senate proposal did not use the term "annual leave" in reference to summer faculty. Academic year employees receive a reasonable and equitable amount of leave time during the academic year in comparison to that earned by calendar year employees during the academic year. The same principle should apply in the summer. Summer teaching faculty do have an equitable number of "days off" in the summer, and summer research faculty should likewise receive paid vacation time comparable to the annual leave earned by calendar year employees during the summer period.
ATTACHMENT D

Rebuttal to Comments on
Faculty Senate Policy Statement on
Summer Employment of Academic Faculty

1. While committee and council work and other peripheral academic activities may be somewhat reduced during the summer, the reduced number of faculty available ensures that the summer faculty do have a substantial burden in this area. No Faculty Activities Analysis has been conducted for the summer. Indeed course and curriculum development often proceeds a greater pace during the summer than during the academic year. Further, the level of teaching effort required for full pay is substantially higher than during the academic year (essentially a full semester's teaching load during a three month period). While the mix of teaching, research, and extension duties may change for a particular faculty member, the duties and level of effort are not reduced.

2. True in most respects.

3. Just as a 9-month faculty member is entitled to sick leave in the academic year even if the illness commences during the summer, the summer faculty employee should be entitled to use his accumulated sick leave for any definitely scheduled period of summer employment.

4. Summer school teachers do receive an equitable number of vacation days (5, not 12, in 1978) but are presently penalized in pay for this "privilege." Summer faculty employed in research do not receive any vacation days except by taking days off without pay. In both cases equity demands a number of paid vacation days consistent with the leave earned by calendar year employees during the summer. "Nine month appointees are not eligible to receive annual leave" simply states current policy, and does not justify the failure to provide the paid vacation time which is part of any professional employment conditions.
MEMORANDUM TO: Dean Victor Hurst  
FROM: Faculty Senate  
DATE: 2-20-79  
RE: Administrative Positions in the Academic Area for Which Search Committees Are Appropriate

In reviewing your letter of October 2, 1978 we concur that those positions listed are appropriate to search committee procedures described on pages 49 and 50 of the Faculty Manual with the following exception:

The Assistant-to-the-Dean in the College of Architecture should be listed since it is understood that he/she has faculty and budgetary line responsibility (see page 12 of Faculty Manual.)

By dissemination of this listing all of us should avoid any future questions about the appropriateness of a search committee for a particular position.

In our discussions it has been pointed out that some question may exist as to which of the policy statements on pages 49 and 50 apply to positions titled other than as specifically delineated in paragraphs 1 thru 5 of the procedures. Accordingly we would appreciate your notifying the deans of the appropriate procedure when you send them their listing of germane positions. For example, the College of Agriculture and the Library have several titles not specifically covered in paragraphs 1 thru 5, whereas all of the College of Engineering's positions are covered. Therefore a bit of clarification might be appropriate. As a suggestion, we have attached a listing to this memo with the appropriate procedure (from our perspective) indicated by those positions not otherwise obvious.

It is felt that a memo from you to the Deans of the Colleges delineating appropriate search committee positions would resolve any ambiguities that might exist and there would be no need to attempt to make the present Faculty Manual statement any more specific.

Thank you for this clarification.
ATTACHMENT E (cont.)

College of Agricultural Sciences

Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences
Associate Dean and Director of Instruction
Associate Dean and Director of Extension
Associate Director of Extension
District Extension Leader, Piedmont ------------------ Proc. #3
District Extension Leader, Savannah River Valley ------------------ Proc. #3
District Extension Leader, Pee Dee ------------------ Proc. #3
State Leader, Extension Home Economics
Associate District Leader, Home Economics, Piedmont
Associate District Leader, Home Economics, Savannah
Associate District Leader, Home Economics, Pee Dee
State Leader, 4H Club Work and Youth Development
Associate Dean and Director of Research
Associate Director of Research
Superintendent, Edisto Station
Superintendent, Pee Dee Station
Superintendent, Sandhill Station
Superintendent, Truck Station
Head, Dept. of Ag. Econ. & Rural Sociology
Head, Dept. of Agr. Engineering
Head, Dept. of Agronomy & Soils
Head, Dept. of Animal Science
Head, Dept. of Dairy Science
Head, Dept. of Entomology & Economic Zoology
Head, Dept. of Food Science
Head, Dept. of Horticulture
Head, Dept. of Plant Pathology & Physiology
Head, Dept. of Poultry Science

College of Architecture

Dean of the College of Architecture
Head, Department of Architectural Studies
Head, Department of History & Visual Studies
Head, Department of Planning Studies

College of Education

Dean of the College of Education
Head, Department of Agricultural Education
Head, Department of Elementary & Secondary Education
Head, Department of Industrial Education
Director, Vocational Education Media Center
ATTACHMENT E (cont.)

College of Engineering

Dean of the College of Engineering
Associate Dean of the College of Engineering
Head, Department of Ceramic Engineering
Head, Department of Chemical Engineering
Head, Department of Civil Engineering
Head, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Head, Department of Environmental Systems Engineering
Head, Department of Engineering Technology
Head, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Head, Department of Interdisciplinary Studies

College of Forest & Recreation Resources

Dean of the College of Forest & Recreation Resources
Head, Department of Forestry
Director of Baruch Institute of Forest Science
Associate Dean & Head, Dept. of Recreation & Park Administration

College of Industrial Management and Textile Science

Dean of the College of Industrial Management and Textile Science
Associate Dean of the College of Industrial Management & Textile Science
Head, Department of Accounting and Finance
Head, Department of Industrial Management
Head, Department of Textiles
Head, Department of Economics
Director, Professional Development

College of Liberal Arts

Dean of the College of Liberal Arts
Head, Department of English
Head, Department of History
Head, Department of Languages
Head, Department of Music
Head, Department of Political Science
Head, Department of Psychology
Head, Department of Sociology

College of Nursing

Dean of the College of Nursing
Director, Baccalaureate Degree Program
Director, Associate Degree Program
Director, Continuing Education in Nursing
Director, Graduate Program in Nursing
ATTACHMENT E (cont.)

College of Sciences

Dean of the College of Sciences
Head, Department of Biochemistry
Head, Department of Botany
Head, Department of Chemistry and Geology
Head, Department of Mathematical Sciences
Associate Head, Department of Mathematical Sciences
Head, Department of Microbiology
Head, Department of Physics & Astronomy
Head, Department of Zoology
Head, Department of Computer Science

Office of Undergraduate Studies

Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Director of the Library
Associate Director of the Library

Office of Graduate Studies and University Research

Dean of Graduate Studies and University Research
Associate Dean of Graduate Studies
Associate Dean of University Research

Office of University Extension

Dean of University Extension
January 27, 1979

Dr. William F. Steirer  
President  
Faculty Senate  
Clemson University

Dear Bill:

I am in receipt of your letter of January 23 concerning the Alumni Merit Scholars program. I relayed your message to the Council at its meeting today.

The Association is looking forward to continued cooperation in building more programs like this in the future. At our annual meeting today the Council doubled the grant to provide for another 20 Alumni Merit Scholars for 1979.

Let me also say that it was an honor and a pleasure to work with you and the others on the Presidential Selection Committee as we sought the best qualified persons to be candidates for President of Clemson University.

Sincerely,

Davis T. Moorhead

DTM:rs
Dr. William F. Steirer, President  
Faculty Senate  
Hardin Hall  
Clemson University  

Dear Bill:  

Your letter of January 23, 1979 with its kind words, was warmly received. We are extremely pleased that we were able to assist in the establishment of this very fine scholarship program.

Perhaps with a Faculty Senate endorsement, annual contributions will be increased to the point that the number of scholarships awarded annually can be increased. We look forward to the time when a Faculty-Staff Merit Scholarship recipient will be in each class level.

I have taken the liberty of sending a copy of your letter to the persons shown below to receive copies of this letter. They were also instrumental in either the establishment of administration of this scholarship.

Please convey my appreciation to the Faculty Senate for their support of this scholarship and for their continuing efforts to increase the level of giving from the faculty.

I would ask that current gifts to support the Faculty-Staff Merit Scholarship be made payable to Clemson University rather than the Clemson University Foundation. If the faculty decide to endow the scholarships, then the gifts which would set up the principal would be made payable to the Clemson University Foundation. We use this procedure to assure that only endowment gifts are placed in the Foundation.

Sincerely yours,

James L. Strom, Ph.D.  
Director  
Planning and Corporate Relations

JLS:cs  
xc: Mr. Stanley G. Nicholas  
Mr. Marvin G. Carmichael  
Mr. Trescott N. Hinton  
Dr. Corinne H. Sawyer
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

March 27, 1979

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by President Steirer at 3:35 p.m. President Steirer introduced Mr. Jim Stovall, the new Editor of the Tiger.

2. Approval of Minutes

Senator Burt requested that the complete reports of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation and the Subcommittee on Retirement be included in the February 20 minutes. This was approved by unanimous vote. The minutes of the February 20 meeting were approved with minor corrections.

3. Special Request

President Steirer introduced Mr. John B. Gentry, retired Clemson University Personnel Director, who addressed the Senate on a serious flaw in the S. C. Retirement System, e.g.: Section 9-1-1660. Nominee on member's death may receive monthly allowance instead of accumulated contributions. This section allows beneficiary to receive a lifetime monthly annuity only if death occurs after he/she has either retired with disability for 30 days, is over 65, had more than 30 years of creditable service, or a combination of 60 years of age or older with 20 years of service.

Mr. Gentry is requesting that we support the campaign to amend Section 9-1-1660 so as to correct this omission among the many benefits provided members of the SCRS. His position is that the situation can be corrected without an additional dollar of appropriated funds. He is appealing for a remedy of a critical hardship which occasionally affects, without warning, a small portion of "the State employee family."

This hardship occurs when an employee dies in active service after completing 15 to 29 years of service, but before the attainment of age 60 or the completion of 30 years of service. Although State law provides, after completion of 15 years of creditable service for vesting of employee contributions plus the employer's matching contributions to provide a Deferred Annuity at age 60, no similar protection is provided the employee who continues State service and dies before age 60. (It is distressing to note that once vested the employee is protected even though he/she may have left S.C. employment, but no similar protection is provided the family of the faithful employee who remains in South Carolina and continues State service.)

Mr. Gentry's appeal is that we support a simple amendment which would protect the families of employees who die "after completing 15 years of service regardless of age with a lifetime annuity under Option 2 to the surviving beneficiary."
4. Committee Reports

   a. Admissions and Scholarship - Senator Edie, Chairman, stated that his committee had no report, but would be presenting resolutions under new business.

   b. Policy Committee - No report.

   c. Research Committee - Senator Fennell, Chairman, reported that the following areas of concern have been discussed by the committee and deserve further consideration: University assistance in the attainment of research grants; graduate student support; current tenure policy and its relation to the hiring of distinguished professors; the role and function of the University Research Council.

   d. Welfare Committee - Senator Burt had no report but did express appreciation to the Tiger for its reporting on and support of the ad hoc committee on Faculty Compensation.

   e. Ad Hoc Committee - No reports.

   f. University Councils and Committees - It was requested that the representative on the Graduate Council report on the study of the use of 600-level courses for a graduate student's plan of study. Senator Edie informed the group that he was not on the committee that was conducting the study, but Senator Howard had attended a Graduate Council Meeting and was able to explain as follows: The resolution forbade the use of a 600 course on GS2 form if the companion 400-level course was required for graduation at the Bachelor's level. (The Council of Deans formed a subcommittee consisting of Anderson, Box, Trevillian, and Vogel to study this problem, but they have as yet not reported back.) The resolution did pass the Graduate Council in February. Further comments indicated that there are additional requirements for 600-level courses, but how do you force the instructor to enforce them? There is a movement underway to eliminate 300-600 level courses.

   The ad hoc committee monitoring the Faculty Evaluation System meets April 9 to end its business.

5. President's Report

   a. Dean Hurst will make no further reply to the Faculty Senate statements on Summer Employment.

   b. Action on other Senate resolutions is as follows:

      FS-79-2-1 -- The Class Withdrawal Policy has been submitted to the Undergraduate Council;

      FS-79-2-2 -- Resolution on Proposed Amendments to State Employment Grievance Procedure. Clemson's administration did not support the action that was taken by the Council of Presidents. Dean Hurst's personal recommendation was to oppose it strongly;
FS-79-2-3 -- Resolution to Accept the Welfare Committee's Report and Recommendations for Optional Retirement Plans in lieu of SCRS. If the Senate desires, the administration will provide a formal statement of support for the optional retirement plans. Purvis Collins opposes it strongly arguing that, because many other groups among the 52,000 state employees have optional plans that they could participate in, to validate one would establish a precedent that would fragment the system;

FS-79-2-4 -- Resolution Concerning Changes in the S. C. Retirement. The best way to achieve these changes would be to include them in a list of priorities to place before the new President. Incidentally, Purvis Collins believes that the provision to vest individuals after five years of service will probably be enacted this year;

FS-79-2-6 -- Resolution on Faculty Compensation. Vice President Melvin Barnette is doing his own peer group study so that he can ask for a one-shot sum of money to bring Clemson faculty salaries up to parity with that peer group. The administration is committed to remedying the situation;

FS-79-2-8 -- Resolution on the Provision of Towels and Soap for Laboratories. The Physical Plant says this cannot be changed.

c. Dean Hurst asks what the Senate would like him to do on the matter of distributing the first semester grade reports for faculty. He will do whatever the Senate desires. So, under Old Business, I will ask you to decide what you want to do.

d. The one item of importance from the Athletic Council is a change that will help faculty members in the distribution of bowl tickets. Distribution of bowl tickets to faculty will be based on years of service to the University. Therefore, a faculty member with 15 years of service will have a higher priority than one with just one year of service.

FS-79-2-6 was discussed and it was pointed out that approximately 1.4 million dollars was being requested to bring us up to parity with the peer group. Mr. Darrell Hickman, Asst. Vice President of Budgets and Systems, has agreed to come and address the Senate on the matter of the programatic five-year plan. Senator Worm moved that Mr. Hickman be invited to address the Senate at the April meeting, Senator Young seconded, and the motion was unanimously passed by voice vote.

Senator Burt moved that the Faculty Senate request a formal statement of support of FS-79-2-3. The motion was seconded by Senator Lambert and was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Senator Hood asked about FS-79-2-7 -- The Resolution on Student Liability Insurance Coverage. President Steirer reported that there was no response on this resolution.
In response to Senator Hood's question on FS-79-2-8 -- President Steirer stated that this is the way it will be and that there will be no promise of change.

Ray Thompson, Personnel Director, is on the committee to study optional retirement plans referred to in FS-79-2-3.

6. Old Business -
   a. President Steirer asked the Senate for instructions on item "c" in the President's Report. Does the Senate object to the distribution of grade reports? Senator Coulter objected and expressed the same sentiments as before that these reports give a false impression of grades given. No Senator who voted to distribute the grades moved for reconsideration of the motion; therefore, the Senate in effect reaffirmed the previous motion that the grades be distributed.

7. New Business

   The following officers were elected:

   President: H. W. Fleming
   Vice-President: C. S. Thompson
   Secretary: E. M. Coulter

b. FS-79-3-1 -- Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Priorities. By letter dated March 13, 1979, Senator Baron recommended that the Faculty Senate advise the President to organize an Ad Hoc Committee for the purpose of preparing a Faculty Senate Position Paper.

"In July, Dr. William Atchley will begin his tenure as President of Clemson University. He will undoubtedly be asked by numerous individuals and organizations to make decisions pertaining to the administration of the University. He will be establishing his priorities.

"In order to ensure that the concerns and interests of the Clemson University Faculty are brought to President Atchley's attention and given appropriate priority, I would like to recommend that the Faculty Senate prepare a position paper listing those items which are of greatest concern to the Faculty. The position paper would be presented to Dr. Atchley immediately upon his taking office.

"We recommend therefore that the President of the Senate immediately appoint an ad hoc committee to draft a document for the Senate's approval. It is suggested that the ad hoc committee be instructed to prepare a brief statement listing not more than six items of concern. The list should include items pertaining to the welfare of the faculty, the administration of the university and academic affairs. The paper should avoid taking a position on items which might be considered controversial by the Senate. Such items should simply be listed for Dr. Atchley's attention. The committee should be advised that it must present a draft to the Senate by the May meeting."
"Therefore, be it resolved, that the President of the Senate immediately form an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee to prepare a Faculty Senate position paper, for presentation to Dr. W. Atchley upon his taking office as President of Clemson University."

Senator Edie moved acceptance and Senator Addison seconded.

Senator Dan Smith moved to table until the April meeting because Senator Baron is absent and should be present to discuss the proposal. The motion to table was seconded by Senator Hood. There was some opposition to tabling, Senator Smith withdrew the motion, and Senator Hood agreed.

Senator Bill Smith moved to amend so that the ad hoc committee would be an ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee which would be composed of a representative from each College. Vice President Dickey seconded and Senator Coulter moved the question. The vote to amend the motion was unanimous.

Discussion on the main motion including the amendment brought out the following points: Senator Grubb asked why there was a limit of six items; Senator Coulter stated that it suggested not more than six; Senator Lambert pointed out that it is a suggestion and would not be law; Senator Whitten suggested that the number of items be left to the discretion of the Committee.

The motion to approve FS-79-3-1 as amended passed unanimously by voice vote.

c. Senator Baron in a communication dated March 12, 1979, submitted a recommendation for a Salutary Letter of Commendation to the President of the University.

"Last year President Edwards advised the Palmetto Golf Tournament officials that the Clemson University Golf Team could not compete in an event sponsored by a racially segregated organization. The action was taken without fanfare. The tournament committee was simply advised that by law Clemson University could not participate in any activity that was racially segregated. A recent newspaper article however, suggests that the President's response was meant to convey the message that the University had more than a legal responsibility in this matter. President Edwards took the position that this University had a moral responsibility not to participate in any segregated activity. It was a response worthy of an institution holding a position of leadership and trust within the State.

"We should therefore like to call upon the Faculty Senate to commend the President of the University for his actions in this matter. Further, we call upon the Senate to request, that the President of the Senate, prepare a salutary letter expressing our appreciation. We further request that the letter be made a part of the Senate's minutes, so that it might be given the widest possible public distribution through the Campus News."

Senator Burt moved that the recommendation be approved. The motion was seconded by Senator Lambert. The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.
d. FS-79-3-2 -- Establishment of Physical Plant Advisory Committee.

WHEREAS, the Physical Plant has the responsibility for janitorial service, maintenance, and repairs; and

WHEREAS, the function of faculty members at the departmental level is directly affected by policies and procedures of the Physical Plant, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that an Advisory Committee made up of one Department Head from each College (to be appointed annually by each College Dean) be established to advise the Physical Plant on matters relating to janitorial service, maintenance, repairs, and grounds upkeep.

Senator Hood moved acceptance and Vice President Dickey seconded. A discussion ensued whereby various complaints were aired: Utilization of kennel fences; utilization of jack hammers and lawnmowers during class periods with no advanced warning to departments.

The motion to accept the resolution passed by voice vote but was not unanimous.

e. FS-79-3-3 -- Retention of present seat assignments.

WHEREAS, Faculty and staff who annually purchase season football tickets have been allowed the option of retaining their seat assignments from year to year; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests the Athletic Department to continue to allow faculty and staff the option of retaining their present seat assignments.

Senator Hood moved acceptance and Senator Dan Smith seconded. During the discussion the question was asked "What does it mean?" Senator Hood responded that he does not want to be moved out of his seat. President Steirer stated that he does not know of any plans to move Faculty/Staff and that it is his understanding that they will have the right to move to the new section if they wish, but they will not be obliged to move. However, the resolution should clarify the situation.

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

f. FS-79-3-4 -- Resolution on Reexaminations.

WHEREAS the original reasons for institution of the policies allowing reexaminations for deficient grade point ratio and for an F received the last semester of the senior year no longer exist.

BE IT, THEREFORE, RESOLVED that the practice of reexamination for an F received the last semester of the senior year and reexamination for deficient grade point ratio (as described in paragraphs 4 through 7 of page 48 of Clemson University Announcements 1978/1979) be abolished.
The motion to approve the resolution was made by Senator Edie and seconded by Senator Grubb. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

g. FS-79-3-5 -- Resolution on Academic Misconduct.

WHEREAS Clemson University's Student Handbook lacks a philosophical statement on academic honesty and does not specify with exactness all cases of academic dishonesty which might occur, and

WHEREAS Clemson's present method of dealing with cases of academic misconduct puts the burden of investigating, prosecuting and punishing solely on the faculty member who suspects or detects cheating, meaning that numerous incidents of academic misconduct go unreported --

BE IT, THEREFORE, RESOLVED THAT:

(1) the publishers of the Student Handbook consider including a philosophical statement on the matter of academic honesty as it relates or pertains to the ideals of the University;

(2) the Student Handbook give a more detailed and comprehensive account of actions that may be considered academically dishonest;

(3) the proper agencies within the University establish a judiciary committee whose function shall be to investigate, prosecute, and pass sentence or recommendations on cases of academic dishonesty.

The motion to approve the resolution was made by Senator Edie and seconded by Senator Bill Smith. After a spirited discussion during which several controversial items were brought out, the motion to table was made by Senator Burt and seconded by Senator Snipes. The vote in favor of tabling was unanimous.

h. FS-79-3-6 -- Resolution on University Admission.

WHEREAS Clemson University presently lacks a written, formal policy of admissions, and

WHEREAS there is currently some confusion and annoyance concerning the University's admission policy, caused particularly by the early cut-off date for application and the importance the University evidently places on a non-academic criteria, dormitory space, and

WHEREAS admission to the University is and will continue to be competitive and in order to maintain the University's high standards,

BE IT, THEREFORE, RESOLVED THAT:

(1) a formal policy of admission be established, based on academic considerations rather than dormitory space. This policy should be in writing and made known to all applicants, the faculty, and the general public, and it should be included in the Bulletin. This policy should be reviewed and revised as needed by appropriate faculty and administrative groups.
(2) the Registrar and Office of Admissions henceforth come under the Dean of the University, indicating thereby the academic nature of their responsibility.

(3) the faculty should play a part in the admissions procedure. For this purpose a permanent University committee on admissions should be established to advise the Registrar in matters of policy, or this function could be assumed by the Undergraduate Council.

(4) the Registrar should present to the faculty long-range goals to improve admissions standards.

Senator Edie moved that the resolution be approved. Senator Snipes seconded. During the discussion it was pointed out that at the present time there is no review by either Faculty or Administration, rather admission is predicated on dorm space; the Registrar and Admission offices should be under the Dean of the University; the Faculty should play a part in formulating admissions policy; the Registrar should present long-range goals in admission policy. Senator Burt expressed the opinion that this responsibility of admission should be under the Admissions and Scholarship Committee of the Senate; whereas, Senator Edie disagrees and stated that it should be under the auspices of the Undergraduate Council. Senator Howard expressed the opinion that this was part of a piece meal approach toward effecting the new constitution; he is concerned with long range admission and questions the adviseability of attracting only the elite; there is no known method of determining who will be successful in a university; the best we have is SAT and class position. The consensus was that the Senate needs to participate by having some group work with the Registrar's office and really have some input. Senator Snipes moved the question, and the motion passed by voice vote, but not unanimously.

i. FS-79-3-7 -- Faculty Compensation to Minimize Losses Due to Inflation.

WHEREAS, the rate of inflation continues to erode real faculty income appreciably,

BE IT RESOLVED. the Senate urges the administration to put first priority this year on insuring that the Faculty does not sustain real salary losses due to inflation.

Senator Burt moved that the motion be approved, and Senator Lambert seconded. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

8. Other New Business

Senator Hood requested that President Steirer ask what the current policy is on official travel outside the United States to attend professional meetings (particularly Canada and Mexico). President Steirer will attempt to obtain an answer to this question.
9. The meeting adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

T. R. Adkins, Jr.
Secretary

Senators Absent:

Agricultural Sciences
S. G. Turnipseed

Education
W. E. West (Substitute present)

Engineering
J. L. Prince
W. Baron
J. C. Hester
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
April 17, 1979

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by President Steirer at 3:33 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes
President Steirer noted that Mr. Darrell Hickman would address the Senate on the subject of the University Five-Year Program Plan instead of the peer group parity budgeting study as indicated on page 3, paragraph 7, of the Minutes. Senator Adkins, outgoing secretary, noted that Mr. John Gentry had offered approximately twelve minor corrections to item three on the first page of the Minutes which described his presentation to the Senate on March 27th. The Senate unanimously approved the changes to be made at Senator Adkins discretion. The corrected Minutes were then unanimously approved.

3. Old President's Report; as follows by President Steirer:

1. In this, my last report to the Senate, I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation to the members of the Senate for their support and encouragement during the past year. It goes without saying that only such support enables the Senate to achieve any degree of success. We have achieved some successes; the credit is yours.

2. On FS-79-2-7 on Student Liability Insurance, John C. Newton, Director of Auxiliary Services, submits the following information:
   a. Students whose parents have a Homeowner's Policy or a Comprehensive Personal Liability Policy are "insured" under those policies up to the limits of those policies;
   b. Part-time and student employees are covered by the University's tort liability policy and students are covered by the University's automobile liability policy when driving a University car on official business;
   c. The state law authorizing tort liability coverage for employees of state agencies does not provide for coverage of students;
   d. If coverage could be authorized, the increase in the University premium would be approximately $75,000 per year at current rates.

3. a. FS-79-3-2, Establishment of Physical Plant Advisory Committee: Vice President Barnette would like a blueprint describing what is being asked for.

   b. FS-79-3-3, Retention of Present Seat Assignments: The option of retaining their present seat assignments will continue to be extended to faculty and staff.

   c. FS-79-3-4, Resolution on Reexaminations: This resolution is now before the Undergraduate Council.
d. FS-79-3-6, Resolution on University Admissions: All the Faculty Senators have received all the information available on admissions, including the 1961 admissions statement. You are asked to look at that material and respond to it in some way.

e. FS-79-3-7, Faculty Compensation to Minimize Losses Due to Inflation: It may be premature to talk in these terms since the Senate has a committee recently constituted to establish priorities for the administration.

f. The current policy on official travel outside the United States to attend professional meetings is simple. No state funds can be used for such travel except to Canada. Why the Budget and Control Board draws a distinction between Canada and Mexico, e.g., is not known.

4. Issues that I had hoped would be resolved in this past year include the Revised Faculty Constitution, the Copyright Policy, the Class Withdrawal Policy, a 2.0 GPR in major area required by graduation, and a more liberal policy on public statements by faculty members. I wish you luck and success in resolving these matters.

5. Faculty Senate Resolution Scoreboard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Adopted/Accepted</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>Under Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77-9-1 Payroll Deduction for Contributions to Alumni &amp; University Funds</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-2-2 Affirmative Action Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-2-3 Plus and Minus Final Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-2-4 Athletic Ticket Priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-2-5 IPTAY Support of Academic Excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-3-1 on Athletic Ticket Priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-3-2 East Campus Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-3-5 Copyright Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-4-1 Faculty Compensation</td>
<td>Report Adopted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-4-2 Group Life Insurance Option</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-4-3 Summer Employment of Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Adopted/Accepted</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Under Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-4-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (Internally)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-4-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (Internally)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-5-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (Internally)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-5-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (Internally)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-6-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (Internally)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-9-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-9-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-9-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-9-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-9-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-9-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-9-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-9-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-9-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (Internally)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-9-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (Internally)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Adopted/Accepted</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Under Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-10-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-11-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-1-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-2-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-2-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-2-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-2-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-2-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-2-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-2-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-3-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X (Internally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-3-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-3-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-3-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-3-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted/Under Resolution:
- Thesis Research in College of Agricultural Sciences
- Reexamination for Graduating Seniors
- on Consulting Policy
- on Being Informed of Professional Test Scores
- Class Withdrawal Policy
- Proposed Amendments to State Employment Grievance Procedure
- Optional Retirement Plans
- Changes in S. C. Retirement
- on Summer Employment
- on Faculty Compensation
- Student Liability Insurance Coverage
- Provision of Towels & Soap for Labs
- Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Priorities
- Physical Plant Advisory Committee
- Retention of Present Seat Assignments
- Reexaminations
- University Admissions
- Faculty Compensation to Minimize Losses Due to Inflation
President Steirer added the following remarks:

A. With regard to Resolution 78-4-1, it was adopted by the Senate only.

B. There has been some difficulty getting the Copyright Policy out of the Legal Council's Office.

C. With regard to Resolution 78-9-2, there are no administrative objections; it has simply not yet been acted upon.

D. With regard to Resolution 78-9-4, the Honors Room has been approved but no room has yet been found.

E. With regard to Resolution 78-9-5, the Committee is still studying the aesthetic aspects of a crosswalk.

F. With regard to Resolution 79-2-1, the Graduate Council has been unable to agree.

G. With regard to Resolution 79-3-7, the resolution seems premature in view of the fact that the current budget is in its advanced stages. The effect of this resolution must await next year's budget.

Grade inflation has become a concern of the Administration. The Faculty Senate needs to consider what, if any, action might be taken to deal with the problem.

President Steirer was questioned about the R. C. Edwards Endowment Fund with regard to the origin of the 3% of salary "quota" for faculty members, and also whether there would be an accounting of who gave what to the fund. President Steirer answered that the 3% figure was suggested by the fund-raising organization, and that, while there would be a "percent of participation" statement, the distribution of that statement is unknown. He indicated that he saw no need for faculty concern here.

President Steirer was also questioned concerning the status of the special Committee on Governance Policy of the University and its impact on the proposed Faculty Constitution. Specifically, it was asked whether the Senate would receive a majority and minority report from the Committee. President Steirer indicated that he was somewhat disappointed with regard to the seemingly negative attitude taken by the Committee thusfar toward faculty participation, and that incoming President Fleming would see to the question of the distribution of any Committee reports.

President Steirer then turned the gavel over to incoming President Fleming.

President Fleming recognized Senator Hester, who presented President Steirer with a salutory proclamation attesting to his exemplary service to the faculty and to the University during an especially difficult year. The proclamation was signed by the members of the Senate, who gave President Steirer a standing ovation. Senator Hester then presented President Steirer an attache case as a gift from the Faculty Senate.

President Fleming introduced the new Vice President, Senator C. S. Thompson, and the new Secretary, Senator E. M. Coulter.
President Fleming then welcomed the new Senators to the organization.

4. **Special Guest**

Mr. Darrell Hickman, Assistant Vice President of Budgets and Systems addressed the Senate on the University Five-Year Program Plan. He was accompanied by Ms. Sandra J. Underwood, Research Analyst for Budgets and Systems. He discussed the origins of the Plan, noting that it was inspired by the Office of State Planning, an agency of the S.C. Budget and Control Board. He distributed excerpts from the Plan from the General Appropriation Bill now before the House of Representatives. He also made available to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate two complete copies of the Plan to be made available to any Senate member who wishes to review it. Mr. Hickman discussed the method by which the plan was compiled. This involved the solicitation of priority lists from the Colleges, which were analyzed by the administration for designation of critical areas of concern. This information was recycled to the Colleges thereby producing a final list of overall University priorities for the Five-Year Plan. These will be budgeted, as funds are available, over the five-year period. Mr. Hickman also discussed the House Budget Bill which calls for a 3.62% base pay increase, plus a $450 flat figure. He indicated that the proposal is provisional at this juncture, and that an average 2% merit pay increase was also possible. He noted the inflationary impact of mandated raises on student fees, expressing the desire of the administration to avoid an increase in student fees, nevertheless. In addition, Mr. Hickman made the following observations:

A. The present State budget formula for higher education is objectionable to Clemson, and it will not be followed this year, but a revised version may be followed in future years.

B. Clemson can expect no new faculty positions not already budgeted.

C. The reported 3.2 million dollar increase for Clemson's budget is illusory. After salary increases and other mandated increases, the real growth is approximately $300,000 which is half of the inflationary impact on operating funds (i.e. we have suffered a net loss of $300,000 in terms of performing at current level).

D. There was no attempt to predict new needs in the Five-Year Plan. It was based primarily on current assessments of priorities.

Mr. Hickman's remarks were interrupted several times with questions concerning whether department heads had consulted their faculties for input into the planning process (the answer was indeterminate); the accuracy of the projection of a 2% increase in staff and a 4% increase in expenditures (the answer was that this is a South Carolina budgeting norm); flexibility in the Plan (the answer was that there will be room for change, especially in view of the coming of a new President, but the University appears bound by the 1980-1981 planning projections which must be reflected in the budget submission of September, 1979); who the peer group universities were (the answer was Southeastern land-grant institutions); who will get the final report on the peer group salary study (the answer was that there will be certain restrictions on certain information due to commitments of confidentiality.
as between institutions supplying information, and general concern for the confidentiality of salaries. Vice President Barnette will probably determine the distribution of relevant information); why should the salaries of endowed chairs be omitted from the study (the answer was that they tend to skew the data with regard to comparing departments as between institutions because of idiocentric patterns of endowed chairs. NOTE: After spirited discussion of this point, Mr. Hickman indicated a willingness to reconsider this point); How will the information be used (the answer was that Mr. Hickman did not know); and finally, who will decide what salaries will be included and what salaries will be left out (the answer was that the study is still in the early stages and these things aren't decided as yet). Mr. Hickman concluded by expressing his confidence that the administration favored increasing faculty salaries, and he invited Senators to discuss these things with him informally at any time.

5. Committee Reports

A. Admissions and Scholarship - Senator Edie, Chairman, submitted the following final report, noting in addition that the definition of "major" study was complete and had been given to the President of the Senate.

This was both a busy and hopefully productive year for the committee. A number of areas were investigated and the following is a summary of the results:

1. Minimum Major G.P.R. for Graduation:

   This effort, initiated by the 1977-1978 Admissions and Scholarship Committee, was completed. All but three departments in the University responded with definitions of which courses constitute a "major" with their curriculum. Thus, since in fact nearly all departments can define their major courses one of the major arguments against establishing a 2.0 major G.P.R. requirement for graduation seems to have been refuted. The compilation of these departmental responses is being forwarded to Dean Hurst.

2. Final Exam Policy:

   The committee prepared, distributed and tabulated a questionnaire covering faculty attitude and practice concerning final exam policy. This was in response to faculty concern that final exams were not uniformly being emphasized. We found that the overwhelming majority of faculty agree with the University policy of required final examinations. Also a large majority give cumulative final exams which count a significant percentage toward the final course grade. We found little evidence of large differences in the practice of administering final examinations.

3. University Honors Program:

   A. The committee introduced a resolution requesting criteria for honors be published in the graduation program. The administration has agreed to this request.

   B. The committee also introduced a resolution requesting additional faculty release time for administration of the honors program. The administration has now increased the faculty release time to administer this vital program.
C. The committee also introduced a resolution supporting the honor students request for an honors common room.

4. Withdrawal Period:
The committee, after consulting with the faculty members of the undergraduate council introduced a resolution which recommends the course drop period be shortened to six weeks. The Faculty Senate subsequently passed this resolution. This resolution is now before the Undergraduate Council for their approval.

5. Undergraduate Scholarships:
The committee drafted a letter of commendation to the Clemson University Alumni Association for its establishment of the Alumni Merit Scholar program. Also a letter to the Office of Development was drafted which urged faculty and staff support of the Faculty-Staff Merit Scholarship program.

6. Professional Test Scores:
The committee introduced a resolution (which was passed by the Senate) requesting a study and publication of the collective results of Clemson students on their respective professional examinations. This study has now been begun by the Dean of the University.

7. University Admissions Policy:
After studying the present undergraduate admission policy, the committee introduced a resolution containing proposed policy changes. The Senate passed this resolution. The resolution requested that a formal policy based on academic considerations be established and this policy be made known to all prospective applicants. Also that the Registrar and Office of Admissions report to the Dean of the University and that a permanent University committee on admissions advise the Registrar on admissions policy.

8. Re-examinations:
A resolution asking for the deletion of the present policy of re-examinations for seniors who either have a low G.P.R. or have received an F their last semester was introduced by the committee and passed by the Senate.

We leave and recommend to the 1979-80 committee consideration of the following items:
1. University Class Schedule
2. Revision of the Academic Misconduct Policy."

B. Policy Committee - Senator West noted that the Policy Committee awaits the majority report from the Committee on Governance of the University so as to decide what future activity will take place with regard to the proposed new faculty constitution.
C. Research - No Report

D. Welfare - Senator Burt presented a final report which follows, noting in addition that the Welfare Committee has studied the use of visiting professors over a five-year period and decided that these appointments are in compliance with the Faculty Manual's "brief association" provisions. The Welfare Committee feels that a two-year maximum appointment should govern. Senator Burt also suggested that the salaries of visiting professors should be monitored by the Welfare Committee.

"The activities of the Welfare Committee have been divided among three subcommittees; Calendar Year, chairman Bob Mazur; Academic Year, chairman Bob Lambert; Retirement, chairman Steve Melsheimer. The principal concerns of these committees have been to establish quantitative descriptions of frings benefits, to develop a policy for summer school employment and to develop quantitative comparisons between the South Carolina Retirement System and other systems such as TIAA-CREF. Other activities of the subcommittees will be described in the summaries.

As a result of last year's Welfare Committee preliminary report on Faculty compensation, an ad hoc committee on faculty compensation was established by the Senate. This committee, reporting to the Senate in February, determined that Clemson faculty are and have been significantly undercompensated relative to a peer group consisting of public, category I (AAUP classification), southeastern institutions. The committee recommended that these inequities be corrected at each rank in the next two years and that the Welfare Committee monitor compensation henceforth on an annual basis. In order to accomplish this monitoring, we recommend that the Retirement subcommittee enlarge its function and become the compensation subcommittee.

Calendar Year Subcommittee: This subcommittee determined the dollar value attached to the fringe benefits received by faculty. Details may be found in the November 1978 report of the Welfare Committee.

Academic Year Subcommittee: The responses received from Dean Hurst to the Welfare Committee's April 18, 1978 report on employment of Clemson faculty in Summer School were unsatisfactory. The subcommittee's replies, adopted by the Senate, can be found in the February 1979 Minutes. The Senate should continue to push for an equitable Summer School employment policy.

A study of the use of the Visiting appointment over the past five years was made. In most cases it seems that this appointment is being used in compliance with the Faculty Manual. The "brief association" statement in the manual should, in general, limit such appointments to no more than two years. Further details, including statistics, will be filed with this annual report.
Retirement Subcommittee: This subcommittee completed its study of SCRS and TIAA-CREF begun last year. Improvements in SCRS contained in the April 1978 report of the Welfare Committee and the desirability of an optional system were recommended to the Administration. Discussions with President Edwards led to the recommendation by the Council of Presidents that faculty be eligible for optional retirement plans. Details may be found in the February 1979 Minutes. The Senate should continue to press for the recommendations of this report.

E. Ad hoc - Senator Thompson reported that the Ad hoc Committee on Senate Policy Goals will meet on April 18th.

F. University Councils and Committees - Senator Lambert reported that the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluations had completed its work and that a committee report will be out shortly. It will recommend the revision of the forms, the elimination of numbered grades at the end, and one or two other minor revisions. The Senate will be furnished a copy of the report. Senator Lambert was questioned concerning the degree of faculty feedback to the Committee. He indicated that about one-third of the faculty responded, as did most of the department heads. Many faculty disliked the numbered grades, but some liked the requirement that department heads sit down with individual faculty members to discuss goals. The rest of the reaction was scattered.

President Fleming presented the following report from the Extension Council:

(1) Non-credit registration in off-campus and continuing education programs amounted to 19,142 for the year 1978 while off-campus credit registrations were 2,364 in 134 courses. When the Cooperative Extension activities are counted, the number of contacts exceeds 2 million.

(2) A newly-revised affirmative action plan has been adopted by the University and accepted by the S. C. Human Affairs Commission.

(3) Clemson University has completed plans for implementing The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 requiring access to programs.
6. President's Report - President Fleming

1. By virtue of my office, I will represent the Faculty Senate on the following University committees during the coming year:

   Athletic Council
   Council of Academic Deans
   Disciplinary Committee
   Educational Council
   Handicapped Student Advisory Committee
   Planning Council
   Vending Machine Committee

   If I am to represent you adequately on these committees, I will need your views and opinions on issues coming before these bodies.

2. Meeting dates have been set for the coming year. If any changes must be made, we must accomplish them immediately.

3. On Wednesday, April 4, Bill Steirer and I were invited to have lunch with President-elect Atchley. During our conversation, I extended Dr. Atchley an invitation to speak to the Faculty Senate as soon as practicable after he takes office. He has enthusiastically accepted. I also requested that he consider meeting with each Senate delegation shortly after he takes office and that he use these meetings as additional means of orienting himself to the campus and University programs. He agreed that this would be useful, and we can expect him to be back in touch with us on this matter early in July or as soon as he feels he is ready to undertake this.

4. The Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Policy Goals has been appointed. Their report is due to the Senate on May 8, 1979. I have informed Dr. Atchley of formation of this committee and the nature of their work.

5. The special committee established by Dean Hurst to examine the proposed Faculty Constitution are completing their work. All that remains is Bill Steirer's minority report. When this is turned over to Dean Hurst, we will be given the majority and minority reports. I hope we can obtain these within the next two weeks. I will be speaking further with Dean Hurst about this matter.

6. The Athletic Department has asked us to remind all faculty and staff that May 15 is the deadline for priority on football tickets.

7. I have not been able to meet with Admiral McDevitt concerning the proposed University Copyright Policy. However, he has indicated that the policy in its present form is not acceptable to the Administration but that an accommodation probably can be reached. The Administration's concern is that a significant investment of resources by the University be adequately protected but that the policy not be overly burdensome on the producer of copyrightable material. He feels, specifically, that the proposed policy does not adequately protect the University. I will schedule a meeting with Admiral McDevitt within the week and report back to the Senate at our May meeting.
8. Dean Hurst has asked the Council of Academic Deans to check on the availability of scores and related information on how Clemson students/graduates fare on their respective professional examinations. The deans have indicated a willingness to comply with the Senate's request that this information be made available regularly. But because of the difficulties they foresee in locating some of the results, problems in monitoring exams taken by graduates several years out of college and the fact that some examinations are given in segments over a period of time, it may be some time before we know how feasible our request is.

9. A revised University Mission Statement has been published. A copy is attached hereto.

10. The Board of Trustees will meet on campus this Friday and Saturday, April 20-21.

President Fleming also presented the following Clemson University Mission Statement, noting that there was some disappointment expressed by some Deans over the concluding four recommendations. Mr. Hickman pointed out that the Mission Statement was arrived at by a Task Force of the S. C. Commission on Higher Education in its effort at creating a Master Plan for Higher Education in South Carolina, and thus, it was not arrived at solely by Clemson officials.

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT

Background and Organization

Clemson University was founded in 1889 when the General Assembly accepted the terms of the will of Thomas Green Clemson, conveying land and other property to the State for that purpose. The institution opened its doors in 1893 as Clemson Agricultural College, and land-grant institution, and has evolved to its present mission as a University emphasizing the sciences and technology. In addition to the usual land-grant responsibilities of Agricultural Research and Cooperative Extension, Clemson University administers the State's Division of Regulatory and Public Service and Livestock-Poultry Health programs that in other states are handled by separate governmental agencies.

Enrollment in the University was initially limited to men; women were admitted as residential students for the first time in 1955. The Graduate School was formally organized in 1957, although post-baccalaureate programs had been offered in a few selected areas of study for some years prior to that time.

In accordance with the conditions set forth in the will of Thomas Green Clemson and the Act of Acceptance by the General Assembly, Clemson University is governed by a Board of Trustees consisting of 13 members. Of these, six are elected by the General Assembly and seven are life members who elect their own successors.

For the purpose of carrying out its roles in instruction, research, and public service, Clemson is currently organized into nine colleges: Agricultural Sciences, Architecture, Education, Engineering, Forest and Recreation Resources, Industrial Management and Textile Science, Liberal Arts, Nursing and Sciences.

Academic Programs

Programs leading to baccalaureate and master's degrees are offered through all of the nine colleges. Doctoral programs are currently authorized in 24 specialties in the Colleges of Agricultural Sciences, Engineering, Industrial Management and Textile Science, and Sciences.
Clemson offers numerous degree programs not offered elsewhere in the State, including the following: agriculture, architecture, city and regional planning, building construction and management, agricultural education, industrial education, textiles, forestry, wood utilization, bioengineering, ceramic engineering, environmental engineering, and recreation and park administration.

Degree programs through the doctorate in the physical and biological sciences and in mathematics provide the foundations of basic knowledge required in all other technological fields of study. Selected programs in the humanities, in letters, and in the arts are currently authorized.

The number of new degree programs required at Clemson is not expected to increase significantly in the foreseeable future. The University is currently planning the addition of new programs at the bachelors and masters levels in computer science and computer engineering, and at the doctoral level is exploring the feasibility of new programs in vocational and technical education and in nursing.

Research and Public Service

Research is an indispensable part of most post-baccalaureate education, and Clemson provides research opportunities in all the fields in which graduate instruction is offered. Major emphasis is placed on the sciences and technology. In keeping with its land-grant role, Clemson's research and graduate programs concentrate on activities that directly support the economic growth and development of the state and the improvement of the quality of life of its citizens. Faculty consulting and advisory activities are important to state industry and as backup support to state government agencies.

Clemson is designated as the land-grant university to serve South Carolina under the terms of the Morrill Act of 1862, and the University is assigned the responsibility for the S. C. Agricultural Experiment Station under the provisions of the Hatch Act of 1887, as well as for the operation of the Cooperative Extension Service authorized by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. Agricultural Research is conducted not only on campus but through six branch Experiment Stations. The Cooperative Extension Service, no longer limited solely to agriculture, seeks practical applications of developing technology to the production, distribution, and marketing of products and services.

Clemson has long been assigned by the General Assembly the responsibility to administer numerous regulatory functions. These programs are administered through the Division of Regulatory and Public Service Programs and the Livestock-Poultry Health Division.

The Division of Regulatory and Public Service Programs is comprised of the Plant Pest Regulatory Service, the Department of Seed Certification, the Department of Fertilizer Inspection and Analysis, and a portion of the activities of the Department of Agricultural Chemical Services. This division has the responsibility of assuring consumers that fertilizers, pesticides, and seeds meet the standards to produce marketable and profitable crops and also has the responsibility to require that various quarantines and rules and regulations promulgated for the protection from certain insects, weeds, and plant diseases are adequately and impartially enforced.

The mission of the Livestock-Poultry Health Division is to control and eradicate certain infectious and contagious diseases of livestock in South Carolina, to supervise and inspect animals moving through livestock auction markets, to promulgate animal import regulations to protect against the introduction of new diseases, and to supervise the proper inspection of meat and poultry.
Currently, every College of the University offers continuing education programs, many off campus and not all for degree credit, with the largest enrollments occurring in the Colleges of Agricultural Sciences, Engineering, Industrial Management and Textile Science, and in Nursing.

Students

By policy of the Board of Trustees, Clemson limits its enrollment of full-time students on the campus to approximately 10,000. Including all registrants for degree credit, on- and off-campus, total enrollment in Fall, 1978, was about 11,300. This figure is not expected to increase significantly in the foreseeable future. Of this number, undergraduate students comprise about 80%, a proportion that is not expected to change significantly. The undergraduate student body is predominantly residential and full-time. Admissions requirements include a combination of class rank and aptitude test scores sufficient to indicate satisfactory progress toward the desired degree at Clemson.

Special Considerations

Clemson's role as the major land-grant institution in the state greatly increases its public services activities and responsibilities as a postsecondary institution.

In the spirit of cooperation with the state's other postsecondary institutions, Clemson conducts activities, both by formal agreement and informally, with a majority of the State's other universities and colleges, including USC, S. C. State, the Citadel, Winthrop, MUSC and TEC. In addition, Furman University and Clemson jointly administer, in Greenville, a program leading to the Master of Business Administration degree, to meet the needs of that area for such training. This unusual venture constitutes the only known instance wherein an earned degree is awarded by two universities, one public and one independent.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

(1) Clemson University continue to maintain the State's primary programs at the baccalaureate level and above in agriculture, architecture, city and regional planning, building construction and management, agricultural education, industrial education, textiles, forestry, wood utilization, bioengineering, ceramic engineering, environmental engineering, and recreation and park administration.

(2) Clemson University continue to focus its principal efforts, particularly at the post-baccalaureate levels, in the above areas and in the sciences and technologies, keeping in mind the need for strong supporting programs in the liberal arts, social sciences and humanities areas.

(3) The state continue to look to Clemson University as a major source of skilled manpower, research and public service, particularly in those areas where the University already provides the sole source of this training and these services.

(4) Clemson University continue to limit its enrollment to approximately 10,000 full-time on-campus students.

It was suggested by Senator Young that the proposed Senate Meeting with President Atchley be scheduled at some time other than in the summer. Pres. Fleming agreed.

Senator Edie noted that too much long-range planning at Clemson occurs without faculty input. He expressed the desire that we be consulted in the future. Pres. Fleming expressed optimism in this regard because of his initial impression of the new administration.
Old Business

A. Copyright Policy - Admiral McDevitt has not yet met with the Faculty Senate with regard to the proposed Copyright Policy. President Fleming senses that the administration does not feel that Clemson is adequately protected where substantial support has been given for the production of copyrightable material. On the other hand, President Fleming feels that the administration intends to be liberal in its attitude toward self-generated material. President Fleming and the chairman of the Research Committee will meet with Admiral McDevitt soon and will report to the Senate.

B. FS-79-3-5 - This resolution on Academic Misconduct which was tabled during the March Meeting was left on the table at the request of Senator Edie who wished it to be considered by the new Admissions and Scholarship Committee. A motion to re-commit the resolution to that committee was approved unanimously.

C. The following revised version of a letter of appreciation to President Edwards was approved unanimously and will be sent to him in the near future.

President Robert C. Edwards
Sikes Hall
Clemson University

Dear President Edwards:

The Faculty Senate commends you for the decision made last July to comply with the law of the land (Title VI) and not to participate in the golf tournament at Orangeburg. It is good to know that Clemson does not need to be forced to do what is both right and necessary in the area of Civil Rights. We hope that Clemson University continues to take the lead among institutions of higher education in the area of race relations.

Sincerely yours,

William F. Steirer, Jr.

Horace W. Fleming, Jr.

WFS/HWF/Im
8. New Business

The following persons were elected to the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee:

- Agricultural Sciences: B. R. Smith
- Architecture: J. L. Young
- Education: W. E. West
- Engineering: J. C. Hester
- Forest & Recreation Resources: D. L. Ham
- Industrial Management & Textile Science: G. H. Worm
- Liberal Arts: C. A. Grubb
- Library: M. A. Armistead
- Nursing: P. M. Kline
- Sciences: D. S. Snipes

9. The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Edwin M. Coulter
Secretary

Senators Absent:

- Agricultural Sciences: A. R. Mazur
  J. W. Dick
  H. M. Harris (substitute present)

- Education: L. H. Blanton

- Sciences: H. F. Senter
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

May 8, 1979

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by President Fleming at 3:33 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The Minutes for April 17, 1979 were approved without comment.

3. Committee Reports

A. Admissions and Scholarship - Senator Hester, Chairman, reported that the Committee had not met since the last Senate Meeting. Senator Hester announced a list of six major items that will be under consideration by the Committee during the coming year. They are as follows:

1. The development of a written Admissions Policy.
2. The size of the student population
3. Past and proposed recommendations for disadvantaged and remedial students.
4. The Senate’s response to grade inflation
5. Faculty requests for a modified class schedule
6. The Senate’s continuing concern with the University withdrawal period.

Senator Hester noted that six sub-committees will be set up to study these issues. Any Senator not on the Admissions and Scholarship Committee is invited to participate in any of these meetings.

B. Policy - Senator West, Chairman, reported that the Committee had not met since the last Senate Meeting. The Committee will meet on May 22 at 3:00 p.m. in 105 Freeman Hall. There has been no report from the Administration or from former Faculty Senate President Steirer on the status of the Faculty Constitution. Any Senator is welcome at any time to appear before the Committee when it is discussing the Constitution.

C. Research - Senator Smith, Chairman, was not in attendance. President Fleming noted that he, Senator Smith, Admiral McDevitt, and Mr. Ben Anderson had met concerning the proposed Copyright Policy. The problem appears to be the subjectivity of the reader when encountering certain vagaries of the language of the policy, especially with regard to the principle of protection of the University. McDevitt is comparing the proposed policy to those of the University of South Carolina, the University of Hawaii, and two other institutions. There does not appear to be much difference among them as to the substance of the language, and modifications of Clemson's policy along the consensus lines is anticipated. President Fleming feels that the Administration intends to be liberal toward faculty interests, once the wording problem is resolved. Senator Smith's Committee will review and re-draft the Copyright Policy during the coming year. Admiral McDevitt suggested that the Senate consider combining the present Patent and future Copyright Committees into a single committee for purposes of coordinating the University's approaches to both subjects.
D. Welfare - Senator Baron, Chairman of the committee reported that he, President Fleming and Senator Turnipseed met with Mr. Darrell Hickman, Assistant Vice President of Budgets and Systems, and reviewed procedures with regard to the peer-faculty salary study. He reported that Mr. Hickman plans to consult with the following "peer" institutions: Georgia, Georgia Tech, The University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill), North Carolina State University (Raleigh), V. P. I., and Auburn University. Senator Baron feels that the University of Virginia should be included and the Welfare Committee agrees. He also noted that Vice President Barnette will take the results of the peer-group study to the Board of Trustees, but after that, the information's distribution is unknown. Senator Baron informed the Senate that, along with the salary data, the peer-group study will also address comparable fringe benefits for faculty. He also announced that Mr. Hickman had reported that the S. C. Commission on Higher Education has revised the formula for institutional budgets in such a way that a comparison among peer institutions will constitute a variable. Senator Baron solicited Senate opinion on what constitutes a "peer institution" and recommended that each college delegation submit to the Welfare Committee a list of four institutions, on a priority basis, which they feel ought to be included in the overall list of peer institutions. An overall list will then be drawn up based on a "weighted" tabulation of the results. Senator Baron also announced that his committee will survey the faculty as to their concerns which the Welfare Committee might address this year, such as the alleged difficulty of collecting Blue Cross claims. Finally, Senator Baron announced that Senator Lambert will chair a subcommittee on recommendations to modify the graduation exercises and on the granting of honorary degrees.

E. Ad Hoc Committees - Senator Lambert reported for the Committee on Faculty Evaluation. They have been meeting for two years. The final report was finished on May 8. It will be printed in the University Newsletter. Specific recommendations are as follows:

1. The present three forms should be retained but renumbered as follows:
   Form I: Evaluation Worksheet; Form 2: Professional Data Sheet; and to continue Form 3: Evaluation Summary.

2. That certain forms be revised as follows:
   a. Form I: Evaluation Worksheet:
      (1) Delete all stipulated subtasks under the retained five categories of: I. Teaching; II. Research; III. Extension; IV. Librarianship; and V. Other Activities, so as to permit department heads and faculty members to agree on their own subtasks for greater flexibility.

      (2) Replace existing scores in each category (a possible 1.0) with a scale ranging from 6-1 on each agreed-upon subtask, the numbers representing in order: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Marginal, and Unsatisfactory.

   b. Form 2: Professional Data Sheet: No change
c. Form 3: Evaluation Summary:

(1) Under III. Performance, department heads will simply check one of: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Marginal, or Unsatisfactory.

(2) After faculty members see their evaluations, they are to indicate whether they concur with their evaluation. If they do not concur, they have ten calendar days to file a disclaimer with the department head which becomes a part of the evaluation.

3. That the schedule of procedure prescribed in the Dean of the University's memorandum of September 20, 1978 be simplified so that normally one conference each Spring between faculty members and department heads should suffice to discuss both Forms I and 3.

4. That certain of the present Faculty Evaluation Procedures be revised to conform to the changes in forms noted above, particularly the Evaluation Worksheet and the Evaluation Summary.

5. That the present Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation be retained with only minor changes.

Senator Lambert fielded questions concerning his digest of the report to wit:

Why is there a numerical rating on the "goal setting form" (#I)? (the answer was that this will not be filled out at that time, but later, for purposes of evaluation);

How will the overall rating be arrived at when each faculty member will have different variables to be considered? (the answer was that the final evaluation will be based on an overall percentage of the figure, six, with each variable score weighted by the department head);

Why the number, six? (there was no answer);

Is the rating, "fair" synonymous with the word, "satisfactory"? (the answer was, probably);

Who will review the evaluation? (the answer was the college dean, who can make additional comments. The faculty member also has ten days in which to file a demurrer. The faculty member may also see any comments made by the dean).

Will the form be used to determine the recipients of merit raises? (the answer was, presumably so!).

Other general comments were that the Ad Hoc Committee recommends no major changes to the evaluation system. It essentially addressed the principle bases of dissatisfaction. The second page is not changed at all. The numerical ratings have meaning only within a single department. A general discussion concerning the philosophical aspects of faculty evaluation and its uses ensued. The conclusion seemed to indicate that the major use of such evaluations should be
for determining salary increases and promotions. The sum of human knowledge not having been greatly enhanced, a motion to terminate the discussion was approved. The report was accepted unanimously.

Senator Thompson reported for the Committee on Policy Goals. He indicated that because of a paucity of time there was a lot of give and take among the members concerning the four broad areas which were determined (See Attachment A for the full report). A motion to approve the report was made. Before it could be voted on, a subsequent motion was made by Senator Hester to amend the report by changing the first sentence on page four to wit: the word "full" to read, "concurrent", and the words "in consultation" to be stricken. After a brief discussion, Senator Hester accepted the word, "co-equal" for the proposed word, "concurrent". His argument with regard to the overall amendment was (1) that co-equal authority was the proper role for the faculty to assume, (2) that this role would be more acceptable to the Administration, and (3) that the word "full" might dispell the spirit of the report and cause its purpose to be defeated. The amendment was approved unanimously. Senator Howard then moved to strike the entire statement on Faculty participation in University governance. He argued that it would cause the Administration to dictate the acceptance of the proposed faculty Constitution which has not yet been passed by the entire faculty. Senator Hester noted that the document does not do anything more than elaborate on the Constitution which is before the Administration already in a preliminary context. The document advises; it does not cause any action. The language is "should" not, "shall". Senator Rollin noted that the document is a basis for discussion only and that any changes in faculty governance will be made in accordance with already-existing structures. The question was called, and the motion to strike was defeated. After some minor typographical errors were corrected, the question to accept was called. The report was accepted.

F. University Committees - No reports.

4. President's Report:

1. Minutes of the Board of Trustees meeting, April 20-21, appear in the May 1 University Newsletter. In addition to the actions of the Board as summarized there, the Board confirmed and ratified award of a construction contract in the amount of $409,777 to expand the student bookstore. It is hoped that renovation of the Library will be completed during September of this year.

2. The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees nominated President Robert C. Edwards and State Senator L. Marion Gressette as candidates for honorary doctorates. The faculty committee (as defined on p. 53 of the Manual for Faculty Members) recommended unanimously that President Edwards be awarded the Doctor of Humanities degree and that Senator Gressette be awarded the Doctor of Laws degree. Citations of the recipients are attached.

3. On April 25, Senator Smith (Chairman of the Research Committee) and I met with Admiral McDevitt and Mr. Ben Anderson, University Legal Counsel, concerning the proposed new Copyright Policy. We will cover details of that meeting under Committee Reports.
AUGUST 15, 1979

4. Dean Hurst reports that the Registrar will publish the criteria for honors in the May 1979 graduation program and in each program thereafter.

5. Those Senators who anticipate extended absences from the campus during the summer months should consult the policy on summer alternates (p. 77 of the Manual for Faculty Members).

5. Old Business – None

6. New Business – Senator Hester moved "that the Policy Committee review the new faculty evaluation process and that the President of the Faculty Senate advise Dean Hurst of our evaluation of the new forms." The motion was approved unanimously. Senator Hester then moved 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." The motion was challenged by Senator Turnipseed as to its timing. Senator Hester noted that since Mr. Hickman and others were currently looking into the question, and that, whereas they might be persuaded to consider these questions concurrently with the proposed committee, he therefore felt that the timing was propitious. The motion passed unanimously.

7. The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Edwin M. Coulter
Secretary

Senators Absent:
Agricultural Sciences: Smith
Education: Blanton
Engineering: Edie

EMC/Im
Enclosures
Senator Lawrence Marion Gressette, Chairman of the powerful Senate Judiciary Committee and President Pro Tempore of the Senate, has served the State of South Carolina and the Nation unselfishly in a career of public service that spans more than a half-century. Since his election to the South Carolina House of Representatives in 1924 and his election to the State Senate in 1936, he has maintained an unswerving dedication to the strengths of our governmental system and has provided the type of enlightened leadership needed for South Carolina to continue to grow.

Senator Gressette's talent is written into the heart of the organic and statutory law of South Carolina. Some highlights of his legislative accomplishments are: the revision and modification of the South Carolina Constitution of 1895, including a total reform of our judicial system, the "home rule" reforms, and adoption of a new article guaranteeing fiscal integrity in government; the support of a sound educational system in South Carolina and particularly the support of technical education, the expansion of vocational and special education programs, and continuing improvements in higher education; the establishment of the State Forestry System, which is a model for the entire Nation; and the support of fiscal conservation in government operations, which has helped South Carolina maintain its Triple A rating in the nation's financial markets and saved the State millions of dollars in capital improvement bonds.

The Senior Senator from Calhoun was born in Orangeburg County on February 11, 1902. He was graduated from St. Matthews High School and the University of South Carolina with an LL.B. degree in 1924, the same
year he began his legislative career as a Democrat from Calhoun County. In 1970 he was awarded the J.D. degree from USC and in 1977 received an LL. D. degree.

In the State Senate, Senator Gressette also serves as Vice-chairman of the Committee of Education, Chairman of the Committee on Interstate Cooperation, and is a member of the Governing Board and the Council of State Governments. In addition, Senator Gressette has served as Chairman of the Senate Education Committee and the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. As Chairman of the Senate Education Committee, he has served on the Board of Trustees at the University of South Carolina and Winthrop College, as well as the Board of Visitors at The Citadel while he was chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. Since 1925 the Senator has been a delegate to state conventions, and in 1952 he was an alternate to the National Democratic Convention and in 1956 was a delegate.

In 1975 Senator Gressette was honored for his work for the mentally retarded by the naming of the Calhoun County Child Development Center the "Marion Gressette Center" in Cameron, South Carolina. Also, March 6, 1977, was officially proclaimed by Governor James B. Edwards as L. Marion Gressette "The Grey Fox" Day in South Carolina. The Senator has also been honored by his colleagues through the hanging of his portrait in the chambers of the State Senate and the dedication of the Senate office building in his name.

Senator Gressette is married to the former Florence Howell, and they are the parents of one son, Lawrence Jr., who is a graduate of 'Clemson and the University of South Carolina Law School.

The law of South Carolina is a dynamic force in our society. That the law lives and, in turn, breathes life into our communities is largely to the credit of Senator Lawrence Marion Gressette.
Robert C. Edwards, eighth president of Clemson University, has presided during the University's greatest era of achievement, growth and service to the people of South Carolina, the region and nation. A native of Fountain Inn, Dr. Edwards began his association with Clemson University in 1929 when, at the age of 15, he came to campus as a freshman. He graduated in 1933 and began a career in textile management. At the height of his success, he was tapped in 1956 as Clemson's first vice president for development. When President Franklin A. Poole died in 1958, he was named acting president. In 1959 he was elected president by the Board of Trustees.

During the Edwards presidency, the University has completed an astonishing, but well-planned growth from military school to fledgling civilian college to major university. Under his leadership Clemson has invested more than $94 million in new facilities, and there is an additional $18.3 million in new projects on the drawing boards — a total of more than $112 million since 1956. He personally has awarded 70 percent of the institution's 40,000 conferred degrees, including all of its doctorates, associate of arts degrees and virtually all of its master's degrees.

The quality of Clemson students is reflected in the 1978 freshman class, which scored more than 100 points better than the national average and 200 points above the South Carolina average on the standardized Scholastic Aptitude Test. Almost 800 of the 2,020 freshmen met requirements for some kind of advanced academic standing.

During President Edwards' tenure the number of faculty members has increased from 291 to 967, while the number with terminal academic degrees has risen from 32 to 68 percent of the total. Clemson operates today with a budget of
$94.8 million compared with $5.6 million in 1955. To President Edwards goes the lion's share of credit for negotiating changes in the Hartwell Reservoir project in the late 1950s that prevented irreparable damage to the University, as well as saving 800 acres of priceless agricultural land.

In 1963, a landmark year for Southern higher education against a backdrop of violence and disruption on other campuses, Clemson met the challenge of desegregation orderly and peacefully, setting a model for the rest of the country. The *Saturday Evening Post* labelled Clemson's action, and President Edwards' accomplishments, "Integration with Dignity."

During the Edwards era, Clemson has solidified its role as a partner of the people. The institution has perfected its undergraduate program, developed its research and public service capabilities to the highest quality, and served as the State's most important vehicle for bringing knowledge from the campus and applying it to problems confronting people.

Recognizing the need for continued excellence and wishing to honor President Edwards for his career of outstanding service to Clemson, the Board of Trustees has established a permanent endowment of not less than $1 million, known as the Robert Cook Edwards Endowment for Excellence in Science and Technology.

President Edwards, who retires June 30, is married to the former Miss Louise Odom. They have two children, Robert C. Edwards Jr. of Hendersonville, N.C., and Mrs. Nancy Reid of Jacksonville, Ala.

President Edwards has received Honorary Doctor of Laws degrees from The Citadel and Wofford College and currently serves as a director of the Duke Power Company and Dan River, Inc.
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FACULTY SENATE POSITION PAPER
ON UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES

Preamble

The major role of the university is the acquisition and transmission of knowledge. The constituency of the university is not limited to its students and faculty. It extends beyond the campus to a much larger population which looks to the university for academic, intellectual, and cultural leadership, and for practical assistance and guidance.

The Faculty of Clemson University represents a substantial and unique resource. That resource must be made available to the citizens of the state, to their representatives in the state legislature, to local governments, and to public administrators at all levels. As a land grant institution and state university, Clemson can and should be the focal point for research into and discussion of those issues which affect the citizens of South Carolina - anticipating and defining problems, exploring alternative solutions, and disseminating new knowledge and insights. Such activities can and frequently do have nationwide and even international implications and effects.
The responsibilities and roles of the university are complex and are constantly changing. And it is mainly the faculty of the university who, by virtue of their expertise and experience, must accept and fulfill these responsibilities and carry out these roles. The history of higher education in the United States amply demonstrates that, to carry out the mission of the university, the faculty - without whom there is no university - must participate in and assume significant responsibilities for determining the objectives and priorities of the university. No university has established itself among the top ranks without such involvement.

The areas of concern to the faculty of a university are many. Of special concern to the Clemson Faculty are the matters of:

1) faculty participation in university governance;
2) faculty compensation (salaries and fringe benefits);
3) the funding of programs and essential units;
4) the intellectual and cultural environment of the university.

Each of these will be considered in turn.

Policy Statement on Faculty Participation in University Governance

In his will, Thomas Green Clemson wrote:

...I desire to state plainly, that I wish the Trustees of said institution to have full authority and power to regulate all matters pertaining to said institution - to fix the course of studies, to make rules for the government of same, and to change them, as in their judgment experience may prove necessary (italics added).

Clearly the ultimate responsibility for managing Clemson University rests with the Board of Trustees. While recognizing as much, the Faculty nevertheless maintains that the time for changing the "rules of the government" of the University has arrived.
In the past the faculty of Clemson University has played some part in establishing some University policies, however their role, historically, has been strictly an advisory one - subject always to review and validation by the Administration and the Board of Trustees. But the Clemson of today and tomorrow may not always be best served by procedures which served the Clemson of yesterday. The Faculty believes that for Clemson to become a university of the first-rank - in the fullest meaning of that term - and a center of learning in South Carolina and the Southeast, its faculty must be endowed with the authority, and must accept responsibility, for exercising governance over those aspects of the university which historically have been the province of faculty in the best and oldest institutions of higher learning. Such authority and its concomitant responsibilities must be real and should be clearly defined. The following are of particular importance:

1) the Faculty should participate equally with the Administration in making decisions relative to the objectives and responsibilities of Clemson University;

2) the Faculty should have co-equal authority and responsibility for establishing academic policy at both the undergraduate and graduate levels;

3) the Faculty should have joint responsibility with the Administration for establishing College and University entrance and continuing enrollment requirements;

4) faculty members of committees, including the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils, promotion and tenure committees, and faculty research committees, should be selected: (a) according to procedures determined by the faculty (b) from the faculty only (c) and by the faculty concerned.

Although these represent the specific major concerns of the Clemson University faculty, the overriding concern is that the participation of the faculty in the governance of the University shall be binding rather than advisory.
Policy Statement on Faculty Compensation

Clemson University faculty are significantly under-compensated relative to faculty at peer institutions. In addition, over the past few years faculty salaries have not kept pace with wages and salaries of non-agricultural workers in South Carolina. It is inevitable that the University's ability to retain outstanding faculty - and hence, some of its best students - will be impaired if the deficiencies in compensation are permitted to continue. In the best interests of the University community and of its broader constituency, a program to correct inequities in compensation be launched immediately. This program should include, but not be limited to:

1) a commitment to achieve and maintain salary levels and fringe benefits commensurate with those of peer institutions;

2) development of an ongoing policy designed to prevent real income losses due to inflation;

3) efforts to maintain an appropriate balance between merit increases and across-the-board compensation.

Faculty should have input into and be regularly informed of the Administration's program to meet these goals.
Policy Statement on Funding of Programs and Essential Units

The funding of University support units and the general support of individual programs throughout the University are in need of improvement; for example:

1) essential units such as the Library and the Graduate School (and including the Office of University Research) must be funded at levels sufficient for Clemson University to be able to compete on even terms with its peers;

2) support items (such as sabbaticals and other professional activities) must be better funded so that the staff of individual units can maintain and increase their professional activity and expertise;

3) budgets for Instructional Equipment must undergo steady improvement;

4) the utilization of space and the setting of priorities for the physical growth and development of the campus must be effected so as to take into account the professional needs and aims of faculty.
Policy Statement on the Intellectual and Cultural Environment

A first-rate university will be characterized by an atmosphere which fosters a continuous exploration of intellectual issues and a high level of cultural activity. Such an environment is conducive not only to teaching and learning, but to the involvement of the citizenry within the university's region, not excluding leaders of business, industry, and government. Such an environment is a necessary complement to the academic, social, and athletic aspects of university life.

That the intellectual and cultural environment of Clemson has not received an emphasis commensurate with that of other aspects of the University's life is suggested by, among other things: the low priority given to the creation of a Performing Arts Center; the absence of an intellectually respectable University Lecture Series; the very limited availability of funds for visiting artists and performers; and the absence of a University Film Series.

The Faculty, accordingly, urges that:

1) administration, faculty, and students be organized to plan a university-wide program for upgrading the intellectual and cultural life of Clemson University.

2) immediate and high priority be given to the construction of a Performing Arts Center.
1. **Call to Order**

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

2. **Approval of Minutes**

The Minutes for May 8, 1979 were approved without comment.

3. **Committee Reports**

   A. **Admissions and Scholarship** - Senator Grubb, Chairman, had no formal report. He announced the next meeting of the Committee to be held at 3:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 26, at 303 Hardin Hall. He stated that his goal as the new Chairman was to conduct a general overview of all Admissions and Scholarship policies instead of pursuing a piecemeal approach to the issues as indicated by former Chairman Hester last month (see May Minutes). He felt that there are apt to be changes in these policies in the near future and that an overall study would enable the Committee to provide better and more timely input. He solicited the advice of any Senator on problems relating to Admissions and Scholarships.

   B. **Policy** - Senator West, Chairman, presented three reports. The first dealt with Faculty Evaluation Procedures (See Attachment A). In this regard, he noted the following changes from the Ad hoc Committee report submitted in May (see May Minutes):

   1) There is new language in paragraph 3 of the Form 2 procedures;

   2) there is a change in the rating schedule from six variables to five

   3) there is no change in Form 2;

   4) the "Purpose" paragraph of Form 3 is reworded in order to tie the evaluation more closely to promotion, tenure and merit raise decisions;

   5) there is agreement that specific items under the five major categories of evaluation be left blank;

   6) there is a suggested numerical range to define the five substantive performance ratings (Very Good, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, and Unsatisfactory);

   7) there is now an additional step wherein the faculty member can read the Dean's evaluation and file a disclaimer to it as well as to the Department Head's evaluation.

Senator West noted that the Senate has until August to review these proposed changes but he hopes to have a Senate consideration and vote on the matter during the July meeting. He asked the Senate to remember that they have three plans to choose from: the existing plan; the recommended plan by the Ad hoc Committee; and the Policy Committee plan indicated above. Senator Thompson opinioned that he preferred the old
plan, feeling that the present confusion surrounding its use would be easier to undo than the introduction of a whole new plan. Senator Rollins countered that the newest plan protects the faculty better, especially with regard to the additional faculty review step. An objection was raised with regard to the change in the numerical scoring (from the 1 - 100% to the 1 - 5 scale). Senator West responded that, since this is a "check list" type of evaluation, it needs to be simplified in order to be more workable and that, whereas the old form was not that bad, it did open up too much difference between departmental approaches to the evaluation scales. The briefer scale (1 - 5) would tend to make Department - to - Department operations more uniform. Senator Rollins added that the category "Excellent" was omitted because of the propensity of some evaluators to reserve this accolade for the rarest levels of achievement while others use it indiscriminately - the problem being essentially semantic. In response to a question concerning the reduced number of blank lines under the various categories of evaluation on Form I, Senator West noted that there can be any number of such lines in the final form, but his typewriter could only accommodate three. Senator West also responded to a question concerning the method of determining the final score where several categories of evaluation are used. When asked whether a Dean could change a Department Head's evaluation, Senator West noted that he could, and that this is why the additional step has been added wherein a faculty member may review a Dean's comments on his form. He also noted that the Ad hoc Committee made a similar recommendation in its report. A motion to accept the report and to discuss it at the next meeting was made and seconded. It passed unanimously.

The Policy Committee has also discussed issues relating to tenure and merit raises. They will seek to have Dean Hurst change the Faculty Manual to allow for faculty members to waive the confidentiality of their departmental evaluations in order for faculty advisory committees to have this information when making recommendations on tenure and promotions. (See attachment B).

A general discussion on the pros and cons with regard to waiver ensued. The President concluded that the matter warranted further study.

A third report was made concerning a review of the Majority and Minority report of the Ad hoc Committee to Review a Proposed New Constitution for the Faculty and Faculty Senate. The report was placed on the current agenda under New Business.

C. Research - Senator Smith, Chairman, reported that on June 18, there was a meeting on the proposed Copyright Policy and the resolution on the creation of an Ad hoc Committee to recommend ways to facilitate the research efforts of the faculty. Senator Smith indicated that the Committee is somewhat confused as to what Senator Hester had in mind in the latter resolution (see the May Minutes), since the University Research Council apparently already does this and it includes faculty members as participants. Senator Smith indicated that the Committee will not proceed further on this matter until they get a clearer idea of the issue raised by Senator Hester.
D. Welfare Committee - Senator Baron, the Chairman, was not present. A spokesman for the Committee noted that the Faculty Salary Survey (Peer institutions) by Mr. Darrell Hickman, (see May Minutes) has been completed, and it will soon be compiled and turned over to Dean Hurst. It will be distributed later, but Senator Baron has not yet seen it. President Fleming announced that he would look into the matter. Senator Worm inquired as to whether anyone on the Welfare Committee had looked at the overall Grievance Policy of the University. He was particularly concerned about the recent request for faculty members to read and sign a statement of consent to a rather complicated new State Employees Grievance Policy. A lengthy discussion ensued during which the following points were made:

1) There are apparently two grievance procedures available to the faculty. The one described in the Faculty Manual for Clemson Faculty, and the State procedure for all State employees.

2) The document to be signed by Clemson faculty concerns changes in the State procedure.

3) It may cause changes to be written into the Faculty Manual, but this is unclear.

4) When the issue of changes in the State policy arose last year, the Welfare Committee indicated no interest in the matter.

5) The best move now would be to check and see if we have lost anything in the new State procedures, and whether substantial changes will ensure in the Faculty Manual, but it would be wise to do this cautiously at the present time in view of past Senate actions and possible future actions by the State Legislature.

The President will look into the matter. A motion was made to commit this matter to the Welfare Committee for further study. It passed unanimously.

E. Ad Hoc Committees - No Reports

F. University Councils and Committees - No Reports.

G. President's Report:(See attachment C). With regard to item 1A, the President noted that this could prove to be expensive and that it has been proposed that the University be content with verification of the last degree only. Concerning item 1B, he indicated an intention to monitor this closely to see what the benefits of the system will be. Concerning item 1D, he noted that he had raised this issue and that he is vaguely optimistic in this regard. Concerning item 3, he noted that the students named were very supportive of faculty priorities, especially in regard to a lecture series, the film series, the performing arts center and faculty compensation. Concerning item 5D, he noted that Vice President Thompson will chair an ad hoc committee to arrange for a social event in connection with Dr. Atchley's visit and the January visit by the Board of Trustees. Concerning item 5F, he stated that he could not usually take faculty members with him to his formal committee meetings with these administrators, so the action in 5F is the next best thing. There followed a spirited discussion of
item 1A, during which it was stated that the proposal to check the credentials of the faculty was ill-advised and an insult to the faculty. The operation of ferreting out bogus degree-holders is an administrative problem and should not require faculty initiation. If "clearance" is required, it is the obligation of the "clearor" rather than the "clearee" to provide information. It is offensive enough to be called "employees"; if this is so, let the "employer" check our bona fides. Faculty members have already provided these documents once, and once is enough. How often does Dean Hurst expect to do this? The consensus seemed to be this whole matter should be rejected by the faculty as a whole, and a resolution was prepared for the current agenda under New Business. The President was asked, in regard to item 1C, whether there had been any discussion of existing programs. The answer was that some had been discussed, but the discussion was not substantial. The President promised to keep the Senate informed. With regard to item 1E, the President was asked what the Deans' interests were. The answer was that they were concerned about decorum during the ceremonies, parking near the Coliseum and the time the ceremonies consume. It was suggested that this matter be taken up by the Admissions and Scholarship Committee rather than by the Welfare Committee.

4. Old Business - There was none.

5. New Business

Salutary Letters. The Senate went into the Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering several salutary letters proposed by the President. The letter to Professor Macaulay was discussed and unanimously approved. (see Attachment D). The letter to Mr. Billy Rogers was discussed and unanimously approved (see Attachment E). A proposed letter to IPTAY was considered during an extended period of debate marked by Byzantine parliamentary maneuvering. It was eventually tabled in order to reconsider the wording. The letter to Mr. Melvin Long was discussed and unanimously approved (see Attachment F). The Senate reconvened.

Letters from President Edwards and Ex-Senate President Steirer thanking the Senate for gifts received from that body were read and accepted.

Resolution FS-79-6-1 was introduced by Senator Rollin to wit:

The Faculty Senate finds the requirement that all faculty submit through their department heads official transcripts of all work done for each degree impugns the integrity of the faculty as a whole and places demands of time, energy, and money upon the individual faculty member in order to carry out a responsibility which properly resides with the Administration;

and further, that the Senate will recommend that faculty members refuse, on principle, to comply with the directive in question.

The resolution passed by a large majority with little further discussion.
Senator Smith submitted the following resolution, numbered FS-79-6-2:

WHEREAS the proposed Clemson University Copyright Policy as revised by the Faculty Senate Research Committee has not been accepted by the Administration of Clemson University, and

WHEREAS substantial work has been done and considerable time has passed since November 1974, when a University Research Council Committee was appointed to draft a copyright policy, be it therefore

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests that the Administration of Clemson University appoint a representative(s) of University Counsel, Office of the President, to assist the Faculty Senate Research Committee in the development of a copyright policy.

He explained that the purpose of the resolution was to get some University Research Council assistance on the drafting of an acceptable copyright policy. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Senator West requested that the Senate go into executive session to discuss the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review a Proposed New Constitution for the Faculty and Faculty Senate (see Attachment G). A motion was made to allow twenty minutes for such a discussion, and it was approved. After the end of the executive session, a motion to include the report under discussion in the Minutes and to place it on the agenda for the next meeting was made and passed. It appears as Attachment G.

Professor Steirer, representing Senator Lambert, asked if there were any questions of him relating to his role on the Ad Hoc Committee aforementioned or on his Minority report. Several questions were asked and answered by him. Dr. Steirer was complimented for his Minority report by several Senators.

The Senate adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

[signature]
Edwin M. Coulter
Secretary

Enclosures

Senators Absent: Agricultural Sciences: Bursey
Architecture: Young
Webb
Engineering: Edie (substitute present)
Baron
Liberal Arts: Lambert (substitute present)
Nursing: Kelly
Kline
Sciences: Burt
Schindler
Snipes
FORM 1 - EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Purpose: This form is to be used to record detailed evaluation of the faculty member by the department head for the purpose of ultimately deriving, through a systematic means, a narrative evaluation of the individual faculty member's overall performance.

Explanations:
1. Each faculty members' assigned duties and professional objectives for the year are categorized into teaching, research, extension, librarianship, and other activities such that the total effort equals 100%.

2. The department head, in consultation with the faculty member, identifies specific qualities and factors which are appropriate and necessary to define adequately the assigned duties and objectives. (See Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation for examples of the qualities and factors which might be identified.)

3. The department head shall, in consultation with the faculty member, determine if some qualities and factors should weigh more heavily in the evaluation than others. No change in established weighing of qualities and factors should be made without prior consultations with the faculty member. When used, relative importance for each major category should sum to 100%.

4. Performance should be indicated with a check mark under the appropriate rating description. Overall rating of performance for each major category should be indicated by a number from 1 to 5 which corresponds to the appropriate rating description.

FORM 2 - PROFESSIONAL DATA SHEET

Purpose: A form to be used by each faculty member to transmit an annual report of accomplishments to the department head. (The form need not be transmitted to college or university administration.)

Explanations:
1. Distribution of effort or work performed such as teaching (courses taught, etc.), research (projects underway), extension (field days, etc.), librarianship (reference work, etc.) and other activities are listed and/or described.

2. Major goals accomplished during the year are listed and/or described. Goals are the same as, but not limited to, those established in consultation with the department head at the beginning of the year.

3. Professional activities such as workshops or seminars attended, activities in professional organizations, publication of papers not associated with assigned duties, etc., are listed and/or described.

4. Other noteworthy activities of a professional nature are listed and/or described.
Purpose: This form is to be used to record the summary evaluation of the individual faculty member for transmission from department head to the college and university administration. The form will be an official document, with narrative and numerical evaluations. It serves the goals of faculty development and improvement, and of providing information relevant to questions of promotion and tenure and upon which merit salary increases shall be based.

Explanations:

1. A summary of the individual's assigned responsibilities and participation in other activities is presented.

2. A narrative evaluation is made which describes the individual's effectiveness, emphasizes particular strengths demonstrated, indicates the area(s) in which improvement is desired and suggests ways in which the individual can reach his/her highest stage of professional development.

3. Performance. The department head will check one: very good, good, satisfactory, marginal or unsatisfactory. The department head will then sign the Evaluation Summary and provide the faculty member an opportunity to read the evaluation.

4. A faculty member who does not concur with his/her evaluation by the department head shall have ten calendar days to file a disclaimer with the department head, which shall become a part of the evaluation.

5. The completed Evaluation Summary is forwarded for review by the appropriate Dean. After review by the Dean and the addition of comments and signature the Evaluation Summary is returned to the Department. At this time the faculty members are to see the completed Evaluation Summary and to indicate that they have read the reviewed evaluation. If the faculty member does not concur with the reviewed evaluation, he/she has ten calendar days in which to file a disclaimer. This disclaimer then becomes a part of the complete evaluation.
# Name ____________________________  Academic Year ____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Total Responsibility</th>
<th>% Importance</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching and Related Duties* (___% of total responsibility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating (Teaching) total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research* (___% of total responsibility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating (Research) total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extension* (___% of total responsibility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating (Extension) total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Librarianship* (___% of total responsibility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating (Librarianship) total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other* (___% of total responsibility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating (Other) total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PERFORMANCE RATING __________________

VG=Very Good  G=Good  S=Satisfactory  M=Marginal  US=Unsatisfactory

*For suggested Criteria see Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Evaluation completed by ____________________________  Date ____________
EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Name: ___________________________ Rank: ___________

Department: ___________________________ College: ___________

Earned Degrees and Dates: ____________________________________________

Years of Professional Experience Prior to Employment by Clemson: ___________________________

Date of Employment by Clemson: ___________________________ Date Tenure Awarded: ___________

I. Assigned Responsibilities: ____________________________________________

II. Narrative of Evaluation: (attach additional sheets as necessary): ____________________________________________

III. Total Performance Rating (from FORM 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5±</td>
<td>3.5±</td>
<td>2.5±</td>
<td>1.5±</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluated by: ___________________________ Date: ___________

I have read this evaluation ___________________________ Date: ___________

I have filed a disclaimer to this evaluation ___________________________ Date: ___________

Reviewed by Dean: ___________________________ Date: ___________

and I concur in this evaluation. ___________ I do not concur in this evaluation. ___________

COMMENTS:

I have read the review of this evaluation ___________________________ Date: ___________

I have filed a disclaimer to the Dean's review. ___________
Memorandum

To: Dean Hurst
From: The Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate recommends that the following statement be appended to page 48 of the Faculty Manual (under "Personnel Evaluation Program," paragraph 5, following the first sentence of that paragraph):

Faculty members may waive the confidentiality of their completed Faculty Evaluation forms in order that said forms may be examined by departmental advisory committees on tenure and promotion.
1. The Council of Deans met on May 14 and June 11. They covered the following items of immediate importance to faculty.

   a. Dean Hurst has asked the academic deans to verify by January 1, 1980 the credentials of all faculty. Dean Hurst essentially has asked that the deans require all faculty to submit through their department heads official transcripts of all work done for each degree the faculty member holds. An "official" transcript is defined as an original copy with an embossed seal of the degree-granting institution and reflecting the fact that the degree itself has been conferred on the faculty member.

   b. Dean Schwartz reports that work on development of the Student Data Base is proceeding but is currently about three weeks behind schedule. When complete, the data base will be used for a variety of record-keeping chores, will facilitate the entire record-keeping process and will be accessible for faculty counseling of students on their academic programs.

   c. At their June 11 meeting, the deans discussed at length post-secondary education in Greenville. Dean Hurst will compile the deans' comments in a report to be forwarded to President Edwards.

   d. There seems to be a consensus of sorts among the deans that we should pursue a higher level of funding for international travel of University faculty and other personnel who travel on University-related business or participate in professional meetings related to their duties at the University. (Heretofore, as you know, many faculty and staff traveling on University business have had to defray major expense out of their own funds.)

   e. The deans are interested in reviewing our commencement exercises format. I informed them that the Senate Welfare Committee haveplanned their own review of graduation ceremonies and would welcome any comments the deans may have as their work proceeds.
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f. I gave the deans copies of our report on University priorities and told them that the Senate would welcome their comments and support of the objectives we have listed. You may wish to follow-up on this matter with your deans.

2. The Educational Council met on May 25. At that meeting, President Edwards stressed certain points contained in the Governor's energy message delivered May 17. Specifically, as you may recall, the Governor has stated that he will seek an order from the State Budget and Control Board setting a target of 15 percent reduction in the number of miles traveled by all state vehicles (excepting law enforcement vehicles) and mandating all state agencies to implement plans to achieve this goal. The Governor also pointed out that the 55 mph speed limit will be strictly enforced and that state employees caught exceeding this limit in a state vehicle will be reported to their appropriate agency heads for disciplinary action. Agency heads are thus required to impose some kind of disciplinary code on this subject. The University, however, has not as yet determined what kind of disciplinary action is to be taken. (I have a copy of the complete text of the Governor's message for those who wish to read it.)

3. On May 30, I met briefly with Bob Fuzy, Student Government President, and Jeff Anderson, President of the Student Senate. They had been given copies of our report on University priorities for their information. They expressed their own personal support of the objectives we listed in the report and would like the opportunity to interact with us in pursuit of those objectives, as appropriate.

4. It appears that the Planning Council will pursue the concept of a University Performing Arts Center during the coming year.

5. The Senate Advisory Committee met June 7. The following matters came before the Committee.

a. Request for leave of absence from the Senate of J. C. Hester (beginning immediately and extending through Spring semester 1980) was received. His seat will be filled on a temporary basis by special election in the College of Engineering, the election to be held immediately.

b. Senator C. A. Grubb was appointed Chairman of the Admissions and Scholarship Committee to replace Senator Hester.
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c. J. L. Young, who has represented the Faculty Senate on the University Union Board during the past academic year, was reappointed to that post to serve during the academic year 1979-80. (This position was not on our original list of appointments to be made.)

d. President-elect Atchley has accepted our invitation to speak to the Senate at our August 28 meeting. He has received copies of our ad hoc committee report on University priorities, the proposed new faculty constitution and comments of the review committee.

e. Vice President Stassen Thompson has agreed to chair an ad hoc committee to plan for a social event following our August 28 meeting and a reception for the Board of Trustees in January during their meeting on campus.

f. Standing committees will begin shortly to identify those administrative officers within the University who deal with matters in the province of these committees. Thereafter, the committees will periodically invite these officers to meet with them informally for discussions of policies of mutual interest and to keep each other current on matters of mutual interest. It is hoped that this will enhance relations between administrators and faculty and facilitate an understanding of our respective viewpoints.

6. Vice President Thompson, Dean Hurst, Dean Anderson, Dr. Godley and I will visit the Experiment Stations September 4-6.

7. Orientation for new faculty and staff will be August 16-17.

8. I want to continue the tradition started by Bill Steirer of visiting periodically with faculty senators and faculty in the several colleges. Please let me know if you would like for me to meet with the senators in your college.
Hugh H. Macaulay,
Alumni Professor of Economics
Department of Economics
Sirrine Hall
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

Dear Professor Macaulay:

The Faculty Senate of Clemson University wishes to thank you for the diligence with which you served the faculty of the University as a member of the Screening Committee to select the new President of the University.

We recognize the great sacrifice which you made in terms of time and effort, at the expense of your other professional and leisure activities. It is to your credit that the process of selecting our new President proceeded so efficiently and with such thoroughness.

The entire University community is indebted to you for the way that you represented its various constituents, and the faculty in particular.

Sincerely,

Horace W. Fleming, Jr., President
For the Faculty Senate
Mr. Billy G. Rogers, President
Clemson University Alumni Association
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

Dear Mr. Rogers:

The Faculty Senate of Clemson University wishes to commend the Alumni Association on your overall record of achievement during the academic year 1978-79.

We note the substantial gains achieved by the Alumni Association in funding of academic scholarships and in the support given the University through over $1,000,000 for faculty research and professorships. We also want to commend you for the level of alumni participation in giving which you and the staff of the Alumni Association have encouraged over the past several years. To have been chosen as a finalist in the U. S. Steel competition for overall improvement in alumni programs speaks well for the dedication of Clemson alumni, you, your fellow officers of the Association and your staff.

If we can be of service to you in your continuing efforts to serve the University, we hope that you will call on us.

Sincerely,

Horace W. Fleming, Jr., President
For the Faculty Senate

HWF/mgm
Mr. Melvin C. Long, Director
Department of University Relations
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

Dear Mr. Long:

The Faculty Senate of Clemson University notes with great pleasure receipt by the University Information Office of the Newsweek Grand Award for News and Information Writing for 1979.

That you have performed at such a consistently high level in this and previous competitions for this award attests to the dedication and diligence of your entire staff. This award represents a high honor for Clemson University and all of the academic and other programs which you have so well represented in the media and in your contacts throughout the state of South Carolina and the nation.

Our sincere congratulations to you, Mr. Cornwell and your entire staff in the University Information Office.

Sincerely,

Horace W. Fleming, Jr., President
For the Faculty Senate
ATTACHMENT G
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MEMORANDUM AND REPORT

TO: Dean Hurst

FROM: Ad Hoc Committee to Review a Proposed New Constitution for the Faculty and Faculty Senate

I. INTRODUCTION

You have asked this Committee to "study and make any appropriate recommendations concerning" the proposed new constitution of the Faculty and Faculty Senate. We have interpreted our mandate broadly. We have studied the present and the proposed documents; we have examined the constitutions of some other institutions; we have heard from Dr. Steirer the motivations and views of those who propose a new constitution; and we have, of course, observed and participated in the relationships of the Faculty and the Administration for varying numbers of years. Our observations here are based on all these factors.

It should be noted that Professor Steirer serves on this committee ex-officio as President of the Faculty Senate. He has been extremely helpful as a resource person representing the views of the Senate, particularly the group who drafted the proposed revision. Obviously he cannot support all the views expressed herein, and the editorial "we" represents herein the administrative members of the committee.

Also to be noted is our awareness that, in including our views about faculty government in general and the prerequisites for its success, we go beyond a narrow interpretation of our mandate. We hope these inclusions are not intrusive; if they are, you may ignore them without damaging our sensibilities.

The basic difference between the present constitution and the proposed is the latter's assignment of sole legislative power in academic affairs to the Faculty. All subsidiary differences proceed from this fundamental one. Since we believe that this abrupt departure from a long-standing tradition of the academic world is unacceptable, we do not find it useful or, indeed, practicable, to give a point-by-point analysis of the proposed document. We have therefore concentrated on reasons why we cannot endorse the philosophical basis of the proposal.

II. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

(A) First of all, it is not at all clear to us that there is at this time a mandate from the Faculty at large to replace the present constitution. The impetus for a complete replacement, we
understand, came entirely or almost entirely from a group within the Senate, acting within their prerogative, of course, but without apparent grassroots solicitation from the Faculty at large. According to our information, a recent poll of the Faculty on the question, undertaken by the Senate, achieved only a 20% response. Of this 20% replying, those in favor of the revision and those opposed to it were roughly evenly divided. Thus it appears that, of the several hundred faculty polled, about ten percent definitely favor the proposed revision; about ten percent are definitely opposed; and about eighty percent do not feel strongly enough even to answer a questionnaire.

(B) Our second general observation is that the present constitution and Faculty role is far more typical of the situation prevailing throughout the academic world than that envisioned by the proposed version. Although our investigations are limited, we are persuaded that most, indeed, nearly all, well-established institutions define faculty and administrative roles much as we presently do: that is, with the Faculty as an important partner in the academic endeavor, aiding and advising in policy making, but with final responsibility and authority vested in the President of the institution and his representatives. We go so far as to say that, if one excepts the University of South Carolina, whose faculty organization seems to have been a model for the one proposed here, we know no large institution which reserves sole de jure legislative powers in all academic matters to the Faculty. And while the University of South Carolina is an estimable institution, we are not certain that its academic stature or its tradition of faculty governance is of an order to constitute a compelling endorsement.

The more compelling circumstance, on the contrary, is that as best we can tell, most institutions with long histories of influential faculty participation in university government define faculty and administrative roles much as our present constitution does.

We believe that before any new constitution is considered, and before any extensive revision of the present document, many questions need to be resolved concerning present Faculty-Administration relationships. Do most Faculty really feel that only under a brand-new constitution can their legitimate aims in University governance be achieved? Is the present constitution so inherently faulty (despite its typicality) that a satisfactory working relationship between Faculty and Administration cannot be achieved under its aegis? Is the Clemson milieu so nearly unique that a constitution typical of most other universities cannot serve it? Are the real or alleged difficulties in present Faculty-Administration relationships owing to a weakness in the constitution or to imperfect human relations? If the latter, would a new constitution serve to remove difficulties, or perhaps even exacerbate them?
A Note on Faculty-Administration Relationships

It is safe to say that every member of this Committee is convinced beyond question that a University Faculty should -- indeed, must -- have an influential voice in university governance, not merely in academic policymaking, but in most other aspects of operation as well. As administrators, we seek to implement this principle in operating our departments, and we recognize that we would ignore or discount faculty views only at our peril.

We think it simplistic, however, to assume that a new constitution would inaugurate an era of mature faculty governance and harmonious faculty-administrative relationships. The language of a constitution seems less critical than a high level of competence, good will, mutual respect, and cooperation in both sectors. Faculty must realize that de jure and de facto authority do not necessarily accompany each other, and that in confrontation the administration has the heavier artillery, no matter what a faculty constitution says. Administrators are obliged to realize that the faculty have real expertise in university operation and that their counsel cannot safely be ignored. Above all, communication between the two segments of the University must be conducted with civility, tact, and decorum -- notes which have not been universally in evidence.

In our deliberations we have examined constitutions of several other institutions with long histories of faculty participation in governance. We will refer here specifically to only two. At the University of North Carolina, where faculty influence in all phases of operation has been extremely strong for many decades, the constitution specifically empowers the Faculty "to consider reports from -- and to make recommendations to -- the Chancellor, faculty committees, departments, colleges, schools, institutes, and other units of the University, and the Faculty Council." At Yale, despite powerful de facto influence, the de jure basis for such power is so shaky that a Yale dean recently told one of us that he was not certain that a faculty constitution even exists. Rather, he said, the spheres of influence are defined by a long tradition of faculty participation, and the legal authority, if indeed there is one, consists, like the British constitution, of a long series of understandings and precedents. It is more nearly an "atmosphere" than a legal instrument. This is, in our opinion, an ideal state, and, we venture, exists wherever faculty governance is truly effective.

III. LEGISLATIVE POWER AND ADVISORY POWER

As noted earlier, the sticking point in the proposed version is the section of the preamble which would confer upon the Faculty "legislative authority in all matters pertaining to the standards of admission, registration, requirements for and the granting of degrees, the curriculum, instruction, research, the educational policies and standards of the University, and academic requirements for extracurricular activities..." that is, in effect, all academic matters.
We find a number of difficulties inherent in the concept of vesting the Faculty with sole legislative authority in academic matters, particularly if only the Board of Trustees could veto their legislation. We also find a great many questions to be answered and agreed upon even if the concept were accepted.

(A) The Matter of Accountability. As faculty members ourselves, we know that a university faculty is an amorphous group of many kinds of individuals, not a monolithic entity. We like to think of ourselves and our fellow faculty as professional, objective, disinterested, idealistic pursuers of truth. We also tend to think of ourselves as uniformly competent, at least when we are arguing for our prerogatives. Realism, however, bids us accept that faculties and administrations alike are made up of the competent and the incompetent, the unselfish and the selfish, the reasonable and the unreasonable, the honest and the less honest. Administrators, however, can be made directly and individually responsible for their decisions, can be disciplined, shorn of authority, even readily removed. But how and by whom is a faculty of a thousand to be disciplined or made accountable and responsible for its joint decisions? How is a Senate of thirty-five persons to be admonished? The answer, in our observation, is that there is no effective way it can be done. We cringe when non-academic people propose an analogy between the task of operating General Motors and the task of operating a university, but there is at least one point they have in common: Effective management requires that authority be accompanied by accountability. It is not sufficient to assume as an act of faith that a faculty of a thousand or a senate of thirty-five will consistently subordinate self-interest to university welfare, or that it will consistently be informed enough to see all situations clearly. No more faith is to be placed in administrators, to be sure; the difference is that when an administrator is overcome by venality or for any reason muffs his job, both the Faculty and his superiors are waiting to pounce upon him.

(B) Authority and Efficiency. Even if the concept of vesting sole legislative authority in the Faculty were acceptable, the proposed constitution in its present form would not serve. Present university governance, vesting actual authority in an administrative hierarchy and assigning faculty an advisory role, has grown up over a century of operation; the roles of president, deans, department heads, and faculty are clearly understood. If authority to make the rules in matters academic were suddenly shifted, it would be necessary to redefine all these roles in great detail. The proposed constitution gives no help in this regard. No one, without detailed definitions or a slowly evolving tradition, can know precisely what should be considered "pertaining to" the long list of areas in which the Faculty asks legislative authority. Are departmental operating budgets matters "pertaining to" Instruction, since paper and chalk must be purchased? Could a dean grant a substitution in a course of study? Could a department head make a rule concerning office hours, since this pertains to Instruction? Could the Vice President for Academic Affairs veto a proposed new curriculum on the grounds that it is not needed? Could he remove an incompetent dean? These and a thousand similar
questions have ready answers at present, but they would become unanswerable until a whole lexicon of definitions and a whole library of operating manuals could be built up. The proposed constitution offers neither definitions nor any apparatus for formulating them. It might be agreed that the Faculty would make policy and the Administration would carry it out; but the divided authority and the impossibility of a complete operating manual would produce an unhappy polarization and atmosphere of confrontation far worse than anything we know. Realism dictates, further, the assumption that the Faculty, like most other groups, would interpret the term "legislative authority" to favor its own views, that is, as broadly as possible, and that there would be a constant stream of confrontations to be settled by the Trustees.

(C) The Role of the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees is the policy-making body of the University. We feel sure they have never wished to involve themselves in day-by-day operating policies in the academic area, and we fervently hope they never will. Yet if they are to be the direct supervisors of Faculty legislation, as proposed, they will perforce become involved -- perhaps we should say embroiled -- in internal university disagreements to the extent that each Trustee will have to make himself an expert in all facets of the academic operation, and will have to commit an amount of time and effort to the job that would be overwhelming. The provision of the proposed constitution naming the Board of Trustees as the only agency that can veto a Faculty-made policy or institute a policy counter to faculty wishes is, in our view, totally unrealistic, in the first place, and totally unwise, in the second place. The President must have authority to operate the University, following broad guidelines set by the Trustees. The Board of Trustees cannot and should not be made into an administrative body.

IV. A COROLLARY OBSERVATION

We have a suggestion about procedure if in the future the constitution is to be revised or replaced. It might be better for a joint Faculty-Administration committee to try to ascertain attitudes, define problems of relationships, discuss remedies, reconcile differences in philosophy, smooth out rough spots, eliminate ambiguities, anticipate objections, and so forth, before revisions are officially presented for review and adoption. After all, administrators are also members of the Faculty and have as great a stake in faculty welfare and harmonious relations as any other faculty members. We are somewhat discomfited by our necessarily negative role. We do not feel authorized to re-write the proposed constitution, particularly since we are convinced that the present one, perhaps with some revision, provides an adequate apparatus for development of appropriate faculty participation in policy-making. Consequently, we can only find fault. If representatives of Faculty and Administration had collaborated from the beginning, difficulties might have been reduced.
The aspect of the proposed document which we deplore most is its projection and cultivation of an adversary relationship of Faculty and Administration. Aside from occasional passing gestures to University welfare, the dominant tone is that of a labor negotiation.

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

We are persuaded that adoption of the proposed new constitution in its present form would not be in the interest of the Faculty, the students, the Administration, the Trustees, or the University as a whole; that it would not automatically achieve its purpose of assuring the Faculty an appropriate voice in University affairs; that it would not promote harmonious relationships between Faculty and Administration but would on the contrary ensure confrontation and polarization; that it would not contribute to the efficient operation of the University but instead would create an unwieldy and ill-defined apparatus for academic policy-making.

We urge instead that Faculty and Administration work together (rather than separately) to examine the present role of Faculty in academic policy-making and to seek to enlarge it.

The Faculty, we believe, should pursue its de jure advisory role with pride, aware that even where faculty governance is strongest the advisory function is the rule rather than the exception; aware also that its collective convictions, appropriately formulated and forcefully expressed, can indeed exert a persuasive influence more powerful than any de jure legislative authority that could reasonably be hoped for.

Administration, likewise, has the obligation to exercise its authority with tact, responsibility, and restraint; to eschew paternalism; to realize and admit a responsibility to Faculty as well as to Trustees; to solicit and give heavy weight to Faculty views on all academic and most other University business; to consider seriously and sympathetically all proposals from the Faculty; and, when it feels it cannot follow Faculty advice, to explain its reasoning fully, promptly, and openly.

[Signatures]

*Dr. Steirer appends hereto a separate minority report of his own views.)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dean Hurst
FROM: William F. Steirer
RE: Minority Report: Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance

The following points illustrate my main concerns with the majority report previously submitted to you. I think it is important for me to emphasize that while I represented the Faculty Senate and the Faculty on this committee, nothing I say herein binds the Senate, the Faculty or any president of the Faculty Senate to the same opinion.

(1) In asking the committee to "study and make any appropriate recommendations concerning the proposed new constitution of the Faculty and Faculty Senate," I believe that you provided the committee with the opportunity to recommend compromise proposals that would help to bridge the gap that exists between faculty and administration expectations and interests in university governance. By interpreting the mandate given the committee so narrowly that only recommendations on the proposed constitution would be entertained, that opportunity has been lost. Indeed, the majority endorses (page 5) the notion that a joint Faculty-Administration committee should "try to ascertain attitudes, define problems of relationships, discuss remedies, reconcile differences in philosophy, smooth out rough spots, eliminate ambiguities, anticipate objections, and so forth before revisions are officially presented for review and adoption." Although the majority obviously believes that the committee cannot act in this way at this time, I disagree. It is precisely to do those things that the majority says must be done by some Faculty-Administration committee, that this committee was called into being.

I embrace the idea of forming joint Faculty-Administration committees to discuss issues of university governance. Because no opportunity for fruitful discussions between faculty and administration should be passed up when the appropriate time is reached. But the appropriate time for such discussion is at the point when the Faculty Senate has developed a document ready to be presented to the Faculty for satisfaction (as in this case).

(2) At several points the majority has declared its confidence in the present faculty constitution and has suggested that no mandate for change of that constitution exists among the faculty. The source for that belief seems to be the abortive referendum on the Constitution and By-Laws conducted in February of 1978. On that occasion the issues that provoked controversy and prompted negative feelings among faculty were all By-Laws provisions,
a. removing the vote from faculty members serving as academic administrators;
b. excluding instructors from the ranks of faculty; and
c. reapportionment questions.
Those controversial provisions have since been dropped, but the By-Laws are not the problem here.

The preamble of the Constitution (the critical area where the philosophy of legislative power for the faculty is expressed) has been approved by the Faculty Senate on six separate occasions with no more than one dissenting vote at any time. The earliest occasion was October, 1977, the most recent, February, 1979. That the Faculty Senate, the only representative body of the Faculty, in the past two years has overwhelmingly endorsed the principle of "legislative authority" in academic matters is clear. That endorsement must be considered as the only significant representative of faculty opinion that is known on a continuing basis.

(3) It is true that at present no "crisis" exists in the area of Faculty participation in university governance, but the lack of such a "crisis atmosphere" offers an opportunity to discuss philosophical differences in an atmosphere where reason and light can prevail. But the lack of a "crisis" does not mean that reasons for a fuller and more comprehensive role for faculty in university governance do not exist.
a. Some university councils and committees do not meet for years at a time. What appears on paper to be an adequate mechanism for Faculty participation, in practice does not materialize. This past year, for example, the Research Council, the Extension Council, the Landscape and Site Development Committee, and the History and Archives Committee never met. The Affirmative Action Committee met once, for the first time in three years. Several of those councils and committees that do meet are totally ineffectual, having been given little to do -- the University Planning Council is a case in point. Responsible Faculty members who look forward to serving their colleagues and their University in an effective manner become frustrated by the inaction.
b. On several occasions in recent years the Faculty Manual has been breached for reasons that to faculty indicated how little regard is given to Faculty participation in University governance. While the administrators responsible for those decisions obviously thought that their reasons were good and compelling ones, Faculty Senators did not agree. Indeed, the critical point here is not that the Faculty Manual was not observed on these occasions, but that Faculty opinion was not solicited in the present constitutional system.
c. The apparent and steady erosion of Faculty perogatives vis-a-vis that of students has made many Faculty members doubly concerned about the role that they are playing and should play in university affairs. Faculty members believe that they constitute the most important part of the University but see no evidence that other components of the University acknowledge this. The Gator Bowl ticket allocation disturbance of 1977 bears this out. The lack of a specific faculty allocation for Gator Bowl tickets was deemed an insult by faculty members and crystallized the feelings of frustration, resentment and anger that had been suppressed.

The frequent use of the term "employees" to describe Faculty angers many (as my mail after the R. C. Edwards Endowment Fund campaign shows), for it seems to demonstrate a lack of sensitivity for the faculty's feelings of professionalism and uniqueness.

d. These feelings of frustration, resentment and anger that have surfaced on certain occasions have been nowhere more obvious than in Faculty attitudes toward the Presidential Selection Process and the solicitation for the R. C. Edwards Endowment Fund. Faculty members are suspicious of administration intentions, wary of administration actions and fearful of retribution should they fail to act in appropriate ways. I do not share these attitudes and have tried vigorously to combat these attitudes during the past year. The fact remains, however, that such attitudes are prevalent and must be confronted. Full participation by faculty members in the ongoing policy-making processes of Clemson University is certainly one way, and in my opinion the most effective way, of combatting such divisive notions.

(4) It is, indeed, over the question of how much participation the faculty should and must have in creating and initiating policy ("making policy") that the most controversy has arisen. The words "legislative authority" have been particularly upsetting to the majority of the committee and other administrators because to them the words apparently suggest that exclusive power would rest with the Faculty. Actually, the only power that "legislative authority" confers is the power to make policy regarding academic matters subject to the veto by the executive branch of the University -- the academic administrators -- and subject, as well, to the ability of the executive branch to interpret and execute the policies established by the Faculty.

What is being sought is the exclusive authority to initiate and create policy, not the power to impose policy or the power to enforce policy. That power to initiate and create policy would only apply to academic matters. In other matters pertaining to faculty welfare the Faculty asks only for the power to recommend and review which is nothing more than what the Faculty now possesses.
(5) The majority of the committee describes the proposed constitution as one which would leave those responsible for making policy unaccountable for their decisions. Quite to the contrary, the proposed constitution would make those making policy more accountable than ever before because they must accept the consequences of their decisions in a way that is not now possible. Certainly under the present mechanism for faculty participation, accountability is notably lacking. The Faculty does not elect representatives to University councils and committees, and while college deans do appoint Faculty members to those councils and committees, they point out that they have no control over their appointees. What is created, therefore, is a set of people who are not accountable to anyone. There should be no room in a system of University governance for participants who are accountable to no one. The proposed constitution would change that by making all participants responsible to those who select them.

(6) The majority of the committee states that all roles at Clemson are clearly understood (page 4). I do not believe this. The roles played by deans, department heads and Faculty in University governance are constantly changing, being subject as they are to varying and shifting individual interpretations. It seems as self-evident to me as the opposite apparently does to the majority that the only thing certain about how roles are defined within Clemson's system of governance is the uncertainty of the definitions. I might add that in the proposed constitution no effort is made to present such definitions because it was felt that a constitution where broad governmental responsibilities and jurisdictions are outlined was not the appropriate place to define specific roles.

Another objection that the majority of the committee cites is the need for new operating manuals and "whole lexicons of definitions" to be produced under the new constitution. To the best of my knowledge such manuals and lexicons exist now only in the minds of administrators and are functional only in so far as individuals agree to interpret positions similarly and to act in concert. Nothing, therefore, would be lost by asking all parts of the system of governance to reinterpret and redefine their participation in that system.

I certainly agree that faculty members would interpret "legislative authority" to favor their views, for the proposed constitution does not aim at changing human nature. But as I understand Clemson's faculty, there exists no monolithic "faculty" viewpoint on any academic matter. The confrontations that would be likely to surface would occur among faculty members of different disciplines, departments and colleges. But that is as it should be. Faculty members have a substantial vested interest in the academic program of Clemson - in fact, the most substantial vested interest - and should, therefore, have the primary responsibility for confronting issues and resolving conflicts within the academic program.
(7) How typical among American Universities Clemson’s present system of University governance is, I do not know, but I do not think that this is particularly important. We are especially, and justifiably, proud at Clemson to explain how unique we are as an institution. It is fitting that an institution proud of its unique heritage and mission create a system of governance which is suited to its own needs and people. I think that in the proposed constitution we have done that and the significant issue is how well the system established under that constitution will function at Clemson University.

(8) The majority observes that "in confrontation the administration has the heavier artillery, no matter what a faculty constitution says." While this is an unfortunate choice of words because of the images of raw power that is evoked, it is probably an accurate assessment of the situation that now prevails at Clemson. It prevails precisely because de jure and de facto authority do reside in the same hands. The new constitution could not alter the manner in which de facto authority is exercised. Faculty members after all, have other duties as important as making policy and otherwise being involved in governance while administrators have a primary concern with implementing policy and exercising authority.

To deny this would be to deny the obvious. What the proposed constitution would accomplish, therefore, would be to place the faculty in a position where de jure authority would be shared constitutionally with administrators (who as noted earlier would continue to possess the veto power) while the nature of de facto authority would be little changed.

(9) The majority of the committee feels that the proposed document projects and cultivates "an adversary relationship between Faculty and Administration" and that "the dominant tone is that of a labor negotiation." Nothing could be further from the intent of the Faculty Senate in promoting the proposed constitution. Rather than creating an adversary relationship, the proposed constitution would help to bring about a new feeling of harmony and cooperation between Faculty and Administration by providing the Faculty with the opportunity to be responsible participants in University affairs. Adversary relationships are most likely to occur when a disproportionate amount of power rests with one party so that "in confrontation the administration has the heavier artillery ...." The qualities that the majority describes in the last paragraph (page 6) do not negate the imbalance of power that the Administration now holds and end the danger of creating an adversary relationship in the present circumstances.

I fail to see how "collective convictions, appropriately formulated and forcefully expressed, can ... exert a persuasive influence more powerful than any de jure legislative authority that could reasonably be hoped for." (page 6) I have never known any group to prefer de facto authority over de jure, or to fail to desire to legitimize the power that they hold or hope to hold. Persuasion in no way can substitute for authority.
(10) With the acceptance of this constitution as an integral part of the system of governance at Clemson University, the Faculty would assume the kind of responsibilities in academic affairs that their training, inclinations and experience has prepared them to assume and that as full and equal participants they are entitled to assume. With the assumption of these responsibilities, faculty members will be able to offer their expertise and talents to the University at a level and in a way not previously possible to the mutual advantage of all. Subordinate participants, as faculty have been encouraged to view their role in the present system, are relatively reluctant to accept the responsibility for new ideas and programs. This waste of talent would be remedied by making Faculty members full partners in the operation of the academic side of the University.

All that Faculty members desire is to receive the opportunity to serve Clemson University in the capacities that their training, inclinations and experiences make possible. The proposed constitution would provide that opportunity and enable the University to use the services of 900 plus Faculty members more effectively and more meaningfully.
Revision

The Constitution of the Faculty
of Clemson University

Preamble

No less than its predecessors, the modern institution of higher learning is a guardian and interpreter of intellectual tradition. It is upon the competence, integrity, and devotion of its Faculty to professional ideals that the University must depend for success.

In order that this Faculty may more fully and effectively serve the University by participating in the establishment of policies, procedures, and practices, the Faculty, subject to the review of the Board of Trustees by whom these powers are delegated, shall possess legislative authority in all matters pertaining to the standards of admission, registration, requirements for and the granting of degrees, the curriculum, instruction, research, the educational policies and standards of the University, and academic requirements for extracurricular activities, and shall possess the power to recommend and review any item which affects Faculty welfare and appears in the Faculty Manual.

The Faculty may delegate certain of these powers and other powers to the Faculty Senate and to University Councils and Committees composed of faculty members elected by the appropriate departmental and collegiate Faculties. The faculty members serving in those capacities shall exercise the delegated legislative powers necessary for achieving the objectives of those councils and committees.

Article I

The Faculty

Section 1. Membership

The Faculty of Clemson University shall consist of the President of the University; the Dean of the University; the deans and directors of the colleges and schools; department heads; professional librarians; the teaching, research, and extension faculty with rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor; and such other members as may be duly elected as provided for in the By-Laws.

Section 2. Functions

The functions of the Faculty shall be to exercise legislative powers in academic matters; to be concerned with matters affecting the welfare of the corporate body and individual members; to approve candidates for degrees; to delegate those powers it chooses not to exercise directly to its Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate; to determine such other University councils and committees it deems necessary to carry out the mandates of this Constitution and to delegate the powers needed for the operation of these councils and committees; to receive reports from the Faculty Senate of its actions; to approve new members as provided for in the By-Laws; and to act on any other matters brought before it by the Faculty Senate or any faculty member.
Section 3. Officers

The officers of the Faculty shall consist of a chairperson and a secretary. The chairperson shall be the Dean of the University, or, in his absence, the President of the Faculty Senate. The Secretary shall be the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, or in his absence, a person appointed by the Chairperson.

Section 4. Meetings

Meetings of the Faculty shall be held prior to each commencement except the August one, and at such other times as deemed necessary by the Chairperson. Special meetings may be called by the Faculty Senate, ten percent of the Faculty, or the Faculty members of any University council or committee acting unanimously.

A simple majority of the Faculty shall constitute a quorum.

Article II
The Faculty Senate

Section 1. Definition

The Faculty shall elect from among its members an executive committee to be known as the Faculty Senate.

Section 2. Membership

The Faculty Senate shall consist of those members elected by the Faculties of the colleges and schools as provided for in the By-Laws.

Any member of the Faculty of a school or college shall be eligible for membership in the Faculty Senate excluding those with primarily administrative functions. For the purposes of this Constitution, the professional librarians shall constitute the Faculty of a school.

Section 3. Purposes

The Faculty Senate represents the Faculty of Clemson University in its negotiations and relationships with the administration of the University; acts as the primary advocate for Faculty interests at Clemson University, and promotes the welfare of the Faculty and its individual members.

Specifically, the Faculty Senate acts:

1. To protect the rights of faculty members to legislate academic policies and practices on the departmental, collegiate and University levels.
2. To recommend and review academic policies and practices on the University level.
3. To recommend and review any item which affects Faculty welfare and appears in the Faculty Manual.
4. To serve as a primary forum for the redress of Faculty grievances.
5. To recommend and review all matters concerning the working conditions and general welfare of the Faculty.
6. To promote and assert the Faculty position on issues of general interest within the University community.
The President of the Faculty Senate shall make an oral annual report to
the Faculty at the May meeting and a written report at the same time. Special
reports shall be made as necessary to keep the Faculty adequately informed.

Section 4. Officers

The officers of the Faculty Senate shall consist of a President, a Vice-
President, a Secretary and a Parliamentarian. The President, Vice-President
and Secretary shall be elected from among the members of the Faculty Senate as
provided for in the By-Laws. The President shall appoint the Parliamentarian
from among the members of the Faculty Senate.

Section 5. Committees.

The standing committees of the Faculty Senate shall be:

1. Nominating and Credentials Committee
2. Executive Committee
3. Welfare Committee
4. Academic Affairs Committee
5. Policy Committee

Special committees of the Faculty Senate may be appointed by the Nominating
and Credentials Committee or by the President of the Faculty Senate with the
consent of the Faculty Senate.

The composition of the standing and special committees and duties of the
former are provided for in the By-Laws.

Section 6. Meetings

The Faculty Senate shall hold one regular meeting each month at a time
determined by the Executive Committee. The schedule of the meetings for the
year shall be announced by May 1, through appropriate channels. Special meetings
of the Faculty Senate may be called by the President at any time with the approval
of the majority of the Executive Committee.

Except for executive sessions, all meetings of the Faculty Senate shall be
open to any member of the Faculty. Such visitors may be invited by any member
of the Executive Committee to participate in particular discussions. The
Faculty Senate may go into executive session by simple majority vote of the
members present.

Any member of the Faculty may present any problem or suggestion to the
Senate for its consideration, provided the member notifies the President of the
Faculty Senate at least one week prior to the meeting.

A simple majority of the elected members of the Faculty Senate or their
alternates shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of all business, ex-
cept the election of Faculty Senate officers and the amending of the Constitution
or By-Laws. For these two exceptions, two-thirds of the elected members only
shall constitute a quorum.
Article III
Councils and Committees

Section 1. Definition

University Councils and Committees are established as deemed necessary by the Faculty to provide an effective means for Faculty participation in University governance, and are essential to the achieving of faculty interests.

Section 2. Membership

University Councils and Committees established by the Faculty are generally composed of faculty members, with such student representation and administration ex officio membership as may be desirable to further the purposes of the council or committee. The Faculty reserves the right to specify the method of selection of Faculty representatives to such councils and committees, and to delegate legislative authority only to such councils or committees composed in accordance with its wishes. Three principles shall govern the composition of such councils and committees: (1) Each College or School directly affected by the actions of the council or committee shall be represented by one faculty member; (2) The Faculty Senate shall be represented by one Senator where it deems desirable for liaison purposes; and (3) Faculty representatives shall constitute at least two-thirds of the council or committee membership.

Section 3. Chairman

The chairman of each council and committee shall be elected from the members at the first meeting of the year. The chairman shall arrange the agenda, appoint sub-committees, and call meetings as needed.

Section 4. Meetings

The chairman of each council and committee shall appoint the time and place of each meeting as needed. Except for executive sessions, all meetings of any council and committee shall be open to any member of the Faculty.

Section 5.

Nothing in the previous sections shall be construed as preventing the Faculty from taking such steps as are deemed necessary to protect Faculty academic and welfare interests so long as collegiate and departmental prerogatives are observed.

Section 6. Implementation

The Faculty will upon the acceptance of this Constitution direct the Faculty Senate to evaluate, and if necessary reorganize, the structure of existing councils and committees. Certain councils and committees may be judged by the Faculty Senate not to be of a Faculty nature and therefore not covered by Article III, Section 2. Until that evaluation and reorganization is completed the present structure will be retained with the present members serving the remainder of their terms.
Article IV
Rules of Order

The Faculty, the Faculty Senate and the councils and committees of the University shall conduct all parliamentary procedure in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order.

Article V
Amendment

The Faculty may amend this Constitution at either of the scheduled meetings prior to commencement during the regular school session or at any meeting called for that specific purpose. Approval shall be a two-thirds majority vote of the members present. A proposed amendment may be brought before the Faculty by either of two methods:

1. A proposed amendment accompanied by the signatures of at least ten percent (10%) of the members of the Faculty may be submitted in writing to the Dean of the University no later than one month prior to the Faculty meeting at which the amendment will be considered. The Dean will then publicize the proposed amendment at least three (3) weeks prior to the meeting, OR,

2. A proposed amendment may be submitted by at least ten (10) members of the Faculty to the Faculty Senate at a regular meeting of that body. The Faculty Senate must vote upon the proposed amendment no later than the fourth meeting following submission. A simple majority vote of the Faculty Senators present is required to forward the proposed amendment to the full Faculty. An approved amendment must be presented in writing to the full Faculty at least ten days prior to the Faculty meeting at which the amendment will be considered.