I. CALL TO ORDER
President Dyck called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY
President Dyck welcomed Provost David Maxwell, whom he had invited to discuss the Instructional Productivity Formula (Attachment A.) To begin, the Provost gave two caveats about the state spending formula. First, such formulae are political documents and much of the content does not rest on any objective cost studies. The formula is designed to keep universities from fighting each other on the floor of the legislature. It reflects historical allocations, as tested or checked against the preceding three to five years' allocations. It is tested at the university-wide level, despite the fact that it is constructed at lower levels. The Provost can show everyone where the numbers came from but asked that they not expect too much. The second caveat is that the first differences are much more meaningful than the magnitudes. In other words, the changes and the
reasons for these changes are the important things to look at when studying the allocations over time.

The Provost then took the Senate through the Instructional Productivity Formula (IPF.) It follows the South Carolina formula for appropriations to state universities, which is basically student credit hour driven, on a nine month basis. It is important to look at the changes in instructional costs as opposed to the appropriations themselves.

The Provost noted some problems in the formula. With "R", the 25% research credit for the preceding year's grant income is actually a 20% return from the state because of a later revenue step which requires the University to produce 20% of its own money. Also the University never gets full formula funding.

The Provost referred to Table 2 in the document "South Carolina Commission on Higher Education 1986-87 Appropriations Formula for Continuing Operations" (Attachment B) to explain how the ratios for section II 2 in the IPF are determined. These student/faculty ratios do not represent the actual situation. They began artificially although they do trail reality. In section II of the IPF, the number of FTE professors stemming from the number of students derived from the number of credit hours results in
the appropriations for the ith unit. Again the Provost stressed that only changes not magnitudes should be noted.

Section III of the IPF measures the change in instructional productivity. It is a measure of the purely financial and operational side of what is happening to a unit.

The Provost's Office is trying to work out an incentive program using this formula. There is another part to the formula needed to determine bonuses, which the Office does not yet have data to support, because there is little or no existing data as they go back in time.

President Dyck asked for an explanation of the 1-20 (instructional faculty salaries) and the 1-30 (research faculty salaries) accounts and their use. The Provost responded that the number of professors technically should come from 1-20, but that the University views research faculty as faculty and uses it in calculations. Appropriations from the state do not differentiate between the two and the University can make decisions from the department level on up about what percentage of time is spent in research without influence from the state.
The Provost said that as soon as a defensible bonus system is developed, the Δ IP will be monitored for each college and there will be an incentive -- augmentation in budget -- for units with the most change. Senator Madison asked if the Commission on Higher Education ratios will be adjusted to fit reality and the Provost said no. Madison asked if there will be a way to weight the Δ IP over time, for units that may, for example, have consistently been operating at peak efficiency. The Provost indicated that this was the problem with the formula and that a table had not yet been built to solve it.

Senator Snelsire asked how the quality of instruction would be measured so that there will be no decline. The Provost said that there was no way to measure quality. He knows, however, that we cannot afford a 15:1 university-wide student/faculty ratio. Over history, Clemson has had a 16:1 or 17:1 ratios and no one suggested then that quality had been lowered. Other equivalent universities have such ratios with good quality instruction. Clemson's challenge is to raise the ratio and not affect quality. Senator Calhoun asked how programs such as the Honors Program will be protected. The Provost said that there is a separate quirk in the formula for honors funding.
Senator Polk asked if there was any research available about accepted norms in class size in certain disciplines. The Provost reported that a few years ago, Dean Schwartz conducted a survey of Clemson department heads and discovered that class sizes were actually lower than department heads' ideals.

President Dyck asked how the artificial student/faculty ratios used by the CHE could be changed and if there was any desire among Group 1 universities to do so. The Provost replied that they would have to be changed one at a time after presenting a strong case. Any effort otherwise would be self-defeating and cause political problems. President Dyck also asked if the 24 and 18 hours is not excessive for masters and PhD students, especially if this figure is for only nine months. The Provost responded that there was not enough use of research courses. He then said that much of what he had been saying was true for summer school if multiplied by .6, but not all.

The Provost then discussed the chart "Commission on Higher Education 1986-87 Formula for Clemson University" prepared by L. W. Martin, 7/28/86 (in Attachment A.) It identifies how to split the colleges and student credit hours against HEGIS codes and then goes through the first four steps of
the formula. Again the Provost asked that not much value be placed on the absolute magnitude of the figures and said that they would need several years of data to determine changes.

Concern was again expressed by the Senators about the student/faculty ratio, Senator Nowaczyk noting that, using Martin's chart, it would figure at 19:1. The Provost said that the University does not support that ratio, although the CHE might. Senator Polk noted that an increase to a 17:1 ratio would be one of 16% and asked how long this was expected to take. The Provost responded that if it occurred rapidly, the University could pick up $2 million of the $5 million it will be short next year. This is not possible, but we need to start raising the ratio immediately because financially next year will be rough. Not all areas of the University need to raise the ratio, but there are courses that could bear higher ratios.

Senator Birrenkott suggested that the cap on enrollment be lifted or otherwise all changes will have to be internal. The Provost replied that enrollment is actually drifting upward. Expansion ought to come in graduate areas, but money is needed up front for that. It is true that the University will need not to fill positions, etc., for internal changes.
The Provost then discussed "Net Instructional Cost 1986-87" (final page of Attachment A.) He said that looking at the relationship between colleges and seeing changes over time were again important. Just because the expenditures exceeds the formula, it should not be concluded that they should be equal; column 2 will generally be smaller than column 3.

President Dyck commented that with the need for emphasis at the graduate level, that the ratios were unrealistic. Senator Mullins asked if the productivity in administrative areas was being examined. The Provost said they and also auxiliaries were being studied to see if they are doing the best they can do.

President Dyck asked how faculty should communicate their suggestions. The Provost responded that they could speak to him at any time. He reminded the Senate that he is more familiar with the situation in Columbia and at the CHE and asked that faculty not try to deal directly with the CHE.

Senator Nowaczyk asked what a dean in an average college should be doing to increase effectiveness. The Provost responded that the crucial economic variable is class size. A dean should look honestly and carefully at increasing class size without
affecting quality. Look at multi-section courses and at cutting or offering more infrequently upper division electives.

President Dyck asked the Provost to comment on the "Budgeting and Planning Guide Manual: Budget Assessment" (Attachment C.) The Provost said that he had not devised this, but that it was an attempt to go back to something approximating a base, although not exactly zero-based. The rationale behind it is to cut more than the amount needed to return to Columbia and to use the difference to aid University-wide programs, and to force reordering of priorities in colleges.

President Dyck thanked the Provost for speaking to the Senate.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes of the October 14, 1986 meeting were approved as corrected.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. Policy: Senator Linvill gave the report
   (Attachment D.)

B. Research: Senator Birrenkott gave the report indicating that the Committee had met twice. The first meeting was a wrap up discussion on SDI
policy and overhead. They are starting to consider the Emerging Technology and Marketing Center and the Clemson University Research Foundation (CURF) and met to discuss these issues with Stan Nicholas, B.E. Gilliland, the Office of University Research Advisory Board, and selected faculty members. The Committee will also be looking at the CHE Task Force on Excellence's report and seeing how it's research program compares with President Lennon's plan.

President Dyck noted that the second meeting was an important one given the fact that there had been minimal faculty input about the CURF until this meeting. Departments and colleges need to think about the value of the Foundation to faculty members in assisting them to do research and then communicate with Birrenkott or Nicholas. Senator Birrenkott said that President Lennon had attended the meeting and spoken in favor of the research program. Lennon also said that he had received comments about the quality of undergraduate education and stated that quality must be maintained and the total thrust of the University must not be skewed. The Committee may possibly have recommendations at the next meeting.
C. Scholastic Policy: Senator Nowaczyk gave the report (Attachment E.)

D. Welfare: Senator Calhoun read the report (Attachment F) and passed out copies of the Fall Semester 1986-87 Faculty Salary Report (Attachment G.)

E. Ad Hoc Committees:
Fine Arts: Senator Nowaczyk reported that the Committee was finalizing their report and should have it by next month.

F. University Commissions/Committees:
Telecommunications: Senator Madison gave the report (Attachment H), noting that the committee had been formed by V.P. Larson and had two faculty representatives. He requested that the Senate supply him with their comments and suggestions, indicating that if additional telecommunications services are needed, there will have to be a strong campaign for them because of budgetary restraints.

Scholarships and Awards: Senator Calhoun reported that the Committee had met to consider a list for Who's Who in Colleges and Universities and had added a few names. There are two Rhodes Scholar candidates on campus and one alumnus who is a
Graduate Studies and Research: Senator Hedden said that the Committee discussed the graduate degree curriculum form, GS-2, and intend to suggest that it be made optional for students if the curriculum is published in the catalog. They discussed but reached no decision on the time limit for receipt of a PhD. They would like to make it more uniform, discussing a six year period after becoming a candidate, with the requirement that qualifying exams be retaken at the end of that period if the PhD was not complete and the candidate wished to continue. Senator Hedden would welcome comments and suggestions on this issue.

Senator Birrenkott said that the Committee had not mentioned a problem with 800 level courses, which was, however, discussed at the last President's Council meeting. A policy had been discussed but never actually passed, requiring that there be eighteen hours of 800 level courses in a masters program. The Graduate School says that it was passed but will not be implemented. The issue has been remanded to the Committee on Graduate Studies for further discussion.
President Dyck commented on some of the items in the report. He noted that the Advisory/Executive Committee meeting with President Lennon (Item 8) had been profitable and that results were forthcoming in the areas of governance and the quality of undergraduate education. The Ad Hoc Committee to look at the commission structure (Item 12) resulted from this meeting, with a membership of Joe Mullins, chair, Senators George Carter and Clay Hipp, and David Senn and Jerry Reel. There is also a related resolution under new business about better communication with the deans. The Provost's memo (Attachment A) desiring faculty input on the IPF and today's meeting with the Provost is result of that meeting, as well as President Lennon's comments at the Research Committee meeting mentioned above. President Lennon also wrote President Dyck asking that the Senate consider an award or reward to recognize quality instruction. This letter will be given to the Welfare Committee for consideration.

President Dyck commented on Item 11. Senator Nowaczyk said that a past president of the Faculty Senate had said that the mandatory use of student evaluations of faculty was a violation of an agreement made between Dean Hurst and the Faculty Senate that teaching
evaluation would not be mandatory.

President Dyck noted that V.P. Larson would be meeting with the Advisory/Executive Committee on November 13 to discuss the Budget Assessment (Attachment C; Update Item 3.) They hope to find out how faculty can become more involved in planning for the assessment.

The Deans have approved the Continuing Education proposal (Attachment J; Update Item 4), but asked that it go to the faculty for review. President Dyck asked that the faculty consider two features: 1) the need for faculty to have quality control and 2) the problem of the potential for credit courses to sneak in -- TV courses, for example. This should be discussed at the department level.

President Dyck commented that the Senate's reception for the Board of Trustees (Update Item 7) will be scheduled for sometime in January. He hopes that a discussion of governance will also take place at this time.

VI. OLD BUSINESS
There was no old business.

VII. NEW BUSINESS
Senator Birrenkott introduced Resolution 86-11-1
(Attachment K) and moved for adoption. The motion was seconded. He stated that this stemmed from a discussion at the Advisory/Executive Committee meeting about how to improve faculty communication with the deans and department heads. Senator Linvill suggested a friendly amendment to add the word "regular" in the third "Whereas" and the "Therefore." Senator Hedden said that Forestry and Recreation Resources holds no regular meeting but that he would agree with the resolution. Senator Birrenkott said that it should serve as a friendly reminder to deans who may not have thought of it. Senator Calhoun noted that it also resulted from a question asked by President Lennon about the deans' knowledge of Faculty Senate activities when the President met with the Advisory/Executive Committee. The resolution passed unanimously.

Senator Huey presented the Ad Hoc Committee on the Planning Board's recommendation on selecting faculty representatives to the Facilities Planning Committee (Attachment L) and moved acceptance. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The resolution passed unanimously and will be sent to the Faculty Manual Committee and through channels to the V.P. for Business and Finance.
Senator Nowaczyk presented the proposal for restructuring the Appeals and Admissions-Exceptions Committees (Attachment M) and moved adoption. The motion was seconded. He explained the background, which had been discussed in past Senate meetings. He suggested that, if passed, the proposal be forwarded to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies for their next meeting and then let the Appeals and Continuing Enrollment Committee determine how to implement it. The resolution passed unanimously.

Senator Nowaczyk moved adoption of Resolution 86-11-2 on admission standards for summer institutes (Attachment N and background in Attachment O.) The motion was seconded. Considerable discussion followed. Senator LaTorre said that a discussion with Director of Admissions Mattox had seemed to indicate that the idea was to lower standards so that an increased enrollment would result, thereby allowing these institutes to survive. Senator Bryan stated that we are not lowering standards but merely bringing students in at a regular level to give them a glimpse of college life. Senator Reichenbach read a statement (Attachment P) submitted by a colleague in Nursing. Senator Nowaczyk responded to that statement by saying that this resolution does not address the issue of older students mentioned in the statement. The
mechanism for admissions is already in place; a committee could change the 15 hour limit to an 18 hour limit without creating a whole new policy.

Senator Linvill viewed this as a good way to support recruiting in some colleges. Offering a low level course brings prospective students to campus. Senator Huey said that he felt that it was bad to invite someone who will not be able to make it and then become discouraged. Senator Mullins agreed; a student who is a junior in high school may not be nearly well enough prepared, so if he is brought in early, he should have higher SATs. Senator Bryan noted that football players in these courses have worse scores than some of these special students. Senator Madison said that there was a need for academically mature, quality students in these programs. Because of the problem of immediacy, Senator Nowaczyk said that a Senate decision had to be made. The issue would be going directly to the President's Council. The resolution passed.

Senator Derr asked for the Senate's comments on suggestions from the Traffic and Parking Committee. She indicated that there are between 600 to 1000 fewer employee spaces than there are employees. Part of this problem results from employees who have more
than one car on campus at one time in use by spouse or child and from students, undeterred by tickets, who park in employee spaces. Senator Derr presented several options for discussion. To prevent an employee from having more than one car on campus at a time, a) only one decal could be assigned per employees to put on one chosen car which must be driven to campus or, b) all cars in an employee's family could be registered but only one, identified with a removable decal hung on the rearview mirror, could be an campus at a time. Only three senators supported having as many cars as the employee wanted on campus at the same time; the rest were opposed. There was some support for the single sticker, for another (as of yet undetermined) method, and for keeping the system the way it is, with slightly stronger support for the removable decal.

To keep students from parking in employee spaces, the Traffic and Parking Committee is considering raising fines for everyone and including an incentive/penalty system where if the fine is paid in x number of days, only 50% is due. If the fine is left until the next semester, 150% would be paid. Many students let their fines build up and have their parents pay them when the fines appear on the next tuition bill. This
suggestion met with a mixed response, which included additional suggestions for Senator Derr to take back to the Committee.

Because of the late hour, two items of new business -- a resolution on appointment of academic administrators and a resolution on an invitation to the NSF Director -- were deferred to the next meeting. Senator Mullins also passed out a resolution on graduation attendance so that Senators could consult with their constituencies before considering it at the next meeting.

VIII. INFORMATION

President Dyck noted that the Advisory/Executive Committee had decided to experiment and send out additional copies of the Senate agenda for placement in coffee rooms, etc. It is hoped that this will encourage communication about Senate issues.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margery N. Sly
Secretary

Senators absent: Baron, Daniels, Leap.

Alternates present: Sparks (for Baron), Kosinski.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Council of Academic Deans
FROM: W. David Maxwell, Provost
SUBJECT: Instructional Productivity Formula

Attached is the most recent version of the instructional productivity formula. Please send copies of this formula to each of your department heads and ask them to share this formula with the members of their departments. Any suggestions for improvement that faculty members may have would be greatly appreciated.

You will note that only the basic formula is included. The section on the distribution of the "bonus" is not included because we have not yet cleared up all the data problems involved.

Please emphasize to your faculty that instructional efficiency is only one aspect of our teaching effort. We are also concerned with the quality of this effort and with the overall relationship of the faculty in each department to their students. Efficiency is a concern, however, because it is becoming increasingly evident that our present ratio of F.T.E. students to F.T.E. faculty (approximately 15:1) is not one that we can sustain, given the level of support that we can expect from the State.

Thus we must take steps to improve this ratio. The challenge is to do so without a diminution of the quality of our teaching effort. I am confident that with the support of the faculty we can do so. Our history and the experience of other excellent universities suggest that a goal of 17:1 as a ratio is not unrealistic.
Please also assure your faculties that the "Second Century" program with its emphasis upon research and its relationship to economic development does not mean any lessened emphasis upon teaching. Teaching is and will continue to be our primary emphasis and we will continue to require documented evidence of teaching effectiveness as one of the criteria for tenure and promotion. Again we have a challenge that I am certain that our faculty can meet. To become an outstanding university we must greatly expand our research activity. In most instances this will actually increase the quality of the instruction that we provide. Our challenge, however, is to ensure that in no instances is this increased emphasis upon research detrimental to our teaching effort.

I am depending upon you and your department heads to gain the faculty support and involvement that we need in order to become both a more efficient and a more renowned university.

WDM/ep

Attachment

cc: President Max Lennon
    Vice President David Larson
Instructional Productivity Credit

I. Change in Net Instructional Costs

Let:
\[ x = \text{Faculty salaries on E & G instructional account (1-20)} \]
\[ y = \text{Faculty salaries on E & G state research account (1-30)} \]
\[ R = \text{Sponsored research expenditures} \]
\[ IC = \text{Net instructional costs} \]
\[ t = 1986-87 \text{ (Academic Year)} \]

Then, for the \(i\)th unit:
\[ (X_t - X_{t-1}) + (Y_t - Y_{t-1}) - .25(R_{t-1} - R_{t-2}) = IC_t - IC_{t-1} \]

Or, generalizing:
\[ \Delta X + \Delta Y - .25 \Delta R = \Delta IC \]

II. Change in Appropriations

1. Let:
\[ \text{SCH} = \text{Student credit hour production} \]
\[ U = \text{Undergraduate F.T.E.} \]
\[ M = \text{Master's level F.T.E.} \]
\[ D = \text{Doctoral level F.T.E.} \]
\[ u/g = \text{Undergraduate subscript} \]
\[ g-1 = \text{Master's level subscript} \]
\[ g-2 = \text{Doctoral level subscript} \]
\[ F = \text{Total number of F.T.E. students} \]

Then, for the \(i\)th unit the number of F.T.E. students is:
\[ (\text{SCH}_{u/g} + 30) + (\text{SCH}_{g-1} + 24) + (\text{SCH}_{g-2} + 18) = F \]

Or,
\[ U + M + D = F \]
2. Let:

\[ S/F = \text{Student-faculty ratio} \]
\[ P = \text{No. of F.T.E. professors} \]
\[ S = \text{Average salary of a professor} \]
\[ A = \text{Appropriations} \]

Then, for the \( i^{\text{th}} \) unit, the number of professors is:

\[ (U + S/F_u/g) + (M + S/F_{g-1}) + (D + S/F_{g-2}) = P \]

And, for the \( i^{\text{th}} \) unit, the appropriations are:

\[ P \times S = A \]

And, for the \( i^{\text{th}} \) unit, the change in appropriations, from one year to the next is:

\[ A_t - A_{t-1} = \Delta A \]

III. Change in Instructional Productivity

Let:

\[ IP = \text{Instructional productivity} \]

Then, for the \( i^{\text{th}} \) unit:

\[ (A_t - A_{t-1}) - (IC_t - IC_{t-1}) = IP_t - IP_{t-1} \]

Or, generalizing:

\[ \Delta A - \Delta IC = \Delta IP \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>HEGIS, CHP, UG</th>
<th>CHP, GR</th>
<th>CHP, GR</th>
<th>CHP, GR</th>
<th>CHP, GR</th>
<th>CHP, GR</th>
<th>CHP, GR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE SCIENCES</td>
<td>0200</td>
<td>3,361</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG SCI</td>
<td>0200</td>
<td>3,361</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO SCI</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH SCI</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE SCIENCES</td>
<td>0200</td>
<td>3,361</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>0400</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF EDUCATION</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>5,598</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>5,598</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF FORESTRY &amp; RECREATION</td>
<td>0400</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>25,429</td>
<td>23,486</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF NURSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORESTRY</td>
<td>0300</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS &amp; ECON</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>5,598</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF COMMERCE &amp; INDUSTRY</td>
<td>0400</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>0400</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ENG</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>4,851</td>
<td>4,294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>5,598</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLIED HEALTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF EDUCA</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>8,546</td>
<td>8,043</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SCI</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>8,546</td>
<td>8,043</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH SCI</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>20,502</td>
<td>16,535</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL SCI</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>17,415</td>
<td>13,349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TO ARRIVE AT FULL TIME EQUIVALENT FACULTY, DIVIDE EACH LEVEL OF FTE STUDENTS - by DISCIPLINARY FACTORS (ex. 21 Bio Sci, 16 Ag Sci, 19 Env) | 15.00 | 6.30 | 5.33 | 852,688 |
| MINIMUM CREDIT HOURS PRODUCED BY 30% | 13.00 | 6.30 | 5.33 | 852,688 |
| MAXIMUM CREDIT HOURS PRODUCED BY 24% | 15.92 | 15.92 | 0.09 | 1,098,90 |
| MINIMUM CREDIT HOURS PRODUCED BY 18% | 15.92 | 15.92 | 0.09 | 1,098,90 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL CREDIT HOURS</th>
<th>TOTAL FACULTY</th>
<th>TOTAL PAYROLL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23,947</td>
<td>9,417</td>
<td>8,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 25, 1986

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council of Academic Deans

FROM: W. David Maxwell, Provost

SUBJECT: C.H.E. Formula Data for 1986-87

Attached are some data prepared by Linda Martin and in which you should be interested. It was a difficult job that Linda did and it is the best data we have.

The final column is one "data point" that we intend to use in the "productivity" formula. If the records permit, Linda plans to construct this same analysis for several past years.

Incidentally, the heading "Fall 85" should be "Fall 84."

WDM/ep

Attachment

cc: Vice President David Larson
    Mrs. Linda Martin
MEMORANDUM

TO: Council of Academic Deans
FROM: W. David Maxwell, Provost
SUBJECT: Preliminary Computation of "Net Instructional Cost" for 1986-87

Enclosed is a preliminary computation of "Net Instructional Cost" (NIC) for 1986-87. You will recall that changes in this measure play an important role in our instructional productivity model.

Not too much should be read into the absolute magnitudes depicted. For example, it should not be concluded that the formula appropriation should be large enough to cover budgeted salaries. The relationship of the magnitudes within a given column are more meaningful.

Most meaningful will be the changes in "Net Instructional Cost" over time. When tables such as the attached are available for several years we will be able to construct this most meaningful measure.

With these caveats in mind the formula appropriations for faculty salaries (Col. 2) are also included to permit you to make other comparisons.

WDM/ep
Attachment

cc: Vice President David Larson
Mrs. Linda Martin
Mr. Al McCracken
Mr. Jim Roberts
### Net Instructional Cost (IC)

#### 1986-87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Formula Appropriation for Faculty Salaries*</th>
<th>Budgeted Faculty Salary Expenditure**</th>
<th>Formula Research Credit</th>
<th>Net Instructional Cost (IC)xxx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri</td>
<td>$1,357,341</td>
<td>$3,057,900</td>
<td>$523,641</td>
<td>$2,534,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>1,405,042</td>
<td>2,153,302</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>2,150,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ</td>
<td>1,706,340</td>
<td>2,036,632</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,036,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engr</td>
<td>4,313,124</td>
<td>7,154,781</td>
<td>542,740</td>
<td>6,612,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRR</td>
<td>675,917</td>
<td>1,035,747</td>
<td>118,273</td>
<td>917,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; I</td>
<td>3,917,885</td>
<td>5,633,776</td>
<td>103,515</td>
<td>5,530,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib Arts</td>
<td>4,287,039</td>
<td>5,303,540</td>
<td>5,194</td>
<td>5,298,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>650,464</td>
<td>1,194,308</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,194,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>6,510,848</td>
<td>8,692,517</td>
<td>474,381</td>
<td>8,218,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Step 4a of the CHE formula. Not offset by the revenue step, the adjustment for teaching assistants or for less than full formula funding. Does not include appropriations for instructional support, departmental administration, or academic support.

** Basic E & G unclassified and graduate assistant salaries budgeted for 1986-87. Does not reflect any budget cut.

xxx Column (3) minus Column (4)
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
1986-87 APPROPRIATION FORMULA
FOR CONTINUING OPERATIONS

The Appropriation Formula provides for equitable sharing of state
taxpayer support for South Carolina's public colleges and universities.
Realistic appropriations are computed impartially by using actual
enrollments, proven student/faculty ratios, uniform salary assumptions,
and justifiable average percentages to cover the agreed programs
(instruction, research, public service, etc.) of the institutions.

***********************
1. STUDENT CREDIT HOURS Use the number of credit hours produced, by
academic discipline, during the fall 1985 and spring 1985 semesters.
Include half credit for contact hours in physical education and
remedial courses unless credit hours toward a degree are awarded for
such courses. (See CHE Report 14) Use actual fall 1985 headcount
enrollment for medicine and dentistry.

2. FTE (FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT) STUDENTS
Divide undergraduate credit hours by 30
professional (Law) " " 28
master's level " " 24
and doctoral " " 18
to determine the number of FTE students to be taught.

NOTE: From Table 1 determine the appropriate Academic Discipline Table
2, 3, or 4 to be used in calculating steps 3, 4a, and 4b for your
institution.

3. FTE TEACHING FACULTY To find the number of FTE teaching faculty
positions required, divide the number of FTE students at each level
and in each academic discipline by an appropriate student/faculty
ratio.

4. INSTRUCTION
a. Compute the cost of teaching faculty salaries by multiplying
the FTE teaching faculty by peer group faculty salary average
for each discipline and level (plus improvements of 6% for
1985-86).
b. Multiply the cost of teaching faculty salaries for each
discipline and level by the corresponding peer group
instructional support percentage to obtain total cost for
instructional support.
c. a + b = total costs for instruction.

5. RESEARCH
25% of prior year sponsored research and non-general fund research
expenditures at your institution equals total costs for research.

6. PUBLIC SERVICE
25% of prior year sponsored public service and non-general fund
public service expenditures at your institution equals total costs
for public service.
7. **ACADEMIC SUPPORT - LIBRARIES**
   10% of total instructional costs (as determined in step 4c) to cover library acquisitions and operations equals total costs for academic support - libraries.

8. **ACADEMIC SUPPORT - OTHER**
   12% of total instructional costs (as determined in step 4c) and 12% of steps 5 (Research) and 6 (Public Service) equals total costs for academic support - other.

9. **STUDENT SERVICES**
   $150 - 1st 4,000 headcount students, $125 - 2nd 4,000 headcount students, $100 - 3rd headcount students, $75 - all over 12,000 headcount students enrolled fall 1984, plus $3 per student credit hour as determined in step 1 equals total costs for student services.

10. **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PLANT**
    a. For physical plant general services, use Formula I, Table 5.
    b. For building maintenance, use Formula II, Table 5.
    c. For custodial services, use Formula III, Table 5.
    d. For grounds maintenance, use Formula IV, Table 5.
    e. Add the actual 1984-85 expenditures for utilities (see Table 6 for definitions) x 1.0812.
    f. The sum of 10a through 10e equals total costs for operation and maintenance of plant.

11. **INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT**
    a. Sub-total steps 4c, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10.
    b. 15% of this total or $50,000 (whichever is larger) equals total costs for institutional support.

12. **UNIQUE COSTS**
    Funding to provide for unique costs and to respond to differences which exist among institutions because of different roles and missions, which are not provided for in previous steps, may be requested. Items included should be of such nature as to require subjective analysis and judgement. When requests for such items are included, they must be subjectively justified (to include how the item is unique, special or not included in previous components of the formula) and specific amounts of costs by program must be detailed as to personnel services, equipment and other operating expenses.

13. **STATE EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS**
    Use state employer contributions as calculated by State Personnel Division for personnel included in the programs funded by the Formula.

14. **COST OF EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL OPERATIONS**
    a. Add the amounts calculated in steps 11a, 11b, and 13. From this total, subtract the amount of teaching faculty salaries for academic discipline 2800, Military Science, computed in step 4.
b. Of the total number of FTE teaching faculty required, determine the proportion to be filled by teaching assistants. (Use the proportion on fall 1984 CHE Report 9, unless justification for a different proportion is presented). Multiply the number of FTE teaching assistants required by $X,XXX (difference between average salary of faculty other than teaching assistants and average salary of teaching assistants for fall 1984 for your institution), plus improvements of 5% for 1985-86. (See CHE Report 10)

c. Subtract the amount calculated in step 14b from the amount calculated in 14a. This is the total cost of educational and general (E & G) operations.

15. REVENUE TO BE GENERATED BY THE INSTITUTION IN SUPPORT OF EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL OPERATIONS.
   Multiply the amount calculated in step 14c by .19 (S.C. State .11, MUSC and USC School of Medicine .05). Multiply the resulting amount by 1.xxx (Where xxx equals the percent out-of-state students, at the undergraduate and first-professional levels only, enrolled in fall 1984). This is the total revenue to be generated by the institution for E & G operations.

16. STATE FUNDS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL OPERATIONS
   Subtract the amount calculated in step 15 from the amount calculated in step 14, and add the amount calculated in step 12. This is the amount of State funds required to support educational and general operations excluding summer school.

17. STATE FUNDS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT SUMMER SCHOOL
   Use the total number of credit hours produced for summer 1985, by discipline and level. Multiply by the faculty salary credit hour costs, by level and discipline, on table 7. Add the totals for each discipline. Multiply by .60. This is the amount generated for summer school.

18. TOTAL STATE FUNDS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT ANNUAL EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL OPERATIONS
   Add the amount calculated in step 17 to the amount calculated in step 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION GROUP</th>
<th>STUDENT/FACULTY RATIOS</th>
<th>SUPPORT PERCENTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U/G</td>
<td>G-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00 AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 FORESTRY</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 BUSINESS &amp; MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 COMPUTER &amp; INFORMATION SCIENCE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 EDUCATION</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 MEDICAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 PRACTICE TEACHING</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 ENGINEERING</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 FOREIGN LANGUAGES</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 SPEECH PATHOLOGY &amp; AUDIOLOGY</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 CLINICAL SCI-DENTISTRY</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 CLINICAL SCI-MEDICINE</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 NURSING</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 PHARMACY</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 MEDICAL</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 LAW</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 LETTERS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 GENERAL STUDIES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 LITERARY SCIENCE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 BASIC SCIENCE-DENTISTRY</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 BASIC SCIENCE-MEDICINE</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 MATHEMATICS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 MILITARY SCIENCE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 PARKS &amp; RECREATION HGT.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 PHYSICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 TEXTILE SCIENCE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 CRIMINAL JUSTICE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 PUBLIC AFFAIRS &amp; SERVICES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 SOCIAL WORK</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 FIRE &amp; APPLIED ARTS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIS CODE</td>
<td>DISCIPLINE</td>
<td>STUDENT/FACULTY RATIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>FORESTRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>COMPUTER SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>LIBERAL EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399</td>
<td>PRACTICE TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>FOREIGN LANGUAGES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>SPEECH PATH/AUDIO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>CLIN.SCI.-DENTISTRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>CLIN.SCI.-MEDICINE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>MIDWIFERY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>NURSING-D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>INCOME ECONOMICS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>LETTERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2499</td>
<td>GENERAL STUDIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>LIBRARY SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600</td>
<td>BIOLOGICAL SCI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2698</td>
<td>BASIC SCI.-DENTISTRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2699</td>
<td>BASIC SCI.-MEDICINE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>MATHEMATICS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2800</td>
<td>MILITARY SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>INTERDISC. STUDIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3010</td>
<td>ARTS &amp; REC. MGT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>PHYSICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4099</td>
<td>TEXTILE SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4301</td>
<td>CRIMINAL JUSTICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400</td>
<td>PUBLIC AFFAIRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4407</td>
<td>SOCIAL WORK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4450</td>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>FINE &amp; APPL. ARTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEMORANDUM TO: Vice Presidents, Deans, Department Heads, Directors

FROM: Max Lennon, President

SUBJECT: University Management: Budgeting—Analysis and Control

I came to Clemson because I believe this University is a great institution with an exciting future.

In managing the daily activities and administration of the University, you, and the faculty, shape and decide its future. Your plans, goals and vision of the future mark an exciting new era in Clemson's history, one which has already presented us with innumerable challenges and choices. At the same time, few situations requiring us to make decisions are simple or one-dimensional.

The South Carolina economy, like the nation and the world, is feeling and reflecting the effects of change, adaptation and restructuring. Difficult choices and decisions face every leader in this state, you included.

Even before I arrived in Clemson, I asked each academic area to examine institutional strengths and establish priorities for the University. In addition, as you know, leaders from both the public and private sectors came to campus to work with us in defining priorities and outlining strategies for action on them. Clemson's Second Century Plan was the result. I believe that the areas outlined in that plan are vital to South Carolina's -- and the nation's -- health, economic growth, security and quality of life. It is essential, therefore, that we do not allow our current fiscal difficulties to stop us from energetically pursuing those goals. Looking to the future, although we can assume a steady-state economy over the next several years, we cannot afford just to drift in times of such turbulence and change. The future will not just take care of itself; we must bend it in our direction.

I believe that we can continue to move forward with our goals and plans if we try to learn how to manage our operations more knowledgeably, more thoughtfully, more creatively. First, we must focus more intently on the major activities and goals of each organization. We need to examine and clarify the University's total resource base and determine how to improve the quality of our decisions and the integrity of our priorities. We will need to make difficult decisions about controlling costs while maintaining and developing programs of high quality. The budget assessment process outlined in this manual is designed to lead us in this direction.
I have found that oftentimes budgeting seems to carry a certain mystique. People imagine that one afternoon the executive administration sits down and decides how to divide the budgetary pie and allocates the University's financial resources when in reality most of those decisions are being made on a day-to-day basis. Each of us makes minor operating decisions without realizing that we may in fact be making major budgetary decisions. I would like to see the budget process reformed such that both administrators and faculty members will feel a sense of responsibility for the way their actions affect the entire budget process and the University. That is the only way he or she will feel in a position to help change the impact of the programs and activities he or she advocates. One thing is sure, the continuing impact of a series of across-the-board budget reductions will ultimately be detrimental to Clemson's most important programs. In the future, with your help in this assessment period, budget reductions must be differentially applied and must come through careful planning in order to minimize any further erosion of quality programs. The initiation of this process is designed to help us make sure that we make the best use of the University's scarce resources through selective reductions and reallocations.

Regardless of the financial roadblocks in this or future years, I am committed to helping you manage your organization more creatively and bolster morale by creating clear incentives to at least reward your organization's most productive, creative efforts. To accomplish this, I have directed Vice President David Larson and his staff to undertake a thorough, comprehensive University-wide budget assessment and analysis of all areas: Academics, Administrative/Institutional Support, Auxiliaries, Athletics, and our land grant public service activities (PSA). We must be better informed and prepared to look at everything and compare expenditures across organizational and functional areas.

Conducting this assessment will require your organization's time and effort over the next ninety days. However, I sincerely believe these steps are necessary in order to improve our budget flexibility and control, boost morale and increase our understanding and perspective on University-wide needs, resources and priorities.

Finally, as there are no easy, short-cut methods to successfully managing a complex research university in a constantly changing world, I urge your full cooperation, commitment and support in making this assessment period worthwhile for all of us.

ML: su
MEMORANDUM TO: Vice Presidents, Deans, Department Heads, Directors
FROM: David R. Larson
Vice President for Business and Finance
SUBJECT: Budget Assessment: Goals, Objectives, Procedures

In an effort to respond positively to the challenges that President Lennon and the South Carolina economy have presented to us, I have prepared this Budgeting and Planning Guidance Manual. The manual outlines the steps that I believe are necessary if we are to create incentives for progress, identify our priorities, and comply with state directives. At this point the manual is still in draft form and focuses on the budget assessment. Other sections -- such as those on Planning, Policies and so on -- are shown to indicate the conceptual framework of the final version that will be developed.

As President Lennon has said, the assessment period and steps outlined in this manual will be both time-consuming and at times difficult. I do not propose that it will offer any panacea for our current financial constraints. I believe, however, that in the end we will all emerge with a better understanding and appreciation of our operations and of University-wide needs and priorities. That in itself should facilitate our decision-making skills and development of plans and priorities. The draft of this guide has been prepared in anticipation of your questions and in an effort to facilitate two-way communications and understanding about both the assessment process and the University's resources, goals and priorities.

Given that the logical first step in undertaking any University-wide change is to determine first what we have and where we can go from there, the following assessment-period goals and objectives are offered:

- to determine information about our resources, prospects, and priorities for FY 1986-87 and FY 1987-88
- to establish incentives for better performance, sound budget management, quality teaching, and increased research activities
- to link our priorities meaningfully to University budgets
- having complied with mandated reductions, to be in a position to lift interim measures
- to facilitate contingency planning
o to establish policies and procedures as clear guides for improved management and to insure achievement of University long-range goals and objectives

o through widespread participation in the process, to facilitate a University-wide perspective and understanding of budgeting linked to planning

o to learn how to help faculty cope with bureaucracy and help remove regulation roadblocks

o to provide tools to consider and evaluate alternatives

o to improve communications between Business and Finance and other Divisions' faculty, administrators and staff members.

Again, this is a collaborative, participative process. It will require the involvement, cooperation, and commitment of all of you and your organizations. The process is designed to foster innovation and creative thinking by eliciting your ideas and suggestions for improving the University and the process itself. Since the approach outlined is as new to my staff as it no doubt will be to many of you, I ask that you bear with us patiently as we work through any process problems together.

As we seek to adapt to the changes of the times, we must remember that adaptation to change need not mean resignation in the face of reduced funding. More creative, entrepreneurial thinking about planning and budgeting will help prepare us to further productive ideas or ventures and deal with unexpected setbacks.

I am confident that with patience and cooperation together we can meet the challenges presented to us by this era and by President Lennon.

DL: su
PHASE I. PLANNING

(This section and its placement are intended to stress the importance of planning driving budgets and not the reverse. While incremental budgeting worked well enough during growth periods, in periods of financial uncertainty it defeats planning because people automatically base their plans on asking for more - although there is less. Budgeting becomes a better tool when combined with an effective planning process.)

SOME TOP MANAGEMENT ASSUMPTIONS:
(Others to be added as they emerge from the assessment process)

External
- The South Carolina economy will remain steady-state, depending upon the level of economic development activities.
- The funding situation for the state's higher education system will not improve or change much from its present level with the exception of program-oriented funding such as the Second Century or Excellence initiatives.
- Undergraduate enrollment will improve slightly while graduate enrollment will increase in line with emphasized research priorities.
- Competition for top students will continue.
- More adults and older citizens will seek Clemson's programs and services.
- Nationally, federal funds will diminish. At Clemson, Second Century Plan initiatives will increase federal funding for University projects.
- Private fund raising efforts will increase significantly over the next five years.
- Public policy changes will affect participation rates by blacks and minorities and increase the need to provide financial aid.
- Creative funding sources for facilities and programs involving the private sector and University land assets will become increasingly important.

Internal
- Designated Second Century projects -- in agriculture, engineering and basic science, marketing and management, quality of life and textiles -- will need priority state and University funding
- Incentive funds will be necessary to bolster faculty morale and to recognize and reward productivity
- As University-wide priorities are clarified, some will shift to higher or lower rankings and with them associated resources.

- Planning, budgeting and control functions must be closely integrated.

- Planning and budgeting decisions will be translated into a controllable form if they are to mean anything.

Further discussion on planning will be provided later.
PHASE II - THE BUDGET ASSESSMENT

Rationale:

The proposed Budget Assessment process will attempt to determine current institutional resources and priorities University wide by requesting and collecting information from all divisions and departments -- Academics, Institutional Support, Auxiliaries, Athletics, other revenue-producing areas, and PSA -- for past, current and upcoming fiscal years so that the President, Vice Presidents, and other appropriate members of the campus community can review and evaluate what the University's actual resources and alternatives are in order to evaluate, establish and accomplish University-wide plans and goals despite budget reductions and shortfalls.

Assumptions:

1. The process will permit an analysis of purposes, costs, and benefits
2. Alternative courses of action can be specified
3. The consequences of those alternatives can be identified and assessed
4. The process will improve the effectiveness of resource utilization
5. The involvement of managerial personnel at operational levels will eventually reduce the budgeting process, and
6. Successful application of the technique will result in better decision making, as well as suggestions for innovation.

Note: Auxiliaries, Athletics, and other revenue-producing areas such as Professional Development are asked to provide Profit and Loss statements for FY 1985-86, and projections for FY 1986-87 and 1987-88. In order to have a complete picture of the University, these areas are also being asked to comply with the budget assessment provisions, despite the distinctive, self-supporting nature of these functions. These distinctions will be given full consideration including the facts of fluctuating market factors, inflation and other circumstances.

Evaluation:

Once the information is received from departments, the Budget Office will prepare, for evaluation, appropriate decision packages on various budgetary issues. The evaluation process will provide for input from appropriate members of the campus community. In some cases separate management studies may be necessary in order to evaluate staff levels. Such management evaluations will utilize various tools such as benchmarks, peer comparisons and special studies.
PHASE II. A. THE PROCESS

The Budget Assessment process will be conducted by the administration with the assistance of Business and Finance staff.

STEPS AND TIMETABLE
FY 1986-87

October 29, 1986
Vice President Larson will distribute a draft of the manual, together with forms, instructions, and samples to each Vice President who will in turn see to the distribution to departments by October 31.

November 5-7, 1986
Meetings will be held upon request with Vice Presidents and their staff members to discuss the process and forms.

November 21, 1986
Completed Budget Assessment forms should be returned to Budgets and Planning from Vice Presidents. Previously, department heads will have forwarded completed forms to their deans and directors who will in turn have sent the forms, with cover letter, comments, and priorities to Vice Presidents for forwarding.

November 24-December 19, 1986
President, Vice Presidents and others, as appropriate, review decision packages.
GENERAL

Only Unrestricted funds should be considered when completing the enclosed forms, except for the supplemental information on Grants, Contracts and Other Restricted Funds. However, total FTE, including restricted, should be indicated where total FTE information is requested. FTE should be calculated in the same way it has been done in the past for budget purposes - such as 12-100 = 1.00 FTE; 09-100 = .75 FTE; 09 - 050 = .375 FTE.

CONTINUATION BUDGET REQUEST

These forms are intended to provide information needed in order to more adequately assess the budget needs of the current fiscal year 1986-87, and to collect information as to the minimum funding requirements, exclusive of inflation and pay increases, necessary in FY 1987-88 to continue (not to improve) current activities. Increases, needed to continue current activities should be included in amounts shown for FY 1987-88. For example, if a new position were added during 1986-87 and additional funds are needed to fund the position for the full year 1987-88, the increase should be included in the total requested for 1987-88. The continuation increases (amounts only) for 1987-88 should be carried over and shown on the Improvement Budget Request and given top priority among total increases requested. Continuation increases for 1987-88 should be explained on the appropriate continuation form.

A completely separate set of forms should be completed for Educational and General, and for Public Service Activities by the College of Agricultural Sciences and the College of Forest and Recreation Resources. All information concerning restricted FTE requested should be included on the Educational and General set of forms.

Personal Services

All unrestricted salaries and wages should be shown except summer school on the Personal Services Summary.

Definitions:

Unclassified:

Permanent - should include all salaries for unclassified personnel assigned to a permanent position number, such as 1903-0003, regardless of title of individual filling the position. Indicate according to undergraduate, masters and PhD programs as applicable.

Temporary - should include all salaries for unclassified personnel not assigned to a permanent position as indicated above -- those assigned to positions having a T as part of the unclassified position number such as 1503-T002. Indicate according to undergraduate, masters, and PhD programs as applicable.

Vacancies - include all permanent unclassified vacant positions.
Graduate Assistants:

Include all salaries for graduate assistants.

Classified:

Permanent - include all permanent classified positions, those budgeted to 0XXX.

Temporary - include the portion of the 3XXX budget level that is used for temporary positions of a classified nature.

Vacancies - include all permanent classified vacant positions.

Students - this should include the balance of the 3XXX budget which is not shown as classified temporary as described above.

Instructional Personal Services - include salaries budgeted or charged to instruction (1-20). Unclassified instructional personal salaries should be distributed between undergraduate, masters, and Ph.D. programs based on your best estimate of the percentage of time distributed between these programs. The distribution of FTE should be based on your best estimate as to the amount of time spent on various activities such as classroom teaching, laboratories, unrestricted research, etc.

SCH Produced - show student credit hours produced by undergraduate, masters and PhD programs and total for department each year.

FTE Instruction - include FTE related to salaries budgeted or charged to instruction and distribute according to undergraduate, masters and PhD programs.

Total Budgeted FTE - the total FTE should be shown in this column; include all functional categories; i.e. instruction, research, public service, etc.

Non-instructional Personal Services - include all salaries not shown in the column for instructional personal services.

Lump Sum Salaries - Do not include lump salaries and SCH's for off-campus or overload teaching on the Personal Services Summary or Faculty Workload Analysis forms. This information will be obtained separately if needed. Any extra pay for non-instructional purposes should be shown in the column for non-instructional salaries.

Supplemental Information - provides additional information on personal services. The distribution of FTE on the personal services faculty workload analysis form should agree with the total FTE shown on the Personal Services Summary form.

The FTE shown on the supplemental form for Grants, Contracts and Other Restricted should also agree with the amount of FTE shown on the Faculty Workload Analysis form for Grants and Other Restricted.

The amount shown for sabbaticals should represent the actual or expected pay out for
the year in which sabbatical is involved.

FTE and salary shown on the Personal Services - Grants, Contracts and Other Restricted form should be that portion sponsored by restricted funds.

**Travel**

Information needed and requested for travel should be categorized according to major purposes of travel, such as, professional development, off-campus teaching, field trips, research data collection, etc. Under each major purpose of travel, the name of individual traveling, destination, mode of transportation, and amount should be shown unless a meaningful summary can be provided. For example, individual trips to conventions should be detailed, but faculty making trips to teach in Greenville could be summarized as such. In cases where detailed information for travel in 1987-88 is unknown, estimate by major purpose using historical trends.

**Supplies and Other Expenses**

Supplies - under the category of supplies, general office supplies may be shown as a total amount for each year without providing details. However, a list of individual purchases exceeding $500 for general office supplies not purchased through Central Stores should be provided (attach to list). Information for classroom/lab and other supplies should be listed according to major type or purpose.

Printing, Binding, and Advertising - provide details, such as purpose, number of copies, total cost, of major types printing, binding and advertising. Copier cost may be shown as a lump sum; however, if the department owns a copier, specify annual volume and costs.

Telephone - costs should be shown separately for local service, long distance and equipment and installation.

Postage - indicate purpose and amount for each mail-out exceeding $500. Items under $500 should be grouped by purpose.

Maintenance and Repairs - describe each maintenance and repair exceeding $500 including purpose. List each maintenance agreement exceeding $500 and type equipment covered. Items under $500 should be categorized by purpose.

Dues, Subscriptions, and Memberships - List and describe purpose of each item.

Other Services - all expenses charged to the 6XXX budget category not specifically identified elsewhere should be included in this category. List details, purpose, amount, etc. for items over $500. Smaller items should be grouped by purpose. Do not include charges for computer services unless the cost is actually billed and charged as used, such as Auxiliaries and Public Service Activities.

**IMPROVEMENT BUDGET REQUEST**

These forms are intended to provide details and justification for increases requested which would improve activities currently conducted, or would add new
programs/activities.

Fiscal Year 1987-88

There is one basic form to be used for requesting increases for improvements. This form includes all budget categories and is very similar to that used the past two years for requesting increases. If additional space is needed, use additional sheets of the form. Net amounts by budget level for continuation increases requested on the Continuation forms should be carried over to the first page of the Improvements form so that the total increase requested for 1987-88 is reflected on the Improvement form. Justification for the continuation increases requested need not be repeated since it should be provided on the Continuation form. Priorities should be assigned to the increases requested with top priorities given to the continuation increases and lower priorities assigned to the improvement increases.

Equipment - a separate form is provided to request funding for equipment for 1987-88. The total amount of funds requested for equipment should also be shown on the basic form for Improvement requests.

Grant Matching - a list of matching requirements expected for the remainder of 1986-87 and a separate list of expected matching requirements for 1987-88 should be provided. No special form is required.

Repairs, Renovations, and Alterations - a list of major repairs, renovations, and/or alterations requiring special funding for 1987-88 should be provided. No special form is required.

Fiscal Year 1986-87

In cases of dire need, you may request additional funding for 1986-87. This should be done in a separate memo clearly explaining the need. This is not intended as an opportunity to repeat requests which were previously submitted but were not funded. Obviously, with an impending cut in state appropriations, any reallocations will be very limited for this fiscal year.

NOTE: Sample forms are provided in Appendix A. of the Budgeting and Planning Guidance Manual.
REPORT OF THE SENATE POLICY COMMITTEE

November 1986

The Senate Policy Committee met on 29 October and 5 November.

A discussion was held on the recent formation of a vice-provost position to oversee the computer center. Creation of this position involved moving responsibility from the Administrative Organizational Chart to the Academic Affairs Organizational Chart. Responsibility for filling positions on the Academic Chart resides in part with the faculty. A resolution has been forwarded to the Senate for its deliberation since the faculty were not involved in filling this new position.

A discussion was held on the merits of an Employee Suggestion Program. This program has been suggested for adoption by Clemson. Several questions arose during our deliberations that were forwarded to Mr. David Larson and Mr. Ray Thompson. Their answers indicate that all full-time university employees, faculty and staff are eligible to participate in this program. Suggestions will be reviewed by local committees and by local departments. The guidelines set forth by the state must be followed in order to award monies for adopted suggestions. Although costs to administer such a program here at Clemson have not been determined, benefits are expected to far outweigh costs of the program.

The productivity formula suggested by the Provost was discussed. We await additional information on the formula before further discussions are held.

A short discussion was held on items included on the general faculty meeting agenda. The practice of presenting awards from clubs and organizations such as the AAUP has been questioned. We are contacting the Provost for additional information on this practice.
The committee met on October 28th. The two items of discussion included the proposal for restructuring both the appeals committee (for academic suspension) and the admissions exceptions committee and a response to the proposed admissions policy for special admissions. Both of these items resulted in recommendations from the committee to the Senate for its consideration at the November meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald Nowaczyk, Chair
To: Larry Dyck, President, Faculty Senate
From: Richard J. Calhoun, Chairman, Welfare Committee
Subject: November Meeting
Date: November 11, 1986

The Welfare Committee met on Thursday, November 6. The main business was a scheduled meeting with Jeff McNeill, Assistant Vice President for Development, to discuss aspects of a capital fund drive associated with the Centennial. Christine Klugh substituted for Jeff McNeill at the last minute. A lengthy discussion took place. Since we have been given the charge of looking into the recommendations of the Governor's Task Force for Excellence, members of the Welfare Committee stressed their belief in the importance of a drive on the occasion of Clemson's centennial to assure both endowments to meet specific needs and to make available unrestricted funds, especially if we are to match successful drives at other universities in the Southeast and to compensate for what we do not receive in state appropriations. The suggestion was made that we seek an endowment fund to supplement professorships was made in the belief that 20 $20,000 supplements for professorships could be as valuable in retaining and securing professors as 4 $1,000,000 chaired professorships could be in enhancing Clemson's reputation. A discussion ensued on the importance of faculty input into development plans since there seem to be no provisions.

As an aftermath of this meeting the Welfare Committee would like to recommend that the President of the Faculty Senate investigate means for an officer or committee chairman of the Senate to meet with an appropriate committee or officers of the Office of Development to provide faculty input.

The concern of the Advisory Committee for the future health of the undergraduate program was discussed in the context of the highly publicized report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. We decided to recommend to the President of the Faculty Student that the Commission on Faculty Affairs look into the recommendations of this report and into how it might provide ideas for inspection of our own undergraduate programs.

The chairman has received a report on faculty salaries for 1986-7. If you have any questions, please ask.
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SALARY REPORT

Fall Semester 1986-87
(Nine-Month Basis)

This report includes:

College-wide Maximum, Minimum, Median, and Average Salaries, by sex, for Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors;

Also, University-wide Maximum, Minimum, Median, and Average Salaries for the above ranks;

Also, Maximum, Minimum, Median, and Average Salaries, by sex, for Professional Librarians.

Note: For occupancy classes containing less than five members, no information is given other than the number in the class. This number is shown in parentheses but is not included in the calculations. Part-time and Visiting faculty have been excluded.

Office of the Provost
November 1986
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>MAXIMUM $</th>
<th>MINIMUM $</th>
<th>MEDIAN $</th>
<th>AVERAGE $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF AGRICULTUR</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>64,294</td>
<td>29,791</td>
<td>41,663</td>
<td>42,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTU</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58,642</td>
<td>36,920</td>
<td>42,952</td>
<td>44,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF COMMERCE A</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>31,320</td>
<td>47,410</td>
<td>49,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF EDUCATION</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48,524</td>
<td>37,302</td>
<td>44,132</td>
<td>42,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ENGINEERIN</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73,500</td>
<td>33,495</td>
<td>50,700</td>
<td>51,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF FOREST AND</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50,455</td>
<td>34,409</td>
<td>41,715</td>
<td>42,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF LIBERAL AR</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54,737</td>
<td>30,332</td>
<td>38,795</td>
<td>39,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF SCIENCES</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66,276</td>
<td>31,603</td>
<td>47,608</td>
<td>47,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF AGRICULTUR</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTU</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF COMMERCE A</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF EDUCATION</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF LIBERAL AR</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF NURSING</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF SCIENCES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56,219</td>
<td>32,833</td>
<td>37,809</td>
<td>42,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>44,689</td>
<td>45,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Maximum $</td>
<td>Minimum $</td>
<td>Median $</td>
<td>Average $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45,061</td>
<td>27,070</td>
<td>32,638</td>
<td>32,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40,144</td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td>34,651</td>
<td>34,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Commerce A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47,850</td>
<td>32,499</td>
<td>40,120</td>
<td>40,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39,300</td>
<td>27,256</td>
<td>31,886</td>
<td>31,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50,500</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>40,053</td>
<td>40,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Forest and Natural Resources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38,320</td>
<td>27,588</td>
<td>32,355</td>
<td>32,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39,842</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>29,887</td>
<td>29,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Sciences</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45,900</td>
<td>23,763</td>
<td>33,038</td>
<td>34,829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Female**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Maximum $</th>
<th>Minimum $</th>
<th>Median $</th>
<th>Average $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37,657</td>
<td>26,628</td>
<td>31,032</td>
<td>31,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Commerce A</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32,097</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>29,531</td>
<td>29,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Forest and Natural Resources</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32,124</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>28,460</td>
<td>28,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Sciences</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<p>|       |       | 50,500   | 23,763    | 37,930   | 34,068    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>FACULTY #</th>
<th>MAXIMUM $</th>
<th>MINIMUM $</th>
<th>MEDIAN $</th>
<th>AVERAGE $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32,720</td>
<td>22,527</td>
<td>27,603</td>
<td>28,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Commerce A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44,950</td>
<td>26,280</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38,600</td>
<td>32,960</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>35,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Forest and</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28,342</td>
<td>23,591</td>
<td>25,931</td>
<td>25,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts (2)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29,851</td>
<td>20,296</td>
<td>25,154</td>
<td>25,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Sciences (4)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>22,419</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Commerce A (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Forest and (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts (21)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29,610</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>23,946</td>
<td>24,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Sciences (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>44,950</td>
<td>20,296</td>
<td>28,549</td>
<td>29,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>MAXIMUM</td>
<td>MINIMUM</td>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF COMMERCE A</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF EDUCATION</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF FOREST AND</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ART</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25,760</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>17,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF SCIENCES</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF COMMERCE A</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF FOREST AND</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ART</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17,760</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>16,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF NURSING</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF SCIENCES</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25,760</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>16,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARIES</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>MAXIMUM</td>
<td>MINIMUM</td>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>26,168</td>
<td>16,761</td>
<td>22,733</td>
<td>21,720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>26,168</td>
<td>16,761</td>
<td>22,733</td>
<td>21,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

Report to the Faculty Senate

The University's ad hoc Telecommunications Committee met on October 24, 1986. The purpose of this committee is to review telecommunications needs at Clemson for the next several years. This committee is to offer recommendations to David Larson, VP for Business and Finance.

Background:
The University's current contract with Southern Bell will expire in 18 months. The University's options are:

1. Renew the contract at the current level of ESSX service,
2. Renew the contract with expanded (or decreased) ESSX service,
3. Buy a PBX with services equivalent to those provided by the ESSX system.

Considerations:
It appears that the main function of this committee is to provide the business office with input on what we perceive to be the telecommunications needs at Clemson for the next several years. The business office needs input on:

1. Are the current voice services adequate?
2. What are the University's needs for data transmission, and can this be best done using the telephone system, or a separate transmission medium?
3. What other communications needs exist on campus, e.g. is video transmission required?

The business office is currently considering the purchase of the PBX as a potential means of saving money. If money can be saved by buying a PBX that provides services equivalent to our current voice services, the business office will decide if the savings should go into enhanced telecommunications services, or into other University needs.

If the University decides to renew its lease with Southern Bell, the level of service and the features that will be provided will need to be negotiated.

In any case, a decision will have to be made within the next 6 to 12 months. Please forward to me any input you, your department, or your college might have on this subject. Without such input, the administration will assume that the current level of service is adequate for now and for several years to come.

Submitted by:
Wayne Madison
Department of Computer Science
419 College of Nursing Building
Telephone - 5862
1. Through the Strom Thurmond Center and the College of Education the university has established a National Drop-out Prevention Center (K-12). I have asked that the chair of the Scholastic Policies Committee, Ron Nowaczyk, serve as the Faculty Senate Representative to the university-wide committee concerned with the center's development and campus-wide interactions.

2. The Business and Finance area has proposed the implementation of the State of South Carolina Employee Suggestion Program within all areas of the university. I have asked the policy committee to review the plan as it pertains to faculty and to bring their recommendations to the Senate at the November meeting.

3. Although the university is unable to finance a new position for a director of a Wellness Program, the College of Nursing has in place a skeletal program related to wellness. I have asked the Welfare Committee to review this matter and to recommend a Faculty Senate position.

4. Over the next two years the Personnel Division will be sponsoring short courses (two three-day sessions) in Management Training. If faculty members see the course as a potential benefit to their work, they should inform their dean to reserve a place in a session.

5. The chairs of all standing committees were provided a copy of the Report of the Task Force on Excellence. The latter is a response to the AVA report provided to the Commission on Higher Education. Among the topics addressed in the report are enhancement of research capacity of the public universities, endowments for university professorships and establishment of a merit scholarship program for talented young South Carolinians.

6. I have been asked to serve on an ad hoc committee to study the fee structure of the Student Health Service and the Student Health Insurance Plan. Please inform me if you have a perspective you wish to be reflected.
7. The advisory committee recommended that the following senators serve as the faculty representative on the Physical Facilities Committee until a permanent representation process is established: Joe Mullins, Martin Davis, Cecil Huey. The ad hoc committee on the Planning Board will bring forward a recommendation on a process for regularizing the process of faculty selection.

8. The Advisory/Executive Committees of the Faculty Senate met with President Lennon for about one and a half hours on Thursday, October 23. The focus of the discussion was twofold. First, the topic of university governance at both the commission level and the department level was considered. Second, the advisory committee discussed how undergraduate education and basic research fit within the new emphases of the university. The chairs of standing committees and college representatives to the advisory committee will discuss the details of the meeting with interested senators.

9. Provost Maxwell will send (or has sent) a memorandum to college deans. They are asked to encourage department heads to discuss the "Incentive Plan for Increased Instructional Productivity" with their faculty. As senators, we should make sure this process occurs.

10. I have been working with the Ray Thompson, Director of Personnel, on a strategy to petition the State Insurance Office once again. We continue to look for ways to make the Anderson Health Plan available to university employees that live in the city of Clemson or its Pickens county environs.

11. The Report on Teaching Evaluation was discussed at the October 31 meeting of the President's Council. The report was accepted by the Council with the understanding that the Commission on Faculty Affairs would investigate two related matters. First, they are to explore ways for assisting departments with the development of statistically valid Instruments for Student Evaluation, should they choose to abandon the Clemson University Student Evaluation Form. Second, the Commission is to review and recommend university based faculty development activities to assist faculty with their teaching effectiveness.

12. The Advisory Committee is forming an ad hoc committee to evaluate the commission structure currently associated with the President's Council. Joe Mullins will chair the committee with additional representation to be announced.
1. Senator Nowaczyk is serving as a faculty representative on the search committee for a new Director of Housing. If you have input, contact him at X-4984.

2. The Provost's 1986-87 survey of Faculty Salaries has been completed and is enclosed. The information also will appear in the Newsletter.

3. A copy of the Budget Assessment is included for your review. Please share the document with interested faculty and provide your substantive input to members of the Senate Executive/Advisory Committee. The latter group will be meeting with Vice-President Larson to discuss the document and the role of faculty in the budget assessment process and associated planning phase and review of decision-packages.

4. The ad hoc committee on Continuing Education submitted its report (enclosed) to the Council of Academic Deans. The Council accepted the committee's recommendations but requested time to allow collegiate faculty to review the proposal. Please encourage discussion within your College and Departments. Comments are required prior to the December 1 meeting of the Council.

5. Discussions on the use of the Anderson Plan HMO by university employees who reside in either the city of Clemson or its Pickens County Environ are continuing. Good news may arrive this week.

6. Senator Birrenkott has officially assumed the responsibilities of Chair of the Faculty Senate Research Committee. Senator Jenny now represents the College of Agriculture on the Senate's Advisory Committee.

7. The Senate will hold its annual reception for the Board of Trustees at the time of the Board's January meeting. Other activities (e.g. discussion of governance) may be associated with the event.
MEMORANDUM

Report

TO: 
Members, Deans' Council

FROM: 
Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
Vice Provost

RE: 
Continuing Education

The Ad Hoc Committee on Continuing Education has concluded its agenda. It recommends:

1. That a University-wide Division of Continuing Education be created;

2. That the administrator in charge be titled the Director;

3. That the Director report to the Provost;

4. That the Definition and Scope be adopted; and

5. That two models, one decentralized and one centralized, be delivered to you with the note that the committee prefers the decentralized model 6 to 1 with 2 absences.

rbb

Enclosures
Purpose

Service is central to the mission of Clemson University, South Carolina's land-grant university. As one way of fulfilling that service mission, Clemson strives to offer continuing education of the highest academic quality to its many constituents. To facilitate the effort, Clemson University has established the Division of Continuing Education and Conferences.

Scope

Clemson University accepts its responsibility to offer continuing education to state, national, and international constituencies. All forms of instruction, for example, conferences, seminars, television, and workshops, are used. Although the focus is primarily non-degree credit, where collegiate faculty and the academic administration choose otherwise, degree credit courses may be delivered through the continuing education media. Federally mandated and funded programs, however, are excluded. (e.g. Cooperative Extension). All other non-degree programming should fall under the purview of Continuing Education.
MODEL A
A PROPOSED MODEL FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

In developing a continuing education program, Clemson University must recognize its responsibility as a land-grant university with a mandated public service mission. The continuing education model supported in this proposal provides for a balance between administrative functions of the Continuing Education Center and programming responsibility within the Colleges.

In developing a model which accounts for a full spectrum of continuing education programs, the following factors must be included:

1. Maintain Clemson University's public service mission.

2. Provide a centralized Office of Continuing Education Center operation and support services. Services can then be provided to the Colleges through that Office on a contracted basis recognizing that all programs do not require all services (i.e. a program contracted for a specific agency would not require registration services, marketing services, bulk mailing, and so forth, yet it may well need space in the Continuing Education Center and hence be charged for that).
3. Allow program responsibility to remain within the Colleges. This does not preclude the Office of Continuing Education from pursuing market drive programs nor does it preclude the Colleges providing continuing education within their own discipline areas.

4. Continuing Education directors within each College will serve in an advisory capacity to the Office of Continuing Education but will report to their individual College Deans.

5. Overhead charges would be scaled to be consistent with the mandated missions and responsibilities of individual units. These charges would assist in the support of University Continuing Education while leaving the fiduciary responsibility and some programming incentives within the Colleges. It is imperative to control costs of continuing education programs so as to remain competitive with other universities seeking the same programs. This is especially critical for programs offered for government and voluntary agencies as opposed to the corporate entity. Programs will be self-supporting.
Model B

1. Clemson University establishes a Division of Continuing Studies with all administrative responsibility for all non-degree credit programs except those excluded in the scope statement at Clemson.

2. The collegiate continuing education directors will be members of the Continuing Education division. This administrative structure will ensure that continuing education is self-supporting.

3. Programmatic responsibility belongs both to the College of Continuing Studies and the disciplinary colleges. Execution of programs is accomplished through the College of Continuing Studies.

4. Revenue division (profit) will be used to encourage disciplinary colleges to work aggressively for the programs.
SOME OBSERVATIONS ABOUT CENTRALIZATION VERSUS DECENTRALIZATION

1. The student rather than the discipline is the center of attention.

2. Continuing educators must adjust the curriculum and learning environment to the adult student's needs.

3. Successful continuing education programs are kept relatively free of academic and administrative rules and regulations in force throughout the rest of the university or college. Continuing education must create, modify, and abolish courses and even curricula. Changes must be made quicker than other academic units to meet educational needs.

4. The continuing education staff must have a system of beliefs that might be called an ideology. The concept of public service and financial solvency must be of paramount importance.

5. The ideal continuing education teacher is described as a scholar with a significant record of research who is interested in teaching adults and has the ability to do so. If unable to recruit such an individual, continuing education should recruit a practitioner who knows the subject and can teach it to adults, rather than a scholar who is an indifferent teacher.

6. Continuing education should seek to involve the university faculty in teaching and other programming activities, but at the same time avoid the kind of faculty control that could transform the special educational programs for adults into a topic of the regular degree programs.

7. The professional staff in continuing education are not academicians, theoreticians, or research scholars. They should be men and women oriented toward action who believe that their primary function is to develop programs that integrate theory and practice, that bridge the gap between academic and real life.

8. In the NUCEA Journal Continum, L. S. Berlin reviewed the University of Michigan Continuing Education program in an article called "Diversity Without Design, Continuing Education at the University of Michigan". He counted 38 identifiable continuing education
agencies at Ann Arbor and characterized continuing education at Michigan as "organized chaos; anarchy; diversity without design; institutional mindlessness adrift in a sea of overlap, duplication, and competition". He raises the question whether continuing education can be successful within a university's value system, which places a high value on academic unit autonomy and the central role of faculty. He makes the following observation "can we assume that the values of autonomy and faculty democracy, which are especially appropriate and necessary for campus (residential) teaching and research, are also equally appropriate and necessary for outreach activities. I think not. I would argue that a far more rational design would call for integration, consolidation, and centralization of much of the university's continuing education activities."

9. In the centralized continuing education unit, the student rather than the discipline is the primary concern. Adult student needs dominate in the development of curriculum and design of the learning environment. In decentralized units, however, subject matter is paramount and campus schools and colleges tend to expect that adult students will adjust to the existing curriculum and to the traditional learning environment.

10. In a decentralized operation, continuing education units are too distant from each other, psychologically as well as geographically to be able to profit from shared experiences.

11. Centralized continuing education units would help universities and colleges meet the challenges posed by growing continuing education clientele.

12. Centralized continuing education units are more likely to serve the needs of the total institution rather than parts of it.

13. If the top administrators of a university decide to give high priority to continuing education, the best programs are more likely to develop in a centralized unit where the continuing education influence is dominant.

14. Decentralized forms of organization are more costly. Four or five continuing education promotion and
publicity sub-units are more costly than one department. The offices of four or five deans and directors of continuing education located in various colleges would be more costly than one dean's office. The centralized continuing education office, by taking its direction from the adult learner and building on the strengths of the university as a whole, is less likely to take a partial view or base actions on what Alfred North Whitehead called "the imperfect categories of thought derived from one profession."

15. A decentralized mode is ideal for serving a full-time student body pursuing undergraduate and graduate degrees, but the needs of the adult student will never be served that way. Everything for the adult student will be done out of the side pocket because the main mission of the individual colleges and their deans and faculty is not, and never will be, the adult student.
Academic Services

Donald H. Brown
Vice President

Continuing Education

Charles L. Elliott
Director

Continuing Education Business Office

Richard A. Wells
Nancy C. Parsons

Purdue-Model

Secretary
Joyce M. Mussie

Receptionist
E. Mildred Saathoff

Administrative Services

Harley Griffith
Director

Conferences
Gay F. Lee
Director

Secretary
Cindy L. Walker

Conference Coordinators
Mark E. Ocker
Susan T. Umberger

Conference Coordinators
Thomas L. Robertson
Melvin L. Looft
Margaret J. Wright

Conference Coordinators
Barbara B. Meyer
Kathleen F. Hyman

Conference Coordinator
Eugene W. Broecker

Secretary
Jill M. Geheb

Insurance Marketing Institute

Eugene W. Broecker

Assistant to the Director
Suzan L. Smith

Secretary
Linda J. VanLaere

On-Campus Special Classes

Donald L. Nona
Director

Secretary
Anna L. Gibson

Restaurant, Hotel, and Institutional Management Institute

Director
Assistant to the Director
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Secretaries
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M. June Smith
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Kathleen E. Tipton
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Secretary
Anita A. Schumpf
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Shirley H. Smith
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Southern Extension Classes
James J. Wagner
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Charles S. Elliott
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Henry A. Wadsorth, Jr.
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Robert M. Showalter
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Philip H. Smith
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Wilbur G. Lowellen
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Nina E. Bell

Engineering
Jerome W. Blank
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Mr. Broecker spends half-time as director, IMI, and half-time as Conference Coordinator

** Suzan L. Smith spends quarter-time with IMI and 3/4 time with Media-Based Programs.

*** School Representatives are primarily staff members in their respective schools.
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English Language Program: Berkeley/San Francisco
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Resolution of the Faculty Senate 86-11-1

WHEREAS: The Clemson University administration has affirmed the importance of faculty input; and

WHEREAS: This faculty input is to begin at the department and college level; and

WHEREAS: Only one college, Agricultural Sciences, has a policy of including its Advisory Faculty Senator in all regular meetings between the Dean and Department Heads; and

WHEREAS: It is a function of the Dean of each college to ensure faculty participation in all collegiate matters;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT

each college dean, or comparable academic administrator, extend an invitation to the Advisory Faculty Senator from that college to attend any and all regular meetings between the Dean and Department Heads.
Committee Recommendations

Procedure for Selecting Faculty Representatives to the Facilities Planning Committee

The Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Planning Board recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt the following procedures for selecting faculty representatives to the Facilities Planning Committee.

1. Have two of the three positions be filled by the current vice president and the immediate past president of the Faculty Senate.

2. Elect a faculty member from the College of Architecture to fill the third position. This representative should have professional credentials in the areas of architectural design and urban planning. The term would be for three years. Nominees for the position would be chosen by the Advisory Committee in consultation with the senate representatives from the College of Architecture.

Rationale

Since the senate president is already designated an ex-officio member of the committee, having the current vice president and the immediate past president fill two of the other positions will result in an orderly progression of terms on the committee. More importantly, because of their other responsibilities of office, these individuals would likely be aware of all forces bearing on issues before the committee. As a consequence, they should serve as effective and informed advocates of academic interests.

Given the function of the Facilities Planning Committee, the need for a representative from the College of Architecture is obvious. An individual having the professional credentials suggested above should provide effective representation from the viewpoint of concern for the physical environment. The three-year term should enable the representative to gain the experience needed to serve effectively since many of the matters before the Facilities Planning Committee will involve long-term issues.

If the procedures recommended here are adopted, a periodic review should be made to insure that effective representation is being obtained. In particular, the need for additional technical expertise in the person of a faculty representatives should be considered. However, it is now felt that faculty representation on the various subcommittees of the Facilities Planning Committee will satisfy this need.
PROPOSED RESTRUCTURING OF APPEALS AND ADMISSION-EXCEPTIONS COMMITTEE

At the present time, the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee has two committees that provide annual reports to it. The first, the Appeals Committee, is a long-standing committee composed of 11 members, nine of whom are faculty appointed by the Provost. The committee's charge is to review and rule on the appeals of students subject to academic suspension. The second committee, the ad hoc Admission Exceptions Committee, was formed this past Spring at the direction of President Lennon to review applications of individuals who did not meet the established standards of admission at Clemson. This five-person committee includes three appointed faculty members. This committee was formed, in part, in response to the Faculty Senate Resolution FS-86-2-2 which called for the establishment of a separate admissions committee with elected faculty members to review admissions policies and admission exceptions.

The Faculty Senate believes that faculty representation on these committees is essential. The admission and academic progress of students at Clemson is critical to the academic reputation of the University. The Senate believes that the majority of the members on these two committees should be elected faculty members who are accountable to the faculty. This goal can be accomplished through the existing structure of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee.

PROPOSED ACTION:

Given that the charge to the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee listed in the Faculty Manual reads, "This committee formulates and recommends policy of admissions and standards for continuing enrollment and re-admission and also hears appeals on continuing enrollment," the Faculty Senate makes the following recommendations to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies,

1. That a permanent admission exceptions committee be established;
2. That both the Appeals committee and the Admission Exceptions Committee have, as their majority composition, faculty members who serve on the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee;
3. That the Provost appoint additional faculty members, if needed, to ensure minority representation;
4. That the Director of Admissions serve as a non-voting member on the Admission Exceptions Committee and the Registrar serve as a non-voting member on the Appeals Committee;
5. That these committees report to the Appeals and Continuing Enrollment Committee on a regular basis;
6. And, that these recommendations be forwarded to the Appeals and Continuing Enrollment Committee for the development of a proposed plan of implementation which would be forwarded to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies at its next meeting for approval.
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 86-11-2

WHEREAS, the Commission on Undergraduate Studies is considering a policy for the admission of students enrolling in academic programs of limited duration including high school students in summer institutes;

AND WHEREAS, this admission policy allows high school students who "meet or exceed the minimum quality of those required of freshmen normally admitted" to be admitted to take courses for academic credit;

AND WHEREAS, this is a change from current policy which requires that high school students "possess superior high school records and [have] SAT score distinctly above average for the freshman class" and "rank in upper tenth of the class and have SAT scores which total 1100 or more;"

AND WHEREAS, the proposed policy can dilute the quality of the undergraduate program by permitting high school students with lesser credentials than is currently allowed to enroll in courses for academic credit;

AND WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the Faculty to maintain the integrity and quality of the academic program at Clemson University;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Faculty Senate opposes the Special Admission - Institute policy and endorses the current requirements for the admission of these students.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee

FROM: W. R. Mattox
Director of Admissions

SUBJECT: Special Admission for Students Applying for Enrollment in Institutes

Plans are currently being developed for the establishment of several summer institutes for high school students. As envisioned, students enrolled in these institutes will receive academic credit that will be recorded on a permanent record, and in essence they will be university students for this period even though they will be returning to high school in the fall. In addition, the College of Nursing operates an eighteen-hour institute encompassing two summers for school nurses, and the Industrial Education Department has a somewhat similar program of equal length for certification of certain trade and industrial teachers. Neither the regular nor special admissions categories well fit those interested in organized, short-term programs of this nature; therefore, there is a need for adopting a new category to be identified as: Special Admission-Institute.

By way of background, obviously students who are yet to complete high school should not be admitted as regular students. On the other hand, our current Special Admission category is designed for adults who have a short-term educational need most often related to improvement of their job skills— or one involving a limited amount of work appealing to their personal interests—and no academic credentials are required of such applicants. In essence, the category was established to accommodate continuing education needs, and the main reason for providing a method whereby these people could enroll in regular classes relates to the fact it is impractical to offer continuing education courses to those whose interests are so diversified that often only one person desires work in a given area. In short, this category was not designed to accommodate an organized group of pre-college students who share an immediate short-term objective and who may wish to apply the credit earned toward a degree at Clemson or elsewhere.
In addition to the institutes contemplated to serve high school students, the School Nurse Practitioner program which commenced in June 1986, as previously observed, suggests another reason for the category proposed. Some of these nurses actually took the work for continuing education units (CEUs); but six enrolled for college credit, with the option of applying the credit earned toward a degree at a later date. Obviously, all of these are adults and initially fit the already established special student category reasonably well; however, the institute curriculum encompasses three more credits than the maximum permitted for special students. A similar problem arises when the special student category is used with trade and industrial teachers, who can take their eighteen-hour program either for certification or college credit.

Since institutes offer an organized program of specific length, it is recommended that all institute programs be brought into a single admissions category; but with a requirement for usual academic credentials for those of high school age, and whether or not such credentials should be required for a given institute involving older candidates to be determined by a committee of the Director of the Institute, the Director of Admissions, and the Dean of Admissions and Registration. The accompanying document is recommended as an appropriate policy statement in this regard.
SPECIAL ADMISSION - INSTITUTE

Colleges and/or departments at times establish academic programs of limited duration that encompass courses included in the University's curricula, but which have an objective considerably short of a degree. These programs are usually designated as institutes, and requirements for admission to them may vary within the limitations specified below.

1. Candidates for admission to an institute or a program of similar nature must have the approval of the director of the institute or program concerned.

2. Official high school transcripts are to accompany the applications for admission, and official reports of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores are to be submitted by those seeking admission to an institute designed to appeal to high school students.* The credentials of those admitted must meet or exceed the minimum quality of those required of freshmen normally admitted to the college or department sponsoring the institute.

3. The specific academic credentials, if any, required of candidates for institutes designed to appeal to those adults nineteen or more years of age will be determined by a committee composed of the Director of the Institute concerned, the Director of Admissions, and the Dean of Admissions and Registration.

*Note: The Committee on Admissions and Continuing Enrollment may wish to stipulate the lowest grade level from which a student can be considered.
4. Admission to an institute does not constitute a commitment or an implication that such a student will be regularly admitted to Clemson University should he or she so apply at some future date. However, should a former institute student become a candidate and be regularly admitted, the work taken in the institute will be a part of his or her permanent Clemson record. Moreover, such work may be applied toward graduation if, at the time of selection, it is included as required or elective work in the curriculum chosen.
ADMISSION

Beginning Freshmen To receive consideration for admission to Clemson, candidates must submit an application and transcript through their high school and have results of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) sent directly from the College Board in Princeton, New Jersey.

The examination scores, rank in class, academic preparation, and recommendation of the high school counselor will be weighed carefully in the admissions decision process. The applicant's acceptance will be confirmed upon presentation of a final high school transcript indicating a continuation of progress and graduation.

In addition, students who have not received or do not intend to receive a high school diploma may qualify for entrance by:

1. Achieving satisfactory scores on the SAT and presenting a high school certificate (awarded by certificate examination) from the state in which residing. This provision applies only to candidates 19 or more years of age.

2. Demonstrating unusual academic ability as an applicant who does not intend to graduate from high school, or one who desires to take courses at Clemson while concurrently enrolled in high school. In special cases consideration may be given to younger candidates who possess superior high school records and whose SAT scores are distinctly above average for the freshman class. The typical student admitted under this provision ranks in the upper tenth of the class and has SAT scores which total 1100 or more.

Special Student Status The special student classification is primarily designed for high school graduates or persons at least 19 years of age who are not interested in pursuing a degree. It is not a "trial admission" status or one for candidates who apply too late to submit credentials for regular admission status. Applicants denied regular admission to Clemson are ineligible to apply as special students.

None of the usual application requirements are required of such applicants. A maximum of 15 undergraduate credit hours can be taken during the regular or summer sessions. Although it is possible to enroll in the immediately succeeding semester until the cumulative maximum of 15 credit hours is taken, students must submit a new application for each entrance period. Moreover, preregistration is prohibited, inasmuch as regular Clemson students have priority for enrollment in all courses.

These restrictions do not preclude a special student who has completed 15 hours or less from applying for regular admission if a change in educational objective occurs. If so admitted, work previously taken in this classification will apply toward a degree at Clemson only if the courses are applicable to the curriculum chosen.
The Faculty Senate Resolution 86-11 which opposes the Special Admission - Institute Policy should be amended so that it applies exclusively to high school graduates coming to the University for the first time. Students who are mature adult learners who have successfully completed a post-high school educational program, such as the School Nurse Practitioner students enrolled in the Program offered in the College of Nursing, should not be grouped with young, inexperienced high school students/graduates.

Clemson University cannot afford to turn away candidates for special programs or institutes who are able to meet academic expectations while attending a special program and may wish to utilize credit earned toward completing a degree at a later date. When and if the student eventually applies for a degree granting program, they are required to meet all entrance requirements, thereby insuring the maintenance of the integrity and quality of the academic programs at Clemson University.

I believe that we must address the special needs of special students who wish to work toward academic credit which may later be applied toward a degree, but who, for a host of valid reasons, may not be able to enroll for a degree program at the time they are in the special program or institute.

The "proof of the pudding" should be whether the student successfully achieves a passing grade in the academic course(s) taken for credit. Whether the program offers a magical 15 credits or something more than that does not seem relevant, nor does the student's rank in the upper tenth of a class, superior high school record or SAT score at the time of enrollment in a special program. Their ability to achieve is the best indicator of their right to be at Clemson or any other university.

I respectfully request that the Faculty Senate take another look at this resolution and at the intent of the Special Admissions Policy.

Dee Evers, Assistant Professor
Continuing Education in Nursing
Program Director, SNP Program
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
DECEMBER 9, 1986

I. CALL TO ORDER
President Dyck called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. He noted that this was the last meeting for several senators. Senator Hudson is becoming an acting department head. Senator King is going on sabbatical. Senator Lyson has accepted a position at Cornell.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes of the November 11, 1986 meeting were approved as corrected.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. Policy: Senator Linvill had no report.

B. Research: Senator Stillwell read the report for Senator Birrenkott and submitted reports from earlier committee meetings (Attachment A.) He asked that comments about administrative assistance which the Clemson University Research Foundation could supply to faculty be given to Senator Birrenkott.

C. Scholastic Policy: Senator Nowaczyk had no report.

D. Welfare: Senator Calhoun read the report (Attachment B.) Senator Linvill said that he hoped that
the committee would also consider teaching improvement grants. Senators Daniel and Baron discussed the retirement proposal, noting that raising the benefit calculation may go hand in hand with raising calculations. The Welfare Committee will continue to negotiate with Personnel on two proposals: 1) the state contributing everything and 2) increasing the percentage without contributing more.

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

Grievance Procedures: Senator Linvill reported that the committee had received input from deans and department heads. They will begin writing draft changes this week.

Fine Arts: Senator Nowaczyk said that their report would appear under New Business.

Committee/Commission Structure: Senator Mullins had no report.

Blue Light Alarm System: Senator Derr said that the committee was considering this new safety system which would consist of telephones, marked by a blue light, posted all over campus. Someone in trouble would need only to lift a receiver and a message would be transmitted to the Police Station which would dispatch a car. A survey of universities with the system found that most
were very pleased and reported low vandalism and low maintenance. The committee views the pros of the system as an increase in safety and the cons as its expense and the possibility of crank calls. They need to report back to General Clausen as to whether the system would be useful and where it should be installed. Senator Sly asked if there had been any study as to whether it was needed on campus. Senator Derr responded that the Police think it is. Senator Mullins asked if alternatives to the phone such as buzzers had been considered.

F. University Commissions/Committees:
Scholarship and Awards: Senator Calhoun reported about the MacDonald Scholarship Fund -- an approximately one million dollar gift with a yearly income of $80,000 (see Attachment C, President's Report Update Item 3.) An ad hoc committee, appointed by the Scholarship and Awards Committee with a representative from each college, is considering what recommendations to make to the Senate. President Dyck indicated that those recommendations would be considered by the Senate once received. Senator Polk, a member of the ad hoc committee, asked whether it was appropriate for Scholarship and Awards to review the matter before the Senate does, since MacDonald's will charges the Senate with the
review. He also indicated that he did not want the ad hoc committee to do work parallel to the Senate. President Dyck said that he would discuss it with the chairman of the Scholarship and Awards Committee, with the Senate's representative on that committee, Senator Calhoun's, input.

Parking and Traffic: Senator Derr reported on the committee's recommendations, resulting in part from Senate input, made to the President's Cabinet. She emphasized that all the committee can do is recommend. They suggested that the present fine system be doubled, with the incentive that, if the fine is paid in ten working days, the fine would be halved. Some form of movable decal was also recommended, with the possible option of something permanent for one-car employees. No fee for parking was discussed. Senator Mullins then said that this issue had been discussed at the Cabinet meeting on Monday. The students, represented by Fred Richey, were very opposed to the fine increase and are trying to come up with a counter proposal. Senator Derr said that the committee had also recommended that the University look into a shuttle system from outlying lots for use by visitors, employees, and students and found that it was already being researched.
Commission on Undergraduate Studies/Admissions and Continuing Enrollment: Senator Nowaczyk reported that several issues were discussed at these meetings. The Commission on Undergraduate Studies accepted unanimously the Senate suggestion for restructuring the appeals and admissions exceptions committees. The plan was sent to the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee which referred it to a subcommittee. This subcommittee met and produced two proposals: 1) that the appeals and admissions exceptions committees consist of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee -- one faculty member from each of the nine colleges or 2) that six elected faculty members serve on the appeals and three on the exceptions committee.

The proposal on Special Institute Admissions did not fare so well. Despite Senate opposition, all parts passed unanimously, except for the section on admitting high school students with minimal requirements. This passed 13-7, because many of the college representatives present voted against it.

Vice Provost Reel, in consultation with President Dyck, has set up eight committees to study the eight tensions described in the Carnegie report, College. The reports are due next semester.
The Commission on Undergraduate Studies finally took up as new business the February 1986 Senate resolution on a new admissions policy. It has been turned over to a subcommittee on which Senator LaTorre is serving. They will be working on updating the policy. Please send comments to Senators LaTorre or Nowaczyk. Last year's proposal was based on predicted GPR (as determined by SAT score and class rank) with a different standard for each college. Minimum requirements for high school students are still under discussion.

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Attachment C)

President Dyck commented on several of the items in the report. He noted that Item 4 was short because the Athletic Council has reaffirmed that the minutes should not be released until they have been reviewed. No substantive business took place at that meeting. President Dyck said that President Lennon had sent a letter to all Athletic Council members offering them two tickets to the Gator Bowl, hotel accommodations, and transportation from hotel to game and back. Dyck refused, thanking the President but reminding him that the Athletic Council has many responsibilities, of which this was not one. Dyck also sent the President
information from previous Faculty Senate discussions and previous administration decisions about perquisites. President Dyck has not received a response as of yet.

About Item 6, Budget Assessment, President Dyck said that Budget and Finance will compile all the data that they received and make up decision packages. Some of the packages will be handled strictly at the administrative level; others dealing with programs and disciplines will be debated among deans who should share with faculty. Senators should ask deans and department heads how the process is going.

The Teaching Evaluation Report, Item 8, was accepted by the President's Council and will be taken up again by the Commission on Faculty Affairs to implement. The first step -- each departmental faculty formulating its own evaluation process -- is very important.

President Dyck would appreciate receiving written input on Continuing Education, Item 11.

Update Item 1 is very important. It is vital that senators get the word out to their faculty about the seminar. The Carnegie Report (Attachment D) is a timely topic, especially in regard to where Clemson is going. There will be a reception following
Stadtman’s presentation, which will be held in Lee Hall.

President Dyck returned this afternoon from the Annual Meeting of the Southern Association (Update, Item 6). The hot topics there were educational assessment and accountability. He will share more on this later.

V. OLD BUSINESS

1. Senator Linvill moved acceptance of a resolution (Attachment E) on appointment of academic administrators. After it was seconded, he explained that a position had been moved from the administrative to the academic organizational chart. The position reported previously to the Vice President for Business and Finance, but now reports to the Provost. Senator Nowaczyk wondered if this move had been discussed in the Cabinet or anywhere. President Dyck said that it came up as a part of the general reorganization of the computer facility, but that there was no specific discussion of this move. There was no faculty input on the shift of position or on the selection of an individual to fill the position. Senator Snelsire said that his Dean was interested in why he cannot do the same thing at the college level -- as opposed to conducting a search that will cost $5000. Senator Hedden noted that the same idea had been suggested for
changing Director of University Research Nicholas into Vice Provost for Research. Senator Stillwell agreed with Senator Hedden that the use of the title of provost so frequently may not be appropriate. The resolution, 86-12-1, passed unanimously.

2. Senator Nowaczyk moved acceptance of a resolution (Attachment F) inviting the NSF Director to campus. Senator Linvill seconded. President Dyck noted that the Office of University Research has a list of others to bring to campus and that this would be an appropriate addition. The resolution, 86-12-2, passed unanimously.

3. Senator Mullins moved acceptance of a resolution on graduation attendance (Attachment G) and it was seconded. Senator Baron noted that he had no objection to this resolution, but that he felt that now was an appropriate time to consider other changes. The faculty have proposed changes for the last ten years, but this is the first time that the administration has asked for faculty to assist in or approve of a change. Senator Baron, therefore, offered a substitute motion (Attachment H.) Senator Linvill seconded. There was considerable discussion as to the wisdom of the substitution. Some Senators noted that it raised issues that needed to be considered.
Others agreed, but asked that the suggestions be reviewed before consideration. Senator Calhoun said that the original motion concerned only faculty, whereas the substitute motion also dealt with students and may include issues not up to the Senate to decide. Senator Mullins and other Senators said that students were opposed to changes in their ceremony. The motion to substitute was defeated, 11-13.

Senator Bryan then proposed an amendment to the original motion, changing "each calendar year" in the first "Resolved" to "every other calendar year" and reducing the percentages in the second "Resolved" to 25, 12.5, and 12.5. Considerable discussion followed with Senator Bryan asking why faculty should be forced to go if they do not want to. President Dyck noted that the Faculty Manual states that nine month faculty are the employ of the University at the time of May Commencement and may, therefore, be required to attend the ceremony. Other Senators added that it is an obligation, that faculty enjoy seeing students graduate, and that students like to have faculty there. The amendment was rejected.

In a return to the discussion of the original motion, Senator Brannock noted that instructors were not required to attend -- only faculty with faculty rank.
Senator Polk proposed an amendment adding the first paragraph from Senator Baron's defeated substitution motion to the original resolution. Several senators noted that shaking the President's hand was the highlight of the ceremony for the students and that the students were opposed to any change. Senator Gardner asked that the Baron motion be considered at a later time. The amendment was defeated.

Discussion of the original motion continued with Senator Bryan asking if excuses were still possible. They would be. There was some question as to whether it would be difficult to get 25% faculty attendance in August. Senator Stillwell and President Dyck reviewed the resolution, noting that it was a relaxation of present requirements and that it was an attempt to have faculty at every ceremony. The resolution, 86-12-3, passed.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

1. Senator Nowaczyk moved acceptance of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Fine Arts (Attachment I.) Senator Calhoun seconded. Senator Nowaczyk gave some background on the committee's purpose, noting that it originated with the Equus censorship, but that the charge to the
committee was much broader than that, including artistic freedom, the rights and freedom of students, and community spirit. Senator Baron cited three concerns and proposed two amendments (Attachment J) to the resolution. His concerns were that it was implied but not plainly stated that these are academic activities, that it should be made clearer that the Vice President for Student Affairs was not responsible for these academic activities (that the academic community is), and that recommendation 3 is totally inappropriate. The University does not, for example, advertise when a speaker might offend some of the community -- if someone does not agree, he can leave.

Senator Baron proposed the first amendment of the original recommendations to substitute his 2. for the original 2. Senator Gardner seconded. Senator LaTorre said that the committee had discussed the role of the Vice President for Student Affairs at length and decided to leave it out. Senator Hudson said that he felt that the use of "academic unit" was sufficient and that, in a chain of responsibility, it would eventually reach the Provost. Senator Huey noted that the original recommendation divorces the issue from Equus alone; putting the Vice President back in would narrow the focus once again. Several
senators commented that the Vice President's participation goes back to the fact that the money for the activities comes from student fees which are handled through Student Affairs. Senator Baron wanted it explicit rather than implicit that the Vice President for Student Affairs would not be involved. The amendment was defeated.

Senator Baron presented his second amendment which would be to delete Recommendation 3 from the original entirely. Senator Snelsire noted that a director could still publicize warnings even if this recommendation was removed. Senator Nowaczyk admitted that it was not clear from their survey results that all schools publicized — only 55% said they did. Senator Linvill stated that this was an educated community that could do its own research and did not need warnings. President Dyck said that a sensitivity to the issues is important. In the joint Faculty Senate/Student Senate meeting, a straw vote on the issue of nudity resulted in a 50/50 split. This amendment was defeated 11-8.

Discussion of the original recommendations continued and centered around recommendation number three. Several suggestions were made to change or delete the use of "warnings" and to better define "appropriate."
After considerable discussion, Senator Nowaczyk moved to table the recommendations, returning them to the committee for modifications following the spirit of above discussion, and sending them to the deans for their comments. The Committee will report back at the February meeting. This motion was seconded by Senator Linvill and passed unanimously.

2. Senator Mullins introduced a resolution (Attachment K) about the Telecampus proposal (Attachment M) and moved adoption. The motion was seconded. He then gave some background on the resolution, noting that he would almost prefer that Telecampus courses receive one year probationary approval at first. Senator Carter said that at a recent meeting of the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee this issue had been discussed. They will vote on it at the next meeting. He noted that courses offered overseas have to be approved separately, even if they are already offered at Clemson. Telecampus representatives will attend the committee's next meeting. Senator Daniels said that he understood that Tom Oswald was meeting with the curriculum committees in each college. Senator Sly asked Daniels if Oswald plans to go to the Library to discuss how the Library will provide materials to "remote" students. Senator Linvill asked what the
difference between these and other courses was. Senator Sly responded that the testing and grading plans and syllabi should vary and Senator Daniels said it should be asked if a course is appropriate for Telecampus use. The resolution, 86-12-4, passed.

Senator Mullins introduced an additional resolution about Telecampus (Attachment L), saying that it reflected President Lennon's request of earlier this year for cooperation between Clemson and the University of South Carolina. Senator Gardner seconded it and spoke in favor of the resolution, stating that there is too much duplication already. The resolution, 86-12-5, passed unanimously.

VII. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margery N. Sly
Secretary

FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
December 8, 1986

The committee met on December 1 at 1:15 pm in F-149 of the P&AS building. The primary item of business was how to get faculty input into the implementation of the Clemson University Research Foundation (CURF). The idea of a survey, which Larry Dyck and Glenn Birrenkott had espoused, was rejected. Sentiment seemed to favor small meetings (college?) of research faculty where CURF could be explained and their input solicited. Because the bylaws of CURF were not yet available (I just received them today, 12/8/86) the research committee stressed the importance of having these in-hand before we begin any discussion of how CURF could be used by the faculty of CU.

Final discussion of the Strategic Defense Initiative Funds (Star Wars) issue was held. It was agreed that present policies, as outlined in the CU Faculty Manual, are applicable and appropriate and that no Faculty Senate resolution is necessary on this issue. To summarize previous discussions - 1) Whether a faculty member seeks such funds should be at his/her discretion, 2) It would set a poor precedent for the Faculty Senate, CU or the Faculty Manual to imply or specify that some Federal-funded or nationally-competitive research funds or projects are better or worse than others on any perceived moral or ethical grounds.

Respectfully submitted,

Glenn Birrenkott Jr.
Chair
The committee met on October 27 at 1:15 pm in room F-149 of the P&AS Building. The primary purpose of the meeting was to distribute information which the committee would be dealing with in the following months. This included documentation on: 1) The Clemson University Research Foundation (CURF), 2) The Emerging Technologies Development and Marketing Center, 3) The CHE Task Force on Excellence. Other issues still under discussion are: 1) Strategic Defense Initiative (Star Wars) funds and 2) Faculty concerns about overhead monies.

A discussion on the recently (September 30, 1986) created Clemson University Land Use Planning Board was held. This item first surfaced in a October 23 breakfast meeting of the Senators from Agricultural Sciences and Forestry / Recreation Resources with Dr. Box the Acting-Vice President/ Vice Provost for Agriculture and Natural Resources. In the four days since the senators found out about this board, the Acting Dean of Forestry and Recreation Resources has decided that the two appointed members from that college would be elected by the faculty.

Belatedly,
But, Respectfully Submitted,

Glenn Birrenkott Jr.
Chair
The committee met on November 7 at 1:15 pm in the classroom of the Cooper Library. This was a joint meeting between the Faculty Senate Research Committee and the Research Advisory Committee (to Stan Nicholas). Additional research faculty as identified by the Advisory / Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate were also invited. (A list of participants is appended.) The first agenda item was a presentation of the Clemson University Center for Emerging Technology Development and Marketing by Dr. Gilliland. This center is not designed as an institute, i.e. it will not have its own faculty. Clemson University faculty will be identified, recruited and contracted for specific research development and marketing tasks. Many of the activities which have been identified in the Second Century Plan may come under the umbrella of the Emerging Technology Development and Marketing Center.

The second presentation was by Stan Nicholas on the Clemson University Research Foundation (CURF). This organization is in place. The Clemson Industrial Research Authority, Inc. at its August meeting changed its name and bylaws to become CURF. Although this was done without faculty input, Stan is anxious for the faculty to provide guidance on how CURF may be used (policies and procedures).

Another agenda item was the research environment at Clemson. This elicited a wide-ranging discussion of how the Office of University Research (OUR) could assist faculty. Maintaining a directory of faculty research interests was one of many suggestions. Implementation of most of the ideas presented will depend upon additional support (fiscal, computer, and moral) from the CU administration to OUR. Dr. Lennon also reminded all faculty and administrators present to be sensitive to faculty concerns about undergraduate education. The recent spate of interest and emphasis on research and graduate education is to take advantage of opportunities we have, and is not meant to detract from the primary mission of this University which is undergraduate teaching.

Belatedly,
But, Respectfully Submitted,

Glenn Birrenkott Jr.
Chair
ROSTER OF JOINT MEETING OF THE
FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
&
RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
&
SELECTED RESEARCH FACULTY

HELD NOVEMBER 7, 1986

Dr. M. Lennon President
Mr. S. Nicholas OUR
Mrs. C. Thurston OUR
Dr. G. Gogue OUR
Dr. H. Vogel College of Sciences
Dr. C. Helms Dept of Biological Sciences
Dr. J. Colacino Dept of Biological Sciences
Dr. J. Huffman Dept of Chemistry
Dr. G. Birrenkott Faculty Senate Research Committee
Dr. W. Byrd Research Advisory Committee
Dr. E. Stillwell Faculty Senate Research Committee
Dr. R. Young Dept of Ag Engineering
Dr. H. Pate Research Advisory Committee
Dr. J. Zimmerman Dept of Biochemistry
Dr. D. Yardley Research Advisory Committee
Dr. B. Rutledge Research Advisory Committee
Dr. L. Larcom Depts of Physics / Microbiology
Dr. G. Bishop Dept of Mechanical Engineering
Dr. J. Haile Dept of Chemical Engineering
Dr. Stutzenberger Dept of Microbiology
Dr. T. Lyson Faculty Senate Research Committee
Dr. S. Oldaker Research Advisory Committee
Dr. R. Thomas Dept of Food Science
Dr. E. Kline Dept of Microbiology
Dr. N. Camper Dept of Plant Path & Physiol
Dr. M. Thies Research Advisory Committee
Dr. D. Tesolowski Faculty Senate Research Committee
Dr. R. Hedden Faculty Senate Research Committee
To: Larry Dyck, President, Faculty Senate

From: Richard J. Calhoun, Chairman, Welfare Committee

Subject: December Meeting

Date: December 9, 1986

The Welfare Committee met on December 2. We discussed several issues, and we make the following recommendations.

(1) The Committee passed a resolution of support for an attempt to raise our benefit calculation to 1.75%, as now exists for the Police Retirement System.

(2) On the issue of lack of faculty representation on the Coordinating Committee of the Office of Development, we recommend that the President of the Senate negotiate membership on that committee for an appropriate member of the Faculty Senate or a faculty member elected by the Senate. We believe that there should be a faculty voice in plan for funds.

(3) On the matters of a distinguished teaching professorship, suggested by President Lennon, and of additional rewards/awards to faculty for teaching, we concur that further awards are needed and recommend for further consideration by the administration the following:
   (a) funding for a distinguished professorship with this professor serving as a resource person for developing teaching resource programs at Clemson.
   (b) planning for a new type of teaching award, a two-year or three-year rotating professorship rewarded for new directions and innovations in teaching with a salary supplement like those for alumni professors plus a like sum to promote teaching at Clemson.
   (c) planning by the Office of Development for foundation or privately endowed teaching awards, such as those offered by the Exxon and other foundations at other universities in this region.

We request that a copy of these recommendations be forwarded to the Provost.

Final item: We received a report indicating that the chances of the Leatherman bill, intended to provide alternative retirement for some faculty, to pass this year are slim. We also discussed proposals in the report of the Task Force for Excellence for professorships and Palmetto Scholars.
1. About two weeks after the beginning of the Spring semester, Edgar's will provide a faculty luncheon every day, consisting of salads, soups and desserts.

2. In the university's request for the funding of asbestos-removal, priorities were as follows: Brackett Hall, Martin Hall, Barnett Hall, Newman, and Earle Hall.

3. The University-wide General Faculty and Staff Meeting is scheduled for 10 a.m., Wednesday, December 17, 1986, in Tillman Hall Auditorium.


5. The Facilities Planning Committee held its first meeting on November 12, 1986. The group discussed its charge, membership, and subcommittee membership; it received a report on capital improvement bond projects, discussed existing plans for renovations of Brackett Hall, Johnstone Hall, Hardin Hall, and a proposal for a Historic District (the latter to be continued). Concerns of the Faculty Senate on educating university personnel regarding Asbestos have been referred to the Safety Committee. Promises were made that the location of the Continuing Education Center will be opened to debate.

6. The Senate Advisory/Executive Committees met with Vice-President Larson on Thursday, November 13, 1986, to review the budget assessment process. Vice-president Larson noted that the process will allow the university to: (1) reassess its base in all divisions and departments across the campus, (2) to find more economical ways to deliver services, and (3) to face both the imposed budget reduction for this year and the pending reductions for next year. Information gained through the Budget Assessment process will be utilized to formulate decision packages. The latter will be reviewed by the President and Vice-Presidents sometime during the month of December. Some decision packages will permit immediate response, others will require discussion and deliberations involving deans, department heads and faculty. The Advisory/Executive Committees encourage you to ask questions of your deans and department heads so as to provide faculty input into the deliberation process.

7. The President's Cabinet approved the design of the S.C. Department of Highways' special "Clemson University" License Tag.
8. The Commission on Faculty Affairs met November 18, 1986, and discussed the implementation of the University-wide Teaching Evaluation Process. The following steps were agreed upon and are being transmitted as recommendations to the Provost: (1) make sure all parties understand that the Teaching Evaluation Report requires the departmental faculty to formulate their own evaluation procedures; departments should review the guidelines established in the report, but are not expected to implement them in their literal sense; (2) departments should undertake the planning phase of their Evaluation Process as soon as possible so that implementation might commence with the 1988-89 academic year; (3) the existing Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee should be asked to provide departments with assistance as they undertake the construction of new or revised evaluation instruments; (4) the existing Faculty Development Committee, in concert with the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee, should review the proposed Teaching Resources Center to ascertain if it will provide a means for assisting interested faculty to improve their teaching effectiveness.

In other matters, the Commission agreed to review the Carnegie Report as it applies directly to faculty; they discussed with Professor Mullins the need for a review of the Commission/Council Structure and discussed with Professor Albert, chair of the Salary & Fringe Benefits Committee, their desire for an improved fringe benefits package, with particular emphasis on increasing the State's contribution toward retirement.

9. The Faculty Senate's position on Graduation Awards was discussed and acknowledged by the President's Cabinet. The proposal was referred back to the Development Office.

10. The Cabinet approved the enclosed proposal for the CU TELECAMPU. The proposal should be reviewed carefully so that all programmatic areas understand the implications of the program and how it fits within their curricular activities and faculty development process.

11. If you have input regarding the proposed organizational structure of the Continuing Education Division (report issued to each Faculty Senator at the November meeting of the Senate), now is the time to communicate with your Dean or Faculty Senate President.
1. The Advisory/Executive Committee agreed to invite Mr. Verne Stadtman to present a seminar at the time of our January Faculty Senate meeting. Mr. Stadtman is Vice President-General Services of the Carnegie Foundation and an editor of the Carnegie report on undergraduate education, titled *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*. He has expressed a willingness to discuss the general impressions and issues of the report with the university faculty.

It will be our collective responsibility to see that all faculty know of this occasion and avail themselves of this opportunity. Unless unforeseen matters arise, we will dispense with the normal order of business, and devote the meeting to Mr. Stadtman's seminar and a question period to follow. Several details have not been concluded, such as the location for the meeting and the possibility of a social to follow.

The Chairs of Standing Committees have been asked to work with their membership to generate relevant questions for Mr. Stadtman. Copies of the Chronicle's synopsis of the report are available.

2. The annual Faculty Senate Reception for the Board of Trustees will be Friday, January 16, 1987. It will be held in the Alumni Center from 5 to 7 p.m. Each of you should receive an official invitation, inviting you and your guest. This is an important opportunity for each of you to meet with both Trustees and members of the university administration. Take advantage of the chance to discuss matters generated by your various committees and to enjoy yourself!

3. I am asking the Scholastics Policies Committee to review the pending recommendations of the Scholarships and Awards Committee relative to the MacDonald Scholarships. Mr. MacDonald's Will provides funds..."to encourage and assist...student(s) in the fields of study promising the most rewarding service to the economy and culture of the nation..." His Will charges that the Faculty Senate, "...select the field or fields of undergraduate or postgraduate study meeting...the definition expressed above."

4. The legal considerations of our proposal to allow the Anderson HMO to serve the city of Clemson and its Pickens County Environs is currently under review in Columbia.

5. Once again I encourage you to utilize your right to nominate appropriate individuals for Honorary Degrees. You may forward your nomination to me or to the Provost.

6. I accompanied the Provost to the Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges & Schools on Dec. 7-9. One of the major concerns of the group was Educational Assessment, an accountability process increasingly demanded by Legislative Bodies and the Public.
News Summary

Articles on inside pages

Changes in the attitudes of college freshmen over 20 years threaten liberal-arts education, according to a new report. Story and profile on Page 31.

Dan J. Smith is in the business of saving financially troubled colleges. Story on Page 3.

More university researchers need to be enlisted in the campaign against AIDS, a panel of scientists has urged. Story on Page 7.

Faculty members at Temple University ended their 19-day strike last week, as contract negotiations on other U.S. campuses continued. Story on Page 11.

Effective presidents of colleges rely on respect rather than popularity, according to a study that names the 100 most effective chief executives. Story on Page 11.

Defining the appropriate role of college administrators and trustees in state political campaigns can be a problem. Story on Page 23.

A campaign aimed at doubling charitable giving by individuals began at last week's meeting of Independent Sector. Story on Page 29.

Lefty Driesell, men's basketball coach at the University of Maryland for nearly two decades, resigned last week. Story on Page 37.

The trustees of the American University of Beirut have said they may have to close part or all of the institution. Story on Page 39.

Study Finds Colleges Torn by Divisions, Confused over Roles

New report by Carnegie chief focuses on 'points of tension'

By MALCOLM G. SCULLY

Undergraduate colleges in the United States are confused over their purposes and racked by tensions that prevent them from providing coherent educational experiences for their students, warns Ernest L. Boyer, the president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in a report that will be released here this week.

Many of the nation's colleges and universities are more successful in credentialing than in providing a quality education for their students," Mr. Boyer writes.

Entitled College: The Undergraduate Experience in America, the report is based on in-depth studies of 29 colleges and universities and on a survey of 5,000 faculty members, 5,000 college students, and 1,000 college-bound high-school students.

Findings of the faculty survey were published in The Chronicle, December 18, 1985. Those of the college-student survey were published in the issue of February 1, 1986. Mr. Boyer's report will be published in book form early next year by Harper & Row.

"During our study we found deep divisions on the campus, conflicting priorities and competing interests that diminish the intellectual and social quality of the under-

Continued on Page 16, Column 7

Soviets Said to Assume All Visiting Scientists Are Spies, but Scholars Unlikely to Experience a Daniloff Incident

U.S. View

By COLLEEN CORDES

When the American journalist Nicholas Daniloff was arrested and charged with espionage in Moscow two months ago, some American scholars scheduled to travel there called the International Research and Exchanges Board in Princeton, N.J.

What were the chances, they inquired, that they too might become targets of official harassment or arrest?

Officials of the board, which sets up exchanges with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, told the callers that such incidents were unlikely. The Soviets realize that their valued science contacts with the West would be threatened, explains Wesley Fisher, who is in charge of the board's joint Soviet-American projects in the humanities and social sciences, so they are not inclined to pick on scholars.

Adds an American professor who has been involved in such exchanges: "They have to do is grab one American scientist, and the scientists will stop going."

Indeed, officials who administer exchanges generally discount the notion that the latest strains in U.S.-Soviet relations—including the stalemate at the Iceland mini-summit and the recent tit-for-tat expulsions of diplomats and cutbacks in embassy staffs—will affect the quantity or quality of

Continued on Page 42, Column 1

Education Already Big Issue for '88 Presidential Aspirants

By STACY E. PALMER

WASHINGTON

A $17-billion education, research, and training program designed to bolster the nation's industrial competitiveness.

The debate over the plan, made while the Senate considered its blueprint for federal spending in 1987, outwardly resembled one that might rage over any ordinary budget amendment. As it happened, the Senate resoundingly defeated Senator Hart's proposal out of concern about the gaping federal budget deficit.

Getting the amendment added to the budget plans wasn't entirely the point, however. With an eye to the 1988 Presidential race, the Colorado Democrat, said Senator Hart's proposal out of the ordinary budget amendment . As it happened, with an eye to the 1981 Presidential race, Mr. Hart has already begun developing the themes he will use to court voters. He is one of a handful of politicians who are saying they would emphasize education
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Carnegie Study Finds Colleges Are Torn by Divisions and Confused over Purposes

Continued from Page 1

The Carnegie Foundation's study of the 576 two-year colleges and the 478 four-year colleges, conducted as part of the Carnegie Foundation's project on higher education, has found that a majority of colleges are torn by divisions and confused over the purposes of their work, and that the concept of a college is undergoing a crisis. The study, conducted by the National Center for Higher Education, has identified three major problems that colleges are facing:

1. A great separation, sometimes perhaps a conflict, between academic studies and social problems on the campus.

2. Disregard over how the college should be governed.

3. The administrative and professional responsibilities of faculty members.

The study also found that a majority of colleges are torn by divisions and confused over the purposes of their work. The concept of a college is undergoing a crisis.

"The American system of higher education, with its open opportunities for education, and the academic achievement of students, is under attack," said Mr. Boyer. "Many young people who go to college lack basic skills in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and many students are not prepared for college." He added that "the concept of a college is undergoing a crisis." The study found that a majority of colleges are torn by divisions and confused over the purposes of their work.
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ity of higher education has increased, confidence in the decision-making processes that have been declined. Presidents are caught in the crossfire of public pressures. Faculty feels more loyalty to their discipline than to the institutions where they teach. And when students are asked to participate in campus governance their involvement is sporadic. Can students, faculty and administrators build community through improved communications?

The next issue is how the outcome of a college education should be measured. Today, the academic progress of students is assessed by each professor, course by course. Class grades are invariably recorded. The final mark of achievement is the diploma, which presumably signifies an educated person. But good teachers, one must recall, teach to quite different good teachers and the college has few ways to evaluate the quality of education overall.

During our study we heard calls for a new approach to evaluation. Increasingly, state and national education officials, lawmakers, parents, and students are wondering just how much is being learned and what college goals and the evaluation of student achievement be more closely linked? Should there be assessment beyond course grades? Are the testing procedures now used adequate to the task?

This brings us to the final concern. Though broad last, it touches all the rest. We found on most campuses a disturbing gap between the college and the larger world. There is, we sensed, a parochialism that seems to dominate higher education, an intellectual and social isolation that reduces the effectiveness of faculty and limits the vision of the student. We feel compelled to ask: How can the undergraduate college help students gain perspective and prepare them to feel compelled to ask: How can the undergraduate experience bring together the separate parts, create something greater than the sum, and offer the prospect that the channels of our common life will be deepened and renewed. The college—set apart from graduate and professional education—remains, as Sheldon Rockblatt of the University of California, Berkeley, put it, "the primary form of [higher education] where the well-being of the self and the problem of self and society are central."

To accomplish this essential mission, connections must be made. All parts of campus life—recruitment, orientation, curriculum, teaching, residence hall living, and the rest—must relate to one another and contribute to a sense of wholeness. We emphasize this commitment to community not out of a sentimental attachment to tradition, but because our democratic way of life and perhaps our survival as a people rest on whether we can move beyond self-interest and begin better to understand the realities of our dependence on each other.

A straightforward message for people in higher education about personal financial planning . . .

COMMON SENSE APPROACHES TO LIFE INSURANCE NEEDS

There's no reason to "go broke" in buying all the life insurance required to thoroughly protect your family's future. Taking into account the insurance you already own, including any group coverage, you can purchase the extra coverage you need to bring your total family protection up to a sound target level for a lot less than you think.

amount of insurance money your survivors would need to help maintain today's income level during the most critical dependency years ahead. It doesn't take into account, however, tomorrow's salary increases which would also be lost if you should die prematurely, increases that are critical to maintaining and improving the quality of life your dependents look forward to as the years go by. Ten times salary is a good measure of an amount of insurance money needed today to equal your lifetime earnings potential, because it's the present value of your total future earnings with assumed increases . . . increases that would be denied your survivors if you were to die tomorrow.

Based on TIAA's experience in counseling thousands of educators over the years, it's realistic for someone with a family to protect to own life insurance and other death benefits equal to at least six times current salary. This simple rule of thumb demonstrates with reasonable precision the important thing to realize is that it's very inexpensive to own large amounts of new family protection these days. If you're employed by a college, university or other nonprofit educational institution and are curious about the exact cost of bringing your total coverage up to six times salary, ten times salary, or some amount in between, just call the TIAA Life Insurance Advisory Center toll free at 1-800-223-1200. No one will call on you as a result of your inquiry.

We proceed, then, with the conviction that if a balance can be struck between individual interests and shared concerns, a strong learning community will result. And perhaps it is not too much to hope that the college, as a vital community of learning, can be a model for society itself—a society where private and public purposes also must be joined.

Major Recommendations to Improve the Undergraduate Experience

1. Transition: School to College

The quality of the undergraduate college is measured first by its all-
Continued on Following Page
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Command from Proceeding Paperance with the schools, by its willingness to smooth the transition between secondary and higher education. The way students are recruited into their college expectations is a good college conducts its recruitment and selection to serve the best interests of students. We found during our study that the path an undergraduate college is not well marked. Students and their parents urgently need to be better informed about the full range of colleges in America and they should be given better advice on the alternatives they have. Such information is essential if the undergraduate experience is to be strengthened.

- The Educational Testing Service, the College Board, and the American College Testing Program should establish regional advisement centers throughout the country. Such centers would be places where high school counselors could learn about colleges in their own area and nationwide.

- We suggest, too, that these national testing organizations give grants to high schools, especially to those with few college-going rates, to strengthen counseling services. And they should make travel grants available to high school counselors so that they can visit college campuses—and the proposed regional advisement centers—to become better informed about higher education.

- We recommend that the Commission on Self-Regulation of the American Council on Education draw up a strict code of conduct for college recruitment based on the work already done in the nation's registrars and admissions offices. To assure compliance, we urge the nation's six regional accrediting associations to review carefully recruitment procedures at every college and university they accredit.

- We strongly urge that every institution reaffirm, as an essential objective, its commitment to educational opportunity, especially for historically bypassed students. We urge that colleges give priority to need-based student assistance awards. At the federal level, we strongly recommend that Pell grant programs be expanded.

- To smooth the transition, we also recommend that every state establish a blue-ribbon panel of school and college educators to consider what students need to know and be able to do in order to prepare effectively for college.

- Meanwhile all colleges and universities should demystify the selection process. Each institution should describe in its literature the various criteria used for selection and give prospective students a profile of the student characteristics that seem most closely linked to the culture of the institution.

- National tests—the S.A.T. and A.C.T.—should be put in proper perspective. The vast majority of the nation's colleges and universities are not selective and we strongly urge that if a college does not use the S.A.T. or A.C.T. scores as a significant variable for selecting students the tests should not be required.

- When scores are required, the use relations make of them should be described fully to prospective students. And college applicants should not only report average S.A.T. scores, but also the scores of admitted students by quartile.

- Every college and university should ask prospective students to submit an essay as part of their application for admission not only to underscore the importance of writing but also as a means of learning more about the needs as well as the strengths of students.

- Throughout the entire selection process, the primary concern of every college should be not just to fill the slots, but to serve the interests of students. Colleges should explain to parents and students the characteristics of those who do not succeed at the institutions as well as the characteristics of those who do.

- Colleges should report back to secondary schools on the academic progress of their former students. And we also recommend that every higher learning institution monitor the relationship between selection procedures and the performance of students.

- We conclude that there is an urgent need for new and better ways to assess students as they move from school to higher education. The goal of the new assessment program would be to evaluate not only the academic achievement of students—linking it to the curriculum that the students studied—but also to provide advisement to help students make decisions more intelligently about their futures.

- Finally, we recommend the formation of a national panel to study all aspects of the high school-college transition, looking especially for ways to achieve more appropriate matching of the interests of individual students with the purposes of higher learning institutions.

Above all, prospective students and their parents should not be intimidated by the process. It is wrong to believe that there is one type of college that is right for all. A handful of colleges are highly selective, and if attending one of these institutions is a student's goal, some degree of competition must be accepted as a fact of life. But many lesser-known colleges also offer a solid, challenging undergraduate experience.

II

Goals

A quality college is guided by a clear and vital mission. The institution cannot be all things to all people. Chances must be made and priorities assigned. And there is, we believe, in the tradition of the undergraduate college, sufficient common ground on which shared goals can be established and a vital academic program built.

- If the college experience is to be worthwhile, there must be stresses and social values that its members hold in common, even as there must be room for personal preference. A balance must be struck between two powerful traditions—individuality and community.

- While responding to students' diverse goals, the college has an obligation to give students a sense of passage toward a more integrated, more coherent v. life.
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III

Orientation

Most students come to college with high hopes. The transition is a major one of passage, but undergraduates are often largely uninformed about the values and traditions of higher education. The first days on campus will probably have a significant influence on the entire undergraduate experience. Hence, the president should consider an orientation program at the beginning of the academic year that would be as significant for matriculating freshmen as the commencement ceremony is for departing seniors.

We also recommend a preterm orientation session for all new undergraduates, one that may extend into the first semester.

A short-term credit course—perhaps entitled The College: Its Values and Traditions—should be offered to introduce new students to the unique characteristics and academic procedures of the campus. We especially urge the college president to be a leader in introducing new students to the campus. At a college of quality, the president is as involved in welcoming new students to the campus as he or she is in meeting the alumni.

Special priority should be given to the difficult but essential task of orienting part-time students. Unless these students are taken seriously by the college and integrated into campus life, undergraduate education in America necessarily will become simply a process in which part-time students drift on and off campus and credits are earned and appropriately recorded. In this process, the most essential values of a liberal education will be lost.

The successful colleges offer a well-planned program of advising for all students, one that provides support throughout the freshman year. Graduates and upper division students may be effective advisors, especially in advising freshmen.

A successful freshman year program will convince students that they are part of an institutionally vital, caring community.

IV

The First Requirement

Productivity in the written and the spoken word is the first prerequisite for a college-level education. Students need language to grasp and express feelings and ideas effectively. To succeed in college, undergraduates should be able to write and speak with clarity, and to read and listen with comprehension.

We urge that the writing and reading capability of all students be carefully assessed when they enroll. Those not well prepared in written and spoken English should be placed in an intensive, noncredit, remedial course that meets daily during the academic term. And good English usage should be insisted on by every professor in every class.

While the need for remedial programs is a fact of life, we are convinced that the long-term answer is better-prepared students. Every college and university should be intimately and with surrounding districts to improve the teaching of English in the nation's schools.

We also recommend that all college freshmen, not just those with special problems, begin their undergraduate experience with a year-long course in English, with emphasis on writing.

While stressing writing, we also urge that oral communication become an important part of the freshman language course. Language and thought are inseparably connected, and as undergraduates develop their language skills, they hone the quality of their thinking and become intellectually and socially empowered. The goal must be to extend, through language study, the common knowledge of its students and, in so doing, sustain the heritage of our culture.

V

General Education

The weak and ineffective approach to general education—through distribution requirements—should be strengthened. To achieve this essential goal, we propose an approach called an integrated core. By the integrated core we mean a program of study that introduces a student to essential knowledge, to connections across the disciplines, and, in the end, to the application of knowledge to life beyond the campus.

To translate the purpose of the integrated core into practice, we suggest seven areas of inquiry that touch the disciplines and relate knowledge to experiences common to all people.

1. Language: The Crucial Connection
2. Art: The Esthetic Experience
3. Heritage: The Living Past
4. The Social Web
5. Nature: Ecology of the Planet
6. Work: The Value of Vocation
7. Identity: The Search for Meaning

It seems clear to us that an exploration of these universal experiences—through courses, seminars, all-collegeconvocations, and the like—is indispensable to students who are better to understand themselves, their society, and the world of which they are a part, ideally, general education, the integrated core, is not something to "get out of the way," but should extend vertically from freshman to senior year. And in a properly designed baccalaureate program, general education and specialized education will be joined.

VI

The Enriched Major

The baccalaureate degree is now divided into two separate parts: general education and the major. We believe these two essential segments of the baccalaureate experience should be blended in the curriculum just as, inevitably, they must be blended during life. Therefore, in tandem with the integrated core, we propose an enriched major. By an enriched major, we mean encouraging students not only to explore a field in depth, but also to put the specialized field of study in perspective.

The major, as it is, is ennobled, would respond to three essential questions: What is the history? Continuous on Following Page.
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The joy of teaching, engaging the intellect of students, and the satisfaction of participating in the building of an institution of higher learning—these, too, can and should be a source of fulfillment as great as seeing one's name in print in the pages of a professional journal or hearing the applause of one's fellow scholars at a professional meeting.

VII

Faculty Priorities

A coherent curriculum is only the beginning. Good faculty are essential to a good college. Members of the faculty determine the quality of the undergraduate experience. And the investment in teaching is the key ingredient in the building of a successful institution.

At every research university, teaching should be valued as highly as research and good teaching should be an equally important criterion for tenure and promotion.

At many research universities, the title Distinguished Research Professor is in place. We recommend that these institutions also establish the rank of Distinguished Teaching Professor, extending special status and salary incentives to those professors who are outstandingly effective in the classroom.

For most of the nation's colleges and universities, where large numbers of undergraduates are enrolled, priority should be given to teaching, not research.

While not all professors should be published research scholars, they nonetheless should be first-rate teachers. Therefore, we urge as the ideal the scholar-teacher. We understand this to mean staying on the cutting edge of the profession, knowing the literature in one's field, and skillfully communicating such information to students. To weaken faculty commitment to scholarship, as we define it here, is to undermine the undergraduate experience, regardless of the academic setting.

Faculty renewal is a crucial component of a good college. A comprehensive plan for the professional development of faculty is important during a period when mobility is increasing. The sabbatical leave is the most common form of faculty renewal, but it is far from universal. We urge that it be available at every institution.

We recommend that funds be available to help teachers develop new ideas and improve their pedagogical procedures. These grants—to be administered by a campus-wide faculty committee—should be restricted at first to those who engage in undergraduate instruction. We also urge that all colleges have a grant program for faculty research.

On behalf of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Johnson and Higgins, has selected United Resources to offer supplemental retirement annuities and financial services to AASCU member institutions.
Your Needs, Our Priorities

United Resources
United Resources is a member of a diversified financial services family specializing in meeting the needs of the nation's higher education community.

Commitment to Excellence
United Resources is committed to offering consumer oriented products and attentive client service.

Institutional Design
United Resources has the flexibility and resources to tailor an effective financial services program for your institution.

Service Orientation
Faculty and staff can be consulted on an individual basis by United Resources Financial Service Representatives.

The Program
United Resources' Financial Services include:

- Workshops/Seminars
  - Introduction to Personal Finance
  - Financial Planning
  - Retirement Planning
  - Tax Planning
  - Understanding Life Insurance
  - Investment Options
  - College Education Funding
  - New Tax Law
  - Current Topics

- Financial Planning
  - Individual Counseling
  - Full Financial Plans

- Financial Products
  - Tax-Sheltered Annuities
  - Mutual Funds
  - Money Market Funds
  - Unit Investment Trusts
  - Individual Retirement Accounts
  - Limited Partnerships
  - Life Insurance
  - Single Premium Deferred Annuities

- Special Services
  - Retirement System Value Projections
  - Life Insurance Analysis Statements
  - Institutional Program Administration
  - Educational Brochures, Newsletters

Your needs, our priorities. United Resources is here to help you.
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tradition of the field to be examined? What are the societal and economic impications to be understoned? And, What are the ethical and moral issues to be confronted and resolved?

Every student, as an essential part of the undergraduate experience, should complete an undergraduate major. Beyond the separate courses, the field of study should include an organized thesis that relates some aspect of the major to historical, social, or ethical concerns. Every student should write a senior thesis and we further suggest that each student participate in a senior seminar in which he or she presents the report orally to colleagues and also critiques the papers of fellow students.

The major begins to interact with the themes of common learning as students return, once again, to the considerations of language, heritage and social institutions, and the rest. At a college of quality when a major is so enriched it leads the student from depth to breadth and focuses, not on more training, but on liberal education at its best.

VII Faculty Priorities

A coherent curriculum is only the beginning. Good faculty are essential to a good college. Members of the faculty determine the quality of the undergraduate experience. And the assessment of teaching is the key ingredient in the building of a successful institution.

At every research university, teaching should be valued as highly as research and good teaching should be an equally important criterion for tenure and promotion.

At many research universities, the title Distinguished Research Professor is in place. We recommend that these institutions also establish the rank of Distinguished Teaching Professor, extending special status and salary incentives to those professors who are outstandingly effective in the classroom.

For most of the nation's colleges and universities, where large numbers of undergraduates are enrolled, priority should be given to teaching, not research.

While not all professors should be publishing researchers, they nonetheless should be first rate scholars. Therefore, we urge as the ideal the scholar-teacher. We understand this as meaning gaining the highest degree of the profession, knowing the literature in one's field, and skillfully communicating that information to students. To weaken faculty commitment to scholarship, as we define it here, is to undermine the undergraduate experience, regardless of the academic setting.

Faculty renewal is a crucial component of a good college. A comprehensive plan for the professional development of faculty is important during a period when mobility is respected. The sabbatical leave is the most common form of faculty renewal, but it is far from universal. We urge that it be available at every institution.

We recommend that funds be available to help teachers develop new ideas and improve their pedagogical procedures. These grants—so administered by a campus-wide faculty committee—should be restricted to those who engage in undergraduate instruction. We also urge that all colleges have a grant program for faculty research.

Faculty development programs might also include exchange arrangements and guest lecturerships that would move faculty from one campus to another. We recommend that clusters of colleges all across the country organize Regional Faculty Exchange Networks.

Because department chairs are so important to faculty development, we recommend regional seminars specifically for department chairs to prepare them for leadership.

A balance must be struck between full- and part-time faculty. Specifically, we propose that no more than 20 per cent of the undergraduate faculty be part-time and that when part-time faculty are used, their employment be educationally justified.

The joy of teaching, engaging the intellect of students, and the satisfaction of participating in the building of an institution of higher learning—these, too, can and should be a source of fulfillment as great as seeing one's name in print in the pages of a professional journal or hearing the applause of one's fellow scholars at a professional meeting.

VIII Creativity in the Classroom

What we found in many classrooms was a mismatch between faculty and student expectations, a gap that left both parties unfulfilled. Faculty, concerned with scholarship, wanted to share ideas with students who are expected to appreciate what professors do, but often this is not the case in lower division courses. Students, remarkably conscious of grades, are willing to conform to the formula of taking notes and taking tests.

We urge that top priority be given to classes for freshman and sophomore students. Special efforts should be made, through small seminar units within large lecture sections, to create conditions in the undergraduate classrooms that increase the intellectual exchange between faculty and students.

The undergraduate experience, at its best, involves active learning and disciplined inquiry that leads to the intellectual empowerment of students.

The methods used by teachers to measure the progress of their students should be improved. Specifically we recommend that faculty seminars be held on student evaluation to help teachers learn how to give students careful and concise criticisms, how to help them understand the strengths and weaknesses of their performance.

The evaluation of teachers is also the mark of a good college. We recommend that the performance of each teacher in each classroom be formally assessed by students.

All members of the faculty should work communally to improve the content of their courses and their methods of instruction and teacher preparation should begin in graduate school as graduate assistants work with mentors who carefully critique their work.

The undergraduate college, at its
Resolution of the Faculty Senate 86-12-1

WHEREAS: A change in Clemson University's administrative structure took place in which the position of Director of the Computer Center & DISD was moved from the Administrative Organizational Chart to the Academic Affairs Organizational chart; and

WHEREAS: The title of said position was changed to reflect the change to an academic position; and

WHEREAS: This position is now an Academic Administrative position; and

WHEREAS: The Faculty has an inherent interest in all matters academic; and

WHEREAS: The procedure for filling Academic Administrative positions is clearly addressed in the Faculty Manual, Section VI:G, page VI:32, paragraphs 1 and following; and

WHEREAS: The procedures set forth in the above cited paragraphs require faculty involvement; and

WHEREAS: Apparently, no faculty input was requested or given in the course of this change in administrative appointment;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT

the aforesaid procedures set forth in the Faculty Manual for filling Academic Administrative positions are to be followed.
WHEREAS, the Faculty are concerned with maintaining and improving the quality of education at Clemson University;

AND WHEREAS, the University has placed renewed emphasis on obtaining additional funds to meet the mission of the University;

AND WHEREAS, the federal appropriations for science and engineering education from NSF has been increased from 53 million dollars to 99 million dollars for the 1987 fiscal year;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate requests that the University Administration invite the NSF director for funding science and engineering education to Clemson to learn more about Clemson University and to meet with faculty members to discuss possible funding avenues for education.
Graduation Attendance

Whereas, the graduation ceremony is a time honored tradition which is very important to the students and their families; and

Whereas, an essential element in the ceremony is the presence of faculty members; therefore,

Resolved, that every employee of Clemson University with faculty rank, who is located at Clemson, SC, and who is paid in whole or part with E&G funds, be required to attend one graduation ceremony each calendar year.

Resolved, that faculty members be allowed to attend August or December graduation ceremonies, on a voluntary basis, in lieu of May graduation; the above being coordinated by each college administration to provide faculty attendance at the graduation ceremonies in approximately the following percentages: 50 percent in May, 25 percent in August, and 25 percent in December.
Faculty Senate Resolution

December 9, 1986

Subject: Revision of the Commencement Exercise

We recommend that the following changes be made in the graduation exercise.

1. Undergraduate and masters degrees will no longer be distributed at the university commencement exercise, i.e., the undergraduates and masters candidate will not parade across the stage.

2. Ph.D. degrees will be individually presented, with the major professor hooding the Ph.D. candidates on stage.

3. A guest speaker will be invited to address the assembly. The honor of choosing the commencement speaker will rotate between the individual colleges. The Dean of the selecting College and the faculty advisory committee of same will choose the speaker subject to the approval of the President of the University.

4. Upon the completion of the University exercise there will be an adjournment. Each college will then reconvene for the presentation of individual degrees by the Dean of the College.

5. There will be faculty representation at each of the three yearly graduation exercises. Approximately 50% of the faculty will attend the May exercise, 25% the August exercise, and 25% the December graduation. The faculty advisory committee of each college will develop procedures for organizing its representation at each of the exercises. No faculty member will be compelled to give up vacation time or to participate during a period of non-employment with the University.

6. The graduation exercise is an academic event. The President of the Faculty Senate will advise the faculty as to proper rules of conduct for such an event.

W. Baron
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE FINE ARTS

Based on the findings of the survey summarized in the attached report and on discussions of the committee members, the committee proposes that the Faculty Senate endorse the following recommendations and forward this report to the Council of Academic Deans for its review and endorsement.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Artistic and creative endeavors of faculty that are part of one's professional responsibilities are protected under the guarantees of academic freedom as described in the Faculty Manual. And, the faculty assume the responsibilities associated with academic freedom with regard to these endeavors. If a faculty member feels that his or her academic freedom has been violated, then the faculty grievance procedure as outlined in the Faculty Manual should be pursued.

2. Responsibility for creative endeavors, even when they involve student participation, resides within the academic unit housing the faculty members who initiate the endeavor.

3. Sensitivity to community standards is critical. Appropriate warnings in advance publicity and at the time of an event itself should continue to be included for endeavors which may have offensive components.
In response to an administrative action to censor a dramatic production involving a scene with partial nudity at Clemson University, the Faculty Senate appointed an ad hoc committee to develop a review process for the fine arts. As part of that charge the committee surveyed a number of other institutions across the nation.

A list of 46 institutions was selected from the membership list of the Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences. Deans or relevant administrators of these institutions were sent a cover letter and a one-page questionnaire in early September. Twenty-two institutions (48%) responded. A listing of these schools is included below.

The tabulation of responses to each question is reported on the following page. A few general comments, however, are appropriate. The responding institutions consider artistic and creative freedom to be part of academic freedom. These schools do not have a specific statement on the protection of artistic and creative freedom in their faculty or policy manual. Perceived violations of artistic and creative freedom are handled by either appeal to the Dean or relevant administrator or by following faculty grievance procedures.

The selection of dramatic productions is most often left to the theatre faculty. The review of these productions is left to the faculty, chair of the theatre department, or, in some instances, the dean of the college. These institutions have no policy on submitting productions for review to the community, although statements about offensive material to the community are normally included in the publicity for dramatic productions. In addition, these institutions do not have a policy for reviewing student participation in dramatic productions.

The schools that responded to the questionnaire are:

- Auburn University
- Univ. of Calif. (Berkeley)
- Univ. of Georgia
- Augustana College
- Towson State University
- Oberlin College
- Kansas State University
- Purdue University
- Furman University
- Ohio State University
- Northwestern University
- University of Alabama
- Univ. of N Carolina (Chapel Hill)
- Mercer University
- Univ. of North Dakota
- Indiana Univ. (Indianapolis)
- NC State University
- University of Maryland
- University of Illinois
- University of Wisconsin
- Texas A & M University
- Univ. of Nevada (Reno)
SURVEY REPORT

QUESTION 1: DOES YOUR FACULTY MANUAL OR UNIVERSITY MANUAL INCLUDE A SPECIFIC STATEMENT REGARDING ARTISTIC AND CREATIVE FREEDOM OF FACULTY MEMBERS?

NO: 100% (a number of institutions listed the AAUP statement on academic freedom or included the statement from their manual)

QUESTION 2: DOES THE ADMINISTRATION CONSIDER ARTISTIC AND CREATIVE ENDEAVORS TO BE A MATTER OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM?

YES: 91%
DON'T KNOW OR HASN'T BEEN ADDRESSED: 9%

QUESTION 3: WHICH ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER (E.G., PROVOST, DEAN OF STUDENT AFFAIRS, ETC.) IS RESPONSIBLE FOR APPROVING DRAMATIC PRODUCTIONS AT YOUR INSTITUTION?

CHAIR OR DEPARTMENT HEAD IN THEATRE: 32%
NO ONE IS DESIGNATED: 27%
THEATRE FACULTY OR INDIVIDUAL FACULTY: 18%
DEAN OF COLLEGE: 18%
ADMINISTRATOR IN CHARGE OF UNIV. PROGRAMMING: 4%

QUESTION 4: HOW DOES YOUR ADMINISTRATION ENSURE, IF IT DOES, THAT CREATIVE AND ARTISTIC ENDEAVORS MEET COMMUNITY STANDARDS?

JUDGMENT OF FACULTY OR DEPARTMENT CHAIR: 59%
NO POLICY: 41%

QUESTION 5: WHAT CONSIDERATIONS ARE MADE BY YOUR INSTITUTION WHEN SCHEDULED EVENTS MAY BE OBJECTIONABLE TO THE COMMUNITY?

WARNINGS IN PUBLICITY AND AT SITE OF PRODUCTION: 55%
NO POLICY: 45%

QUESTION 6: DOES YOUR INSTITUTION HAVE A MECHANISM FOR REVIEWING STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE CREATIVE ENDEAVORS OF A FACULTY MEMBER?

NO: 100%

QUESTION 7: WHAT AVENUES OF RECOURSE ARE OPEN TO A FACULTY MEMBER WHO BELIEVES THAT HIS OR HER ARTISTIC OR CREATIVE ENDEAVORS IN YOUR INSTITUTION ARE BEING RESTRICTED?

GRIEVANCE OR APPEALS PROCEDURE (OR COMMITTEE): 82%
APPEAL TO DEPARTMENT CHAIR OR DEAN 18%
2. Theatrical productions, artistic shows, all of the fine arts programs, produced by faculty members, whether or not they involve student participation, are academic endeavors. Thus, the responsibility for establishing academic standards for such activities resides within the academic units housing said faculty members. The Student Affairs, having no academic responsibilities, will thus have no responsibility for setting standards for those programs produced by faculty.

3. Delete three.

W. Baron
Whereas, the Committee on Nontraditional Delivery of Off-Campus Courses has submitted to the President a Proposal for Implementation of the Clemson University, TELECAMPU S; and

Whereas, this Proposal has been approved without sufficient input from departments and faculty; and

Whereas, this program is relatively new to Clemson University and requires changes in modes of teaching; and

Whereas, curriculum committees are charged with the approval of all course offerings at Clemson University; be it, therefore

Resolved, that all courses offered in a non-traditional delivery system be considered new courses requiring the approval of college and university curriculum committees; and, be it further

Resolved, that the Proposal be forwarded to all curriculum committees and appropriate commissions for their review.
RESOLUTION

Whereas, In the past years there have been many unnecessary duplications of educational programs within the South Carolina system of higher education; and

Whereas, The TELECAMPU S concept appears to be a program which could potentially duplicate other programs which exist or will exist in the future at other campuses within the state; therefore

Resolved, That the administration of Clemson University coordinate TELECAMPU S with the University of South Carolina and other campuses to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs.
MEMORANDUM

To: President Max Lennon

Via: (1) Dr. Arnold E. Schwartz
Vice Provost and
Dean of the Graduate School

(2) Dr. W. David Maxwell
Provost

From: Thomas H. Oswald
Associate Professor and
TELECAMPUS Project Manager

Subject: Proposal for Implementation of the Clemson University
TELECAMPUS

October 28, 1986

I am pleased to submit for your consideration a proposal for
the implementation of the Clemson University TELECAMPUS. This
program will bring Clemson into the ranks of many other leading
universities who, for some time, have offered credit courses to
off-campus students by means of instructional television and
other electronic media.

This proposal is the result of one year of investigation by
the faculty Committee on Nontraditional Delivery of Off-Campus
Credit Courses. We believe that the program details have been
sufficiently covered to warrant our official proposal for its
inauguration. Projections of the initial level of effort, as
well as expense and revenue estimates, are based on our prelimi-
nary assessment of the market in the areas of business, educa-
tion, engineering, and nursing. Funding of the program will
enable us to begin intensive market analysis by calling on
potential client organizations with a firm program of offerings
in hand. As the proposal indicates, the TELECAMPUS program has
the capability to be entirely self supporting, once it is well
established.

We request that this proposal be given immediate funding.
Time is critical if we are to begin in the fall semester,
1987. I will be glad to provide additional information at your
request.
Copy to: Mr. David Larson
Vice President for Business and Finance

Members of the Committee on Nontraditional Delivery of Off-Campus Credit Courses
A PROPOSAL

FOR THE
ESTABLISHMENT OF THE

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY TELECAMPU

Submitted to
President Max Lennon

By:
Thomas H. Oswald, P.E.
Associate Professor and
TELECAMPUS Project Manager

Via:
Arnold E. Schwartz, Ph.D.
Vice Provost and
Dean of the Graduate School

W. David Maxwell, Ph.D.
Provost

October 27, 1986
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Proposal

It is proposed that Clemson University establish a system of nontraditional delivery of off-campus credit courses, to be known as the Clemson University TELECAMPU$$. The program will provide offerings of credit courses to a statewide audience by such media as instructional television, computer networked instruction, "electronic blackboard", and possible combinations of these and other telecommunications methods. Implementation should proceed in order to commence delivery of the first courses in the fall semester, 1987.
Background

Over the past twelve months the University has been exploring the delivery of credit courses by electronic media. Such delivery methods have been in use by other major universities for fifteen years or longer.

The recent completion by the State of South Carolina of the initial phase of the Instructional Television Fixed Service (ITFS) system makes possible the statewide transmission of instructional television to corporate and institutional subscribers. This development makes media-delivered courses easily accessible to companies, schools, hospitals, and other entities which have need for such courses, and for which it is impracticable for people to commute or move to the campus.

In a presentation to President Max Lennon and other senior administrators on May 22, 1986, the faculty Committee for Nontraditional Delivery of Off-Campus Credit Courses outlined the characteristics of the proposed system and received approval in principle to go ahead with its development. Since then, designs and estimates for physical resources have been assembled, certain basic policy obstacles have been removed, initial program offerings have been identified, and communication of the plan to the department heads and faculty has been initiated.

For a fall 1987 start, budget allocations must now be made, and detailed tasking must be accomplished. The subsequent sections of this proposal will (1) describe the scope of the TELECAMPUUS program, (2) list the essential tasks for its implementation, (3) provide a time schedule for the completion of these tasks, and (4) identify the resources needed to begin.
Scope of TELECAMPU S Program

In its initial stage the Clemson University TELECAMPU S program will consist of three primary methods of delivery:

- **Instructional television (ITV)** using the state ITFS broadcast network. Initial offerings will be in the areas of engineering, nursing, business, and teacher certification.

- **Computer network based instruction of advanced placement (AP) high school students**, in mathematics and biology. The mathematics program, in addition to providing instruction for AP students, will include graduate credit courses for faculty development at schools having limited AP enrollment. Teacher training will use the same delivery system as that used for the AP students.

- **Computer network based graduate seminars**, primarily in history.

Instructor-student interaction

The ITV systems will feature two-way audio communication between the field students and the classroom. The system proposed for the AP mathematics and biology courses will have not only two-way audio interaction, but also two-way transmission of dynamic fixed-frame computer images. The history seminars will provide computer communication via a central "electronic mailbox" system, but with the two-way communication possibly separated in time by hours or even days, depending on the response-time criteria set by the instructor.

Academic program scope

Except for the AP course delivery by computer, the TELECAMPU S program will consist of regular Clemson University graduate courses. Graduate degree programs are a long-term objective,
but are not proposed in the initial phases of TELECAMPU S because of the need for Commission on Higher Education approval, and because of network broadcast time limitations.

This proposal also is limited to the delivery of credit courses. Non-credit continuing education and other public service programming will be available, and its offering via TELECAMPU S will be permitted on a space-available basis, and subject to self-support financial arrangements yet to be developed.

Origination of class sessions

The major portion of ITV programming will be "live" broadcasts of classes actually in progress on the campus. Tape-delay programming will be used only when the schedules of the field students so dictate, as in the case of nurses, and also only with the approval of the involved faculty.

Except for possible non-credit programming purchased from external sources, all TELECAMPU S offerings are contemplated to have primary origination by Clemson University faculty and from the Clemson University campus. It is not our plan to import courses from other universities.

Experimental program elements

The technology and state of practice of instructional television are well developed, and this program will simply enable Clemson University to join numerous other institutions who have been delivering courses by this medium for a long period of time. On the other hand, the two types of computer based instruction included in this proposal are technologically proven but have been utilized only in a small number of pioneering programs. For this reason the AP mathematics and biology programs, and the graduate history seminars, will be undertaken largely on an experimental basis. Market demand is believed to
exist, and this program will enable these faculty members to verify this demand and to develop the most effective ways to inaugurate the service. The College of Sciences has received a grant of $186,477 from the Commission on Higher Education, a significant portion of which is designated for the development and implementation of the electronic delivery system.

Ancillary services

Initiation of electronic course delivery will require that we provide extraordinary support to participating faculty. The next section describes an organization to provide these instructional support services.
Instructional Support Services

Nontraditional, electronic instruction media impose extraordinary requirements on instructors. If these constraints are not properly addressed, the result can be inefficient use of the media or, in the worst case, failure to achieve the learning objective and abandonment of the medium by discouraged instructors.

Whereas in traditional classroom delivery the instructor is the medium, in the electronic classroom he or she must receive extra support in order to be able to concentrate on the development and articulation of the subject matter. To fully exploit the potential of electronic delivery, the professor must be joined and supported by several other persons, each of whom has specific expertise and the time to apply it, which the professor usually does not have nor want to be responsible for.

The instructional support team

These "support team personnel" normally consist of the following:

- The instructional designer. This person is expert in the overall formulation of an electronically delivered session: the interrelationship between the straight lecture presentation and the inclusion of graphics; the performance of other technical input such as computer programs; etc. The instructional designer must be a professional who is knowledgeable of both instructional objectives and media methods.

- The graphics designer. This is the person who produces graphics assistance for the professor in the form of typography, charts and graphs, diagrams, cartoons, and other printed materials.
- The *computer programmer*. Use of computer aided instruction, with or without electronic delivery, imposes serious time demands on the instructor for producing fully debugged programs. This need is more acute when electronic delivery is used, because of the need for high reliability in every part of a presentation.

- The *video producer-director*. This person is the key individual in the technical staff which makes the electronic session possible. Interacting with the instructor and the instructional designer, the producer-director is responsible for the coordination and production of the electronic class session.

These four individuals comprise the support team for most effective delivery of courses by nontraditional means. While their individual expertise lies in the technical area, there are other support functions which are administrative in nature, but contribute to the "painless" development and delivery of courses by the faculty. These essential faculty development services include: training in *video teaching techniques*, creation of *guidelines and operation procedures for the production team described above*, for the field students and their organizations, and for the university administration. They also include *evaluation services*, *by the faculty and by others*; courier service *coordination* for the delivery of handouts, examinations, homework, etc.; recruitment and orientation of new faculty; *middleman services* between field students/organizations and university admissions offices and other administrators.

Proposed TELECAMPU S support organization

It is essential that the initial efforts on this campus be not only successful but singularly impressive. This perception of excellence is necessary for the initial cadre of field subscribers and students, because long established competing programs are commonly available, and will certainly be used in comparing Clemson's output to that of other institutions. The
very purpose of electronic delivery is to make "viewing" possible in the client's office, and this in itself allows comparisons of numerous institutions also to be made without leaving the headquarters.

As important as external perceptions of quality are the perceptions formed by initial faculty participants, and those who either ignore, resist, or strongly oppose the use of such media. Poor initial performance would be very difficult, if not impossible, to overcome.

In order to ensure the most competent production of our initial offerings, a professional instructional designer should be recruited for service at the beginning of the first full year of operation. Beginning with the second year of operation instructors should be accorded the support of a full time graphics designer. Computer programming services can be provided as needed by individual instructors, by the provision of funds for student wages, with the professor hiring students familiar with the specific courses being supported.

This proposed staffing assumes that the video producer-director is a given asset, acquired by the Communications Center as a fundamental element of preparing to deliver instructional television. Administrative support would be provided by the Graduate School office, expanding to dedicated personnel positions only as warranted by the growth of the program. The existing TELECAMPU $ project manager would provide oversight and direction of the early efforts on behalf of the administration.

The budget in Appendix II reflects the hiring of the instructional design specialist, at a salary of $30,000, beginning in FY 1987-88, followed by the graphics specialist, at $14,000 per annum, in FY 1988-89.
Implementation Tasks

The implementation of a major new program such as TELECANPUS requires coordinated action in a number of areas, moreso when the system is being put into place on an expedited schedule. The breakdown given here is divided into the areas of program development, facilities development, market development, SCETV/ITFS liaison, and program management, both administrative and technical. Systematic and thorough accomplishment of this work will ensure the success of initiating the TELECANPUS program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Area</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Development</td>
<td>Formulate concept and define scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify policy issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present to Administration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University and college levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify initial courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit instructional designer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit and train faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Development</td>
<td>Upgrade Nursing ITV classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Install internal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>links (Comm. Ctr. to Nursing, and Nursing to IRM tower).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiate equipment procurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Install and test equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist SCETV in lobbying for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>authorization of the ITFS expansion phase, to provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>four additional channels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Development</td>
<td>Identify potential users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify client organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Development (Cont'd.)</td>
<td>SCETV/ITFS Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disseminate program information:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Printed brochures.&lt;br&gt;Media announcements.&lt;br&gt;Campus luncheon and presentation.&lt;br&gt;Field visits and presentations.</td>
<td><strong>Determine network participation standards and requirements.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Submit broadcast time request.&lt;br&gt;Negotiate for maximum time allocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruit and train technical personnel.
Expand instructional support services.

Appendix I provides a progress chart display of the tasks, and sets the time schedule for implementation.
Budget

The budget for the implementation of TELECAMPUUS consists of the following amounts:

- Remainder of FY 1986-87: $209,800
- FY 1987-88 (first full year of operation): $155,000
- Subsequent years (excluding capital expansion): $183,600

Appendix II provides a budget breakdown and summaries by program element and expenditure category.
Financing of TELECAMPU S

It is necessary that the Clemson University TELECAMPU S generate most or all of its budget support from tuition, nontraditional delivery fees, and state supplemental funding resulting from the student credit hours delivered.

Appendix III contains a projection of total revenue for six TELECAMPU S courses in a single semester, which is a reasonable expectation for the first full year of operation. The fee structure used is similar to that used by several other leading institutions in the field of instructional television. It has the advantages of (1) preserving the identity of established university tuition rates, (2) providing for adjustment of the nontraditional delivery fee portion without changing the established tuition rate, and (3) providing a total cost to client organizations that is proportional to their use of the system. It also recognizes the differences among fees which are reasonable for corporate, for-profit organizations, as opposed to school districts, hospitals, and individual teachers and nurses who may enroll.

Projected revenue

In the analysis of Appendix III, enrollment estimates are made for each of four discipline areas: business, education, engineering, and nursing. 600 student credit hours are projected, from a combination of the full time, on-campus enrollment and the part time remote students who will participate in classes simultaneously with the on-campus students. These numbers are extended by the applicable fee rates, and further by the average state supplemental funding per student credit hour of master's-level courses to arrive at the total revenue per course. The grand total of $212,520 represents the total anticipated revenue from a semester's operation of the TELECAMPU S program. Considering the summer session a semester with equal
enrollment, the annual revenue would therefore be approximately $637,000.

Revenue vs. expense

The costs to be covered in a 12-month period of operation are as follows (from Appendix II):

- Operating expenses, year two and beyond: $183,600
- Building capital investment amortization: 5,820
  - (10 years, straight line)
- Equipment amortization (5 years): 24,060
- Total incremental program costs to be covered: $213,480

Add: Instructional salaries

- Six courses at $12,000, x 3 semesters: 216,000
- Grand total of program costs: 429,480

The TELECAMPUS program therefore might reasonably be expected to be fully self supporting.
APPENDICES
Appendix I

Clemson University TELECAMPUS
Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope and policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information briefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty recruitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip. procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eq. inst. &amp; testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARKET DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotional actys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client contacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCETV/ITFS LIAISON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stds. &amp; requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time alloc. request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROG. MGMT. - ADMIN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin. staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROG. MGMT. - TECH.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. Suppt. Svcs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX II

Clemson University TELECAMPUS

Budget Summary
October 27, 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Program Element</th>
<th>FY 1986-87</th>
<th>FY 1987-88</th>
<th>Subseq. Yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Investment</td>
<td>$178,500</td>
<td>$ -0-</td>
<td>$ (Variable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Production</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>60,700</td>
<td>69,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Development and Marketing</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>52,100</td>
<td>51,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support Services</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>42,200</td>
<td>62,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$209,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$155,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$183,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Budget Category</th>
<th>FY 1986-87</th>
<th>FY 1987-88</th>
<th>Subseq. Yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Investment</td>
<td>$178,500</td>
<td>$ -0-</td>
<td>$ (Variable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel (Salaries, fr. ben., wages)</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>142,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operating Expenses</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>35,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$209,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$155,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$183,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clemson University TELECAMPUSS

Budget Estimate
October 27, 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Item</th>
<th>Estimate of Funding Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 1986-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. CAPITAL INVESTMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Physical Plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade studio-classroom in College of Nursing (30 student positions)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber optic path, P&amp;AS Bldg. to Nursing Building</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex microwave system, Nursing to IRM tower</td>
<td>16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Capital Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and recording equip., for classroom and control room</td>
<td>87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio system</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTEL Communications Audiographics system *</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Participation&quot; software or equivalent</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL, CAPITAL INVESTMENT</td>
<td>$178,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A second OPTEL system is necessary for this program, and is being provided under the CHE grant. This grant also will fund approximately $44,000 in specialized computer modems and software, which will be loaned by the University to participating high schools.
## II. VIDEO PRODUCTION (Communications Center)

### A. Personnel (Salary and 20% fringe benefits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineer (3 mos. first yr.)</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$21,600</td>
<td>$21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer-Director</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student wages</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL, PERSONNEL</strong></td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$46,700</td>
<td>$46,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Operating Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance, repair, replacement</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tape</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. supplies</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING EXPENSE</strong></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL, VIDEO PRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, VIDEO PRODUCTION</strong></td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$60,700</td>
<td>$69,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND MARKETING (TELECAMPUS Project Manager)

#### A. Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>FY 1986-87</th>
<th>FY 1987-88</th>
<th>Subseq. Yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>$31,200</td>
<td>$31,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL, PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,900</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visits to other programs</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing visits within SC</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance to clients</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL, TRAVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. Other Operating Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications and Graphics services</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and mailing</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TELECAMPUS Budget Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Operating Expenses</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor equipment</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(portable VCRs and monitors for office and field presentations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 9,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 5,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 6,500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARKETING</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 24,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 52,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 51,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES

### Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Design Specialist</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$35,700</td>
<td>$35,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Designer</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>16,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student programmer assts.</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL, PERSONNEL**

-0- $39,700 $56,300

### Operating Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor equipment</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous operating</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL, OPERATING EXPENSE**

-0- $2,500 $6,000

**TOTAL, INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

-0- $42,200 $62,300
APPENDIX III

Clemson University TELECAMPU S
Revenue Projection, One Semester

I. Assumed fee structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee category</th>
<th>Tuition &amp; Univ. Fee</th>
<th>Nontrad. del'y. fee % of Tuition $</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Corporations, other for-profit organizations</td>
<td>$68.00/cr. hr.</td>
<td>100% $68.00</td>
<td>$136.00 per hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Schools, hospitals, other not-for-profit organizations, individuals w/o corporate sponsor</td>
<td>68.00/cr. hr.</td>
<td>50% 34.00</td>
<td>102.00 per hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Full time, on-campus students</td>
<td>886.00/semester ($74 pro rata per sem. hr.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. State supplemental funding
1986-87 state supplemental funding, University average, MS degrees: $247 per SCH

III. Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Total Est. Enr.</th>
<th>Tuition and Fees</th>
<th>State Suppl.</th>
<th>Total Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business (MBA)</td>
<td>2 20 60 C</td>
<td>$4,440</td>
<td>$14,820</td>
<td>$19,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 120 A</td>
<td>$16,320</td>
<td>29,640</td>
<td>45,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (In. Ed.)</td>
<td>1 10 30 C</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>9,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 150 B</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>37,050</td>
<td>52,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2 20 60 C</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>14,820</td>
<td>19,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 120 A</td>
<td>16,320</td>
<td>29,640</td>
<td>45,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1 10 30 C</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>9,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>6 60 140</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>10,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$212,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III-1