MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

April 3, 1984

I. Call to Order:

President Ulbrich called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.
President Ulbrich called on the members of the Advisory Committee to introduce the new members from their colleges. New Faculty Senate Roster attached.

II. Approval of Minutes of the March Meeting:

The minutes of the March 6, meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as corrected.

III. Committee Reports:

A. Policy:

Senator Camper reported that the Policy Committee met and considered the Palmer Resolution entitled "Tenure" and endorsed this resolution. Faculty involvement with funds that are outside of the normal accounting procedure for the university will be a hold-over item for the next committee meeting. A proposal for revised guidelines for the Open Forum was also discussed and the Policy Committee was in support of the Open Forum Committee report. The policy committee did not recommend a change in the size of the Grievance Board at this time. Attachment A is the annual report of the Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate in 1983-84.

B. Research:

Senator Overcamp presented the Faculty Senate Research Committee Annual Report (Attachment B). Two major items were pointed out: 1) The Conflict of Interest Policy and 2) the Library Acquisitions Policy. The committee endorsed two resolutions, an Ad Hoc Committee Report which deals with return of indirect costs, and the recognition presentation of the Outstanding Researcher Award at Spring commencement.

C. Welfare:

Senator McGregor presented the Welfare Committee annual Report (Attachment C).

D. Scholastic Policy:

Senator Bauer reported that a final decision on + grading should be made on April 27, and that the proposed new university calendar would be addressed under new business (Attachment J).

IV. University Committees, Commissions, Councils:

A. Traffic and Parking:
Senator Gowdy reported that parking on Bowman Field was voted down 8 to 1, but the old policy will be retained.

B. Graduate Studies:
Senator Dickey reported a nondisclosure statement must be signed by all persons, faculty and graduate students, having access to special research information.

C. Undergraduate Studies:
Senator Hill reported that the satisfactory progress statement had passed and could be in the catalog this fall.

V. Boards:

A. University Planning Board:
Senator Senn reported that Jim Boniface, Architectural Consultant for the Thurmond Center, would be in town the week of April 16, to discuss site selection (Attachment D). Alternative "B," the Institute Building and Performing Arts Center on campus and the Continuing Education Center on the lake, was the current choice.

VI. President's Report:

President Ulbrich met with the President and discussed the formation of a task force to take action on the selection procedures for Alumni Professors. There should be an opportunity for Senate representation on this task force as well as Alumni Professors. Indirect costs were also discussed with the President. The proposed restructure of committees, commissions and councils was discussed at the President's Council. Recognition for the Association of Department Heads and the need to allow them to select their own representatives for various councils and commissions was also discussed.

The Council of Deans has been informed that the Commission on Higher Education would like to sponsor a minimum of one endowed professorship at each state school. The Commission would supply $35,000 as an endowment. This sum is to be matched by the University and the proceeds used as a $4,000 salary supplement and $1,000 for departmental expenses. It also appears that we are going to get full formula funding or at least 96% thereof. President Ulbrich gave some high points and some low points of the last year's Faculty Senate. Certain negotiations in the Open Forum discussion were a low point. A discussion of office hours with the Council of Deans was another low point. High points could be summarized as 1) a victory in the battle of the bicycle barricades; 2) satisfactory resolution of the Outstanding Research Award presentation; 3) support of the Provost over opposition of three deans for disclosure of evaluation results (Attachment K).

VII. Old Business:

Senator Palmer recommended adoption of the report to amend the tenure probationary period as it appears in the faculty manual (Attachment E). He stated that the current wording says that prior service will be considered only from previous employment from a tenure
track position at an institution of higher education. We were told when we were writing the faculty manual that the provision for other tenure was taken care of, but over the past couple of years, we have discovered that this has not been the case. Where there is prior service, in a tenure track position at an institution of higher education, it must count toward the probationary period regardless of what that institution may be. Senator Overcamp suggested that this resolution might mean that we would have to give up the possibility of early tenure. This could aid the recruitment by other institutions for those that are doing a good job and cannot receive tenure until the probationary period has been met. He moved that we amend the resolution by eliminating the replacement wording for the fifth paragraph which states that a decision to grant tenure shall be made during the penultimate year of the probationary period and become effective at the beginning of the next year. The amendment carried with one no vote. The original resolution with the paragraph deleted by amendment was passed unanimously.

Senator Overcamp presented a resolution on the indirect cost policy (Attachment F). The resolution was seconded and President Ulbrich stated that the President had said "it was his intent that some of the indirect cost go back to the principal investigator for use in the project." The President had received written copies of the policy through the Provost from the Council of Deans. Senator Stutzenburger indicated that there is a problem at the Department Head's level as well as at the Dean's level. He feels that the Department Heads do not disclose to the principal investigator the amount of money or what is to be done with that money. Senator Hudson moved that the motion be postponed until the next meeting. The motion to postpone was seconded, and passed with one no vote.

Senator Camper reported that the Open Forum Committee, had a very positive meeting with Harry Durham and reached agreement on all of the items proposed in the written document prepared by the Open Forum Committee. This written document should be forthcoming by the next meeting. The document will state that the Open Forum Committee will be responsible for documents selected for publication. In the event that there is a division of opinion within the Committee, this difference of opinion will be presented to the Faculty Senate President and resolved in consultation with the President. Senator Baron stated that he felt most letters would wind up in the hand of the President and the President of the Faculty Senate for a decision. Senator Camper stated that the committee felt that the President's approval would be the exception rather than the rule. President Ulbrich suggested that we continue discussion of the Open Forum at our next meeting.

Senator Hudson had no report on the Public Service Award and suggested the appointment of a new Ad Hoc Committee to deal with this matter.

Senator Overcamp reported on the Russian Program (Attachment G) and referred to minimum class enrollment using the Russian Program as an example. He felt that this matter should be referred to the scholastic policy committee for further study. Senator Dickey moved to adopt the resolution on the Outstanding Research Award (Attachment H). The motion
was seconded and Senator Dickey indicated that George Moore agreed with the resolution, but felt that the award might be presented at the Spring Faculty Meeting rather than Spring Commencement. Senator Palmer expressed reservations for this resolution feeling that the Spring Commencement Exercise is a ceremony for the students. Senator Overcamp took exception with Senator Palmer's statement stating that commencement was a solemn occasion for the university. The resolution passed unanimously, and that concluded old business.

VIII. New Business:

A token of appreciation from the Faculty Senate was presented to outgoing President Ulbrich by incoming President Senn, followed by a round of applause from the Faculty Senate floor. Incoming President Senn accepted the gavel and presided over new business.

Incoming President Senn stated that we have two items of new business. The first was a proposed calendar which comes from the scheduling committee. This information was distributed in a special mailing on March 14. Senator Bauer expressed some concerns raised in the Scholastic Policy Committee Meeting. 1) Is summer graduation necessary? 2) The fact that all finals are in one calendar week, Monday thru Saturday, and 3) the calendar comes from the Scheduling Committee, which is a committee of administrators whose membership does not contain faculty. Other concerns are the three weeks between semesters, how multiple lab sections will be handled with the new calendar and how quickly senior grades can be processed. The Scheduling Committee did have an informal poll of the faculty. It was an informal poll and the Scholastic Policy Committee has some question as to how effective that poll was. In effect, the Scholastic Policies Committee would like to see this matter studied further.

President Senn said the proposed calendar is out for review and comment with no indication of how long that reviewing comment period will be. The calendar is proposed for the '85-'86 year and is usually made up a year in advance. Senator Privette said that she was an alternate member of the Scheduling Committee and this proposal was reviewed and passed by this committee and is to go to the Undergraduate Commission and Graduate Commission. Senator Gowdy indicated that his faculty poll did not feel the issue of turning in senior grades had been solved. Senator Camper stated that the College of Agriculture faculty had not been polled on this subject. President Senn indicated that the faculty senators had had this information since the middle of March and that he had circulated it in his college and asked if all other senators had done the same. Senator Dillman indicated that he had circulated it among his faculty and the concern over turning in senior grades has not been resolved. Dillman said that this subject was discussed with Dr. Reel in the Welfare Committee and his response was that senior level courses were scheduled to occur earlier in the examination period, and if there had been any problem, David Fleming should be contacted. Fleming indicated to Dillman that he should give a multiple choice test so that he could get his grades in quicker. Senator Privette indicated that this calendar was made out by a faculty member and forwarded to the Scheduling Committee in an attempt to get away from the 14 week schedule.
presented last year. Senator Baron said that he had polled the College of Engineering and no one seemed to care about any subject except senior grades. Under the old, the new or the proposed system, no change has been made in the arrangement for final exams. Senator Dickey moved that we refer the calendar issue to the Scholastic Policy Committee which was seconded and passed unanimously.

A lengthy discussion followed the tabling of the motion with the final decision being made to take the subject up during the Advisory Committee Meeting on Tuesday, April 10.

Senator Senn indicated that the last item on the Agenda was the approval of the procedural by-laws for the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Manual states that procedural by-laws can be established at the discretion of the Faculty Senate so that it will not have to go through the entire faculty for minor change approval (Attachment I). Senator Hill moved adoption of the by-laws. There was a call for the question followed by an explanation of the procedural by-laws by President Senn. Senator Hill withdrew his call for the question and expressed concern over the wording of the sentence containing items of consideration at Faculty Senate meetings. He felt that "should notify" meant that it was a suggestion rather than "shall" meaning a fact. Senator McGregor proposed an amendment which reads, "The President of the Senate shall appoint a parliamentarian at the beginning of the year to serve at all meetings of the body. The amendment was seconded and passed with one no vote. Senator Coston indicated that he had several questions on this document as amended and moved that it be postponed to our May meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

IX. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
John F. Welter
Secretary, Faculty Senate
ANNUAL REPORT - POLICY COMMITTEE, FACULTY SENATE - 1983-84

April 3, 1984 - Activities of the Policy Committee for 1983-84.

1. Considered a request by the Extension Senate for representation on certain search committees.

2. Considered a proposed revised faculty evaluation scheme and recommended that it not be adopted. Further testing of the presently used form was encouraged prior to adopting a new one. The proposed use of three categories (Below Expectations, Meeting Expectations, and Exceeding Expectations) was considered unacceptable.

3. Discussed the duties and responsibilities of the new position, Vice President for Development.

4. Formulated a policy statement for faculty office hours, which was to be established by each department.

5. Recommended deletion of the faculty absence form (Section III. 2, Faculty Manual).

6. Considered the faculty status of department heads, but deferred action until action by the Association of Department Heads.

7. Recommended that visiting faculty be evaluated annually by the appropriate department head in the manner used for other faculty in that department.

8. Recommended several changes in the Grievance Procedures as stated in the Faculty Manual.
   a. Right Appeal to the President
   b. Notification of Grievance Committee's Recommendation
   c. Simultaneous Filing of Grievances under GPI and GPII.
   d. Content of Grievance Petition

9. Requested that Section IV:16 of the Faculty Manual dealing with Military Leave be studied by the legal staff of the University and suggest wording that will comply with state and federal laws.

10. Recommended revised wording of Part II, Section L. (page II:16) of the Faculty Manual dealing with tenure.
The principal activities of the Research Committee in the 1983-1984 Senate year are as follows:

1. A report was presented to the Senate on a draft of a proposed "Conflict of Interest Policy." This report found that the proposed policy on consulting and outside activities was in conflict with provisions of the Faculty Manual. The committee recommended reconsideration of the proposed policy, and the initiation of changes in the Manual, which would require concurrence of both the administration and the Senate, if present policy was found inadequate. This committee report was unanimously accepted by the Senate at its July 12, 1983 meeting.

2. A report was presented to the Senate on the Library Acquisitions Policy. This report gave the formula used in budget recommendations for monographs and its Collection Development Statement. The report recommended that the Depositories Committee (which has been replaced by the Libraries Committee) review the current acquisitions policy. The report was unanimously adopted by the Senate at its November 15, 1983 meeting.

3. After a year of informal efforts by members of the committee to clarify the policy on the "Return of Indirect Costs," the committee has endorsed the ad hoc committee resolution which will be introduced at the April 3, 1984 Senate meeting.

4. The committee has endorsed the resolution on "Recognition of Outstanding Researcher at Commencement" which will be introduced at the April 3, 1984 Senate meeting.

In addition to these issues, the Research Committee addressed a number of other issues during the year. These include (1) the eligibility of those in special faculty ranks including those in visiting professorial and research associate/research professorial ranks for the University Research Grant Committee Awards and Provost Research Awards, (2) support for publication costs, (3) the biennial Faculty Publications summary, and (4) the consulting policy for faculty in the College of Agricultural Sciences and the College of Forestry. The Research Committee may wish to consider these issues next year.
From May, 1983 through March, 1984, the Welfare Committee:

1. Reviewed, revised, and resubmitted several times a University Long-Range Planning Committee recommendation, approved by the Senate. This useful concept finally faded away, for the present, due to administrative disinclination in Sikes.

2. Studied an adjusted annual leave policy for 12-month faculty. An opinion survey of 12-month faculty was completed. This item remains to be followed up by the three units namedly affected -- Cooper Library, Forest and Recreation Resources, and Agricultural Sciences.

3. Looked again at unified giving, but took no action. This should be pursued through the new office of Vice President for Institutional Advancement.

4. Arranged for information to be provided to faculty and staff about the South Carolina State Employees Association through the Newsletter and in new-faculty packets.

5. Called the Administration's attention to the fact that the annual faculty salary report has become "deannualized," and urged its reinstatement.

6. Recommended, along with the Faculty Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee of the Commission on Faculty Affairs, the establishment of a University Health-Wellness Committee. This committee has been appointed by President Atchley.

7. Discussed a series of mini-courses for faculty and staff on various topics such as investments, estate planning, retirement planning, health-wellness, etc. This has not yet seen fruition.

8. Reviewed status of, and plans for, the University Club.

9. Met with Mr. Ron Herrin, Director of Payroll and Employee Benefit Programs, to discuss recent changes in State Employees' Health Insurance Plan, administered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield.

10. Reviewed with Mr. Herrin tax-deferred annuities, and reported to the Faculty Senate on the status of a periodic survey and ranking of the various tax-deferred plans.

11. Met with Vice Provost Jerry Reel to review the Summer School program in general, Summer School pay specifically, and to exchange ideas on other concerns related to Summer School. No action was taken, the Committee feeling that Provost Reel is working effectively to improve Summer School, and that he should be encouraged to continue in this direction.

12. Considered the Provost's apparent view of promotion, tenure, and reappointment, as gleaned from a Newsletter position statement and other sources, and discussed the confusion prevalent about what material or documentation
the Provost desires in support of these career steps. Rather than proposing formal action, the Committee requested that the Faculty Senate President pursue the matter informally with the Provost, and further that the Provost be requested to provide a clear, specific statement of the reasons for reversing a unanimous recommendation (favorable or unfavorable) from peer committee, department head, and dean, along with suggested remedial steps when tenure or promotion is denied.

13. Became engrossed in a particular health insurance problem related to clinical pathology services in Anderson Memorial Hospital and from that to the general question of cost-containment in health-related services and insurance. We met with representatives of South Carolina Blue Cross-Blue Shield, the South Carolina Medical Association, Anderson Memorial Hospital, Piedmont Pathology Associates, P.A., and the state employees' health insurance unit of the State Personnel Division. Hopefully, a resolution of the clinical pathology problem is in the making.

14. Studied the possibility of a deferred tuition plan for Faculty's spouses and/or children attending Clemson University. A survey showed 179 children/spouses of 154 faculty were enrolled in Clemson in the Spring, 1984 semester. This item requires further followup by the 1984-85 Committee.

15. Reviewed a paper, "A Study of Faculty Retirement Practices in Selected Higher Institutions," compared Clemson's practices, and concluded that Clemson's recognition of, and benefits to, retired faculty compare quite favorably with those of other schools.

16. Discussed impacts of the recent change of reporting travel expenses as income on a separate W-2 form, and a change in interpretation by the Business and Finance Office relating to reimbursement for use of personal vehicles for official travel.

17. Presented a resolution opposing diversion of state health insurance reserve funds to the general state operating budget.

It has been an interesting year. Several carry-over items remain for follow-up. Several new items are already on the worry list. The 1984-85 Welfare Committee can rest assured that there will be no dearth of worthy concerns.

Faculty Senate Welfare Committee - 1983-'84
Davis McGregor, Chairman, Forestry
Bill Baron, Civil Engineering
Hassan Behery, Textiles
Donald C. Coston, Horticulture
Buddy Dillman, Ag Econ & Rural Soc.
Maureen Harris, Library, Documents
Larry Hudson, Animal Science
John Romeiser, Languages
John Welter, Poultry Science
The University Planning Board met jointly with the Board of Trustees' Planning Committee on March 16. The purpose of the meeting was to hear a report from Mr. James Boniface, architectural consultant, and to discuss site alternatives for the Strom Thurmond Center.

Mr. Boniface reviewed some of the major concepts of the Master Plan. One of the foremost changes was the reorientation of the University from an east-west campus to a north-south campus. Possible linkages to the lake were discussed during the development of the Master Plan, but no facilities were proposed for the lake at that time.

Mr. Boniface reported on his meetings with various campus groups during the preceding week. In addition to the original Master Plan proposal for the Strom Thurmond Center, he presented four other generic plans which emerged during his meetings:

a. All three facilities of the Center on the lake at Lewis Field.

b. The Institute Building and the Performing Arts Center on campus and the Continuing Education Center on the lake.

c. The Performing Arts Center on campus and the other two facilities on the lake.

d. The Institute, Performing Arts, and a Conference Center on campus with hotel/dining facilities on the lake.

Mr. Boniface reported that he had found considerable support for the Master Plan during his campus meetings but continuing education coordinators (except for those in agriculture) preferred a lake site for the Continuing Education Center in order to increase its marketability. He then reviewed possible lease-back arrangements, legal and financial considerations, and finally, the importance of a Request for Proposal (RFP) approach to document what the University wants in the Thurmond Center facilities.

At the present time, Mr. Boniface is drafting a report which will analyze all five options -- the original Master Plan and the four plans outlined above. He will return to campus during the week of April 16-20. Another joint meeting of the University Planning Board and the Trustees' Planning Committee will be held on April 20. It should then be possible to select a site plan. At that point a campus group would be formed to draft a RFP which could include any combination of or all of the facilities desired.

Respectfully submitted,

David J. Senn, Vice-President
MEMORANDUM

TO: H. Dwight Camper, Chairman
   Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Mervin Palmer

DATE: February 14, 1984

SUBJECT: Tenure Probationary Period

Some time ago the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate appointed a committee consisting of Arlene Privette, Larry Hudson, and myself to look at the statements in the Faculty Manual concerning the tenure probationary period in the light of our experience on the Grievance Board, and to report to the policy committee. Our report follows:

We propose the following to replace the third paragraph under Part II, section L, page II:16.

"The tenure probationary period for a full-time, regular faculty member shall not exceed seven years. All or part of a faculty member’s full-time tenure or tenure-track service at another institution of higher learning and/or other professional experience relevant to the appointment at Clemson may be included in this probationary period. Inclusion of any such service shall be reviewed in accordance with a department’s regular tenure peer-evaluation process and shall be mutually agreed upon in writing at the time of the initial Clemson appointment."

If this change were made, then there would be little need for the provision for early tenure that follows. Thus the fifth paragraph under II:L should be replaced with

"The decision to grant tenure shall be made during the penultimate year of the probationary period and become effective at the beginning of the next year."

This wording will correct two difficulties with the present paragraph.

1) It will allow Clemson to recruit outstanding faculty from non-academic research facilities and to recruit faculty from institutions that do not grant tenure for positions that are tenured at Clemson (as in Ag. Extension), and to establish for such people a tenure probationary period appropriate for their professional experience.
Faculty Senate Resolution FS-84-4-

RETURN OF INDIRECT COSTS

WHEREAS, the policy of returning funds equivalent to a set fraction of earned indirect costs to the various Colleges with the expressed intent that the investigators would be able to expend a portion of the funds derived from their projects has provided a positive incentive for obtaining external funds, and

WHEREAS, investigators in selected administrative units have neither realized direct benefit nor have had any input into the expenditure of these funds, be it therefore,

RESOLVED, the Faculty Senate asks that the President review the policies of each administrative unit to check for compliance with the spirit and intent of his policy.
Minimum Class Enrollments: The Russian Program

In the past year we have seen the Russian language courses deleted from the schedule booklet due to low class enrollments. Although this immediately affects the Russian program, minimum enrollment levels could affect a larger number of programs or courses throughout the University.

An external review committee recently submitted a report entitled, "A Review of Foreign Language Programs in South Carolina Institutions of Higher Learning" to the Commission on Higher Education. In the section of their report on the Department of Language at Clemson University, two of their comments and recommendations were:

1. "We deplore the action of the university in eliminating instruction in Russian and we urge the reversal of the decision. Russian is a language which has strategic value for the nation and is appropriate to the interests of students in science, engineering, architecture, and other fields well established at Clemson. To remove a proven Russian program from the catalog at this time strikes us as a short-sighted and regressive act."

2. "We urge the university to reconsider its policy of rigid minimum enrollment levels in advanced courses. The administration should permit low-number courses to be balanced out by higher-number general courses in the same department. This policy is followed successfully by many institutions in all parts of the country."

Although the Russian courses have not actually been deleted from the catalog, the deletion from the schedule booklet has, in the short run, accomplished the same purpose.

In view of the broad implications of such actions, the Scholastic Policy committee could study the issue of minimum class enrollments and issue a report to the Senate.
Recognition of Outstanding Researcher at Commencement

WHEREAS, a great university both discovers and transmits knowledge, and

WHEREAS, the hallmark of a great university includes outstanding research as well as outstanding instructional programs, and

WHEREAS, great programs are the sums of the efforts of individual faculty, and

WHEREAS, reward and recognition are great motivational forces for achievement by individuals, and

WHEREAS, the recognition and prize for outstanding teaching (Alumni Master Teaching Award) is given at the spring commencement, be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the Outstanding Research Award be presented (citation read and prize given) at the spring commencement.
FACULTY SENATE PROCEDURAL BYLAWS

1. Regular Meeting Agenda

The President of the Faculty Senate shall prepare an agenda for each meeting. Members of the faculty having items for consideration at a Senate meeting should notify the chairperson at least one week before the meeting.

The order of business shall be:

a. Call to Order
b. Special Order of the Day (if any)
c. Approval of Minutes
d. Committee Reports:
   1). Standing Committees
   2). Ad Hoc Committees
   3). University Commissions/Councils/Committees
e. President’s Report
f. Old Business
g. New Business
h. Adjournment

2. Roll Call Votes

A roll call vote may be called for as a motion from the floor, seconded from the floor, and passed if 20 percent of the senators vote in support of the motion.

3. Resolutions and Standing Committee Reports

A written copy of all resolutions and standing committee reports must be submitted to the secretary by the conclusion of each regular Senate meeting.

4. Parliamentarian

The Vice-President of the Senate shall serve as parliamentarian at all meetings of the body.

5. Assumption of Office

Newly elected senators and alternates shall assume office at the beginning of New Business of the regular April meeting each year.
Faculty Senate
Scholastic Policies Committee
1983-84 Annual Report

April 21, 1984

Activities of Scholastic Policies Committee for 1983-84:

1. Recommended adoption of the S.C. Commission on Higher Education prerequisites for admission to public college and universities.

2. Suggested no response to a report from the UCLA Senate dealing with freshman participation in athletics.

3. Began work on a catalog statement dealing with determination of which curriculum requirements are effective for particular students, such as those who transfer or change majors. This should be resolved in the near future.

4. Met with personnel in Admissions and Records and discussed the student data base and admissions.

5. Began working with the Advising and Placement Committee on discussion of concern about advising.

6. Began discussion of the issues related to the deletion of the Russian program; i.e., how are decisions made as to what courses are not offered due to low enrollment, is the university contractual obligated to offer courses.

7. Recommended adoption of +/- grading. This should be resolved in near future.

Continuing issues for next year:

1. Admissions
2. Satisfactory progress
3. Effects of new academic regulations
4. Advising
5. Russian program

Respectfully submitted,

Larry L. Bauer
PRESIDENT'S REPORT
March, 1983 (for the April meeting)

1. This has been a relatively quiet period in some respects and a very busy one in others. Spring break was a good opportunity to prepare to wind up the Senate year and turn over the reins to Dave Senn, who has been working hard in preparation to take over. I know that you will all give Dave the kind of support, advice and encouragement you gave me. I have attached a score sheet of sorts to this report as a summary of the major events of the year. Overall, I think we have done well. There are a lot of "happenings" which don't show up as Senate actions. Much of the "behind-the-scenes" work is results from the fact that the President of the Faculty Senate is a voting member of both the Cabinet and the Council of Deans.

2. I have been working with the President on the return of indirect cost issue and with the President and George Moore on the Alumni Professor issue. I hope to have some report on both by the time the Senate meets.

3. The Commission on Faculty Affairs met in March and will meet one more time before the Senate meeting. The Marshal's Committee recommended only minimal changes in the commencement exercises. Their report will be duly forwarded to the President's Council. The ad hoc committee on faculty evaluation is working on piecemeal revisions. That work will be carried forward to the next Commission/Senate year. The ad hoc committee on teaching evaluation is working and has found some preliminary direction. I hope to meet with Henry Pate and the Provost before the April 3rd meeting of the Senate.

4. I was very pleased with the joint meeting of the Student and Faculty Senates, although I was disappointed at the lack of a quorum on our side (seventeen faculty senators attended). The discussions were spirited and the interchange was most helpful. They concurred with our resolution on the Thurmond complex and passed their own resolution on "Unleash the Open Forum". I hope the active dialogue and cooperation between the two senates will continue in the future. Certainly our two joint efforts--on bicycle barricades and on Bowman Field--were most fruitful.

5. The Cabinet discussed the recommendation on Bowman Field and referred it back to Traffic and Parking with a suggestion that no parking be allowed on Bowman Field if weather conditions are adverse. Alumni goodwill was cited as the major concern in not supporting the actions of the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate, and the Traffic and Parking Committee.

6. The dialogue on the Open Forum continues. I expect to have a report from our two committee members, Dwight Camper and Victor Rudowski, and have accordingly placed the subject on the agenda under old business. I had lunch with Boo Cheney and Jack McKenzie and we finally figured out that the additional changes in Steve's letter without clearing them with him were a result of a communications failure. Additional changes had been
considered earlier and were pencilled in on one copy of his letter, but Ross Cornwell requested only two changes, which Steve agreed to. That message was not clearly relayed to Jack McKenzie and he thought all the changes which had been discussed were to be included. Public Relations would like to keep the Open Forum going. I leave that with our duly elected representatives.

7. The Advisory/Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate met with planner Jim Boniface on March 13th and shared the Senate's feelings about the locational issues relating to the Thurmond complex. We will have an opportunity to meet with him again later when he has some alternative options to present.

8. I think I promised to get schlocky in this report. I'll save that for the meeting and the Beer Bust. Please don't forget the beer bust--Camp Hope shelter, right after the Senate meeting--Senators old, new and continuing, alternates, spouses, Provost and President invited. Carl and I are hosting with some help from Senate wives Eleanor Hare and Starr Swanson and the Vending Machine Committee is paying the bill. A keg is a lot of beer, so please be sure to come and bring spouses. There will be soft drinks also and munchies.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

March 6, 1984

I. Call to Order:

President Ulbrich called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. She reminded the Senate members of the joint meeting with the Student Senate scheduled for Monday night, March 12. She also reminded the Advisory-Executive Committee of the meeting with Mr. Boniface on Tuesday at 3:00 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the February 7 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as corrected.

III. Committee Reports:

A. Scholastic Policy:

Senator Bauer reported on the results of the survey of faculty in regards to grading systems (Attachment A). Senator Bauer noted several interesting aspects of the report. He noted that 63% of the faculty had responded and that 60% of these favored change. 84% of those responding favored using the same system for both graduates and undergraduates. He called attention to the survey of other universities in this region as well of those nationwide which are using some form of plus-minus grading. Senator Bauer requested that he be allowed to report to the Commission that the Senate has reaffirmed its previous resolution on this matter.

Senator Bauer reported that the committee hopes to have a revised statement for the inside front cover of the catalog by next meeting.

B. Policy: no report

C. Research:

Senator Overcamp presented a report on the issues discussed at the February meeting of the Research Committee (Attachment B). He noted that since no consensus had been reached the Committee did not take action at this time on the matter of University Research Committee guidelines for eligibility of faculty for research awards.

Senator Behery brought up the issue of the indirect cost return and the lack of clarity and standardization of policies regarding how the funds are to be spent. Senator Overcamp said that attempts to settle this issue have been unsuccessful. President Ulbrich said that the matter has been called to the attention of President Atchley and that he has requested each dean to spell out the way in which this matter was to be handled in their college. The deans were to send their policies to him for his study. President Ulbrich said that
to her knowledge no action had been taken and that she felt that it was appropriate to follow this up with a resolution.

Senator Romeiser requested that a study be initiated on the limits on travel costs, especially for overseas travel. Senator Overcamp said that the Provost had indicated that it was the perogative of the University Research Committee to set guidelines. He asked that this matter be directed to the of the Committee. President Ulbrich said that it was appropriate to draft a resolution through the Senate Research Committee.

D. Welfare:

Senator McGregor reported that the Welfare Committee had met on the 14th and on the 21st (Attachment C). In the first of these two meetings they reviewed the discussions of the previous meeting with the representatives from Piedmont Pathologists, Anderson Memorial Hospital, S.C. Blue Cross-Blue Shield and the S.C. Medical Association. On February the 21st the Committee wrote a response directed to Piedmont Pathologists suggesting that they come up with a solution to the problem. This response also said that progress on their actions would be reported at the May meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Senator McGregor said that the whole problem of insurance and health care costs would be pursued by the Committee. He said that the Committee had invited a representative from the state health insurance to come and talk on the relationship of state health insurance funds to Blue Cross-Blue Shield.

Senator McGregor said that the questionnaires on deferred tuition indicated that 15.7% of the faculty had dependants enrolled in the University. A straw poll of the Senate members showed that majority of the senate members favored pursuing the matter. Senator McGregor noted that this did not mean reduced tuition but a way of stretching out the payments over a longer period of time.

Senator McGregor reported that the limit on accumulation of sick leave has recently been doubled. He said that they may pursue the matter of the loss of sick leave by some in the previous change.

Senator McGregor said that the Committee had studied the issue of instructors hired before the new rules were instituted. He said that the Provost had sent out a memo stating that although instructors hired before the five year limit were not guaranteed continuous employment they were not required to be replaced.

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

Senator Hudson reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluation had met last week to discuss changes in the faculty evaluation form and that they will met again soon.

Senator Palmer said that a proposed addition to the Faculty Manual on grievance petitions would be presented under New Business.

F. University Commissions /Committees

Senator Overcamp gave a report on the February meeting of the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research. They received a
report on the matter of the English speaking ability of graduate students and of faculty. A survey made by department heads showed that there seems to be no problem. A subcommittee was appointed to question the suitability of the use of classified (governmental and industrial) research in theses and dissertations.

Senator Sieverdes reported that the Greek Affairs Committee had met on February 21 to plan a series of workshops on student leadership. The Committee also discussed the matter of housing for fraternities.

Senator Petersen gave several reports for Senator Taylor. The first was a report on the meeting of the Commission on Public Programs. He said that the Commission concluded that Continuing Education did not have sufficient representation on the Commission. Senator Taylor had suggested a council as a solution to this. President Ulbrich said that there is already a proposal to have the Committee on Continuing Education report to the Commission on Public Programs.

Senator Petersen reported that the Honors Committee had met and had made plans to have Edward Graham, head of Bell Laboratories, Mathematics and Research Center, as the speaker for the R.C. Edwards Science and Technology week. The week set aside for this is April 2-5.

Senator Baron raised the issue on granting waiver of out-of-state tuition fees to out-of-state scholarship holders. He said that he felt that the same advantages should be given to in-state students who hold scholarships. He pointed out that this was a significant amount of money. He said that the legislature would have to act on the matter but that the Scholastic Policies Committee should undertake a study of this matter.

Senator Camper reminded the Senate that the Student Union Board meets on a weekly basis.

Senator Senn gave a report on the meeting of the University Planning Board (Attachment D). He said that Mr. Jim Boniface, the architect and planner who had originally worked on the Master Plan, would be meeting with the Executive-Advisory Committee on March 13. The items to be discussed would mainly concern the Strom Thurmond Center. He said that Mr. Boniface would spend several days on campus meeting with various groups.

Senator Senn reported that other matters that came before the Board were the electronic message boards and the request by the intramural committee for placing shelters on the hockey and baseball fields for use by the Emergency Medical Service people.

Senator Hill reported that the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee had met and had worked on the matter of satisfactory progress. He presented the latest draft (Attachment E) from the subcommittee. He noted that a check on progress would be made in the spring semester. Full time students would be required to complete 12 hours each semester. Deficiencies would be made up in the summer. A limitation of six years of full time enrollment was
suggested.

Senator Sieverdes brought up a question on the removal of the Braegen terminals. He said that he felt that unless plans were made to immediately replace these that classroom functions would be severely inhibited. Senator Overcamp said that the Braegens and all parts that were available were purchased by Clemson at the time the company went out of business and that no other parts are now available. President Ulbrich said that this matter should be referred to the appropriate representatives in each college.

Senator Gowdy's report that the Traffic and Parking Committee had passed unanimously a resolution to keep all parking off Bowman Field received applause. Student support of the issue was recognized as being influential. President Ulbrich said that she had forwarded Senator Coston's letter on care of turf to the Cabinet but that the issue did not come up this past meeting.

V. President's Report:

President Ulbrich called attention to several items listed in the President's Report (Attachment F). Among these were the letters on the Open Forum, the resolution on resumes and the issues on scheduling changes. President Ulbrich introduced the three speakers who would later address the Open Forum issue under New Business. She spelled out the procedure whereby these speakers would address the Senate. She referred to the handout that takes the chronology of events surrounding the publication of the Open Forum (included in Attachment H).

She expanded on the item dealing with the changes in the semester schedule. She brought out the fact that the Scheduling Committee was not a policy setting committee and that the matter would come before the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. She said that Vice-Provost Reel felt that lengthening the class time would not receive support but that shortening the semester to fourteen weeks would. President Ulbrich added four items to New Business. These were:

- e. Tenure Criteria
- f. Resolution on Resumes
- g. General Education Requirements
- h. Resolution on Clemson Players

VI. Old Business:

A motion was made by Senator Palmer and seconded to adopt the proposed addition to the Faculty Manual which describes the content of a grievance petition (Attachment G). Senator Rudowski proposed that a friendly amendment be added to section e. to read: A precise explanation of the nature of the harm done to the grievant and the specific relief which is being sought. The amendment was not accepted. It was then offered as a formal amendment and was defeated. Several senators felt that sometimes in seeking fair treatment it would be difficult to prove a specific harm done but then fair treatment should be expected. The proposal on content of a grievance petition passed after the page number had been corrected to 11:30.

Senator Bauer moved that the original resolution in favor of plus-
minus grading be reaffirmed. The motion was seconded and passed by a vote of 27-7.

VII. New Business:

(a) Election of Officers
The slate of candidates for Vice President/President-elect presented by the Nominating Committee contained the names of Senators Bauer and Hill. Both candidates took the allowed period of time to present their attributes for the office. Vote was by written ballot. Senator Bauer was elected the new Vice President/President-elect. Senator Welter was elected by acclamation to be the new secretary of the Senate.

(b) Open Forum
Dr. Wainscott referred to the situation regarding his letter and Dr. Idol's letter to the Open Forum (Attachment H) as being unacceptable. He suggested that editing of his letter and dropping Dr. Idol's letter were uncalled for acts and that a compromise should not be made to cover up coaches classes.

Dr. Idol said that he found the procedure of censoring the first letters to the Open Forum and deleting his letter entirely to be appalling since his letter was suppressed because the letter was critical of IPTAY. He said that he will write another letter advising faculty to not write letters to the Open Forum.

Senator Hill moved that the Resolution on the Guidelines for the Open Forum (3-6-84) (Attachment I) be adopted. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. A motion to amend the resolution by deleting the word 'resolve' failed. Feelings were expressed that the faculty should finance the printing of its own letters.

Senator Hill said that there was a need to elect someone to replace him on the Committee and that the Open Forum Committee should return to the Senate with a report before any more issues were printed. Senator Rudowski was elected.

Senator McGregor moved for the adoption of resolution FS-84-3-2 (Attachment J) opposing the use of Health Care Funds collected from state employees for state budget purposes. The motion passed unanimously.

The motion by Senator Palmer on tenure probationary period (Attachment K) was postponed until the April meeting.

Senator Overcamp presented Resolution FS-84-3-3 (Attachment L) on faculty resumes. A motion to table the adoption of this resolution passed with one dissenting vote.

A resolution asking the President to reconsider the general education requirements (Attachment M) was presented by Senator Baron. Previous letters on this subject were handed out and discussed. These letters are also attached. The motion to table this item was defeated. The resolution passed by a vote of 16-8.
Senator Senn made a motion that the resolution, FS-84-3-6, concerning the Strom Thurmond Center and Land Use (Attachment O) be adopted by the Senate. The proposed Center includes the Performing Arts Center, The Strom Thurmond Institute and the Continuing Education Center. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Senator Hill presented a resolution, FS-84-3-5, (Attachment N) to commend the Clemson Players and Professor Ray Sawyer on receiving national recognition in their drama production, The American Buffalo. The resolution passed unanimously.

VIII. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 6:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Muriel B. Bishop
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments

Senators Absent (Substitutes Present):
D.C. Coston (George Carter) R. J. Taylor (K.M. Peterson) W.R. Hare
## Results of Faculty Survey--Grading System

### Clemson University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of faculty</th>
<th>Univ</th>
<th>Ag</th>
<th>Arch</th>
<th>C&amp;I</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>Nurs</th>
<th>Sci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses (number)</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(percent)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Favor change (number)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Percent yes</th>
<th>If yes, prefer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Plus/minus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distribution (% of responses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Plus/minus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Associated with proposed systems elsewhere (no.)**

| 213 | 37 | 9 | 24 | 15 | 31 | 11 | 53 | 6 | 27 |

**Favor change (number)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Percent yes</th>
<th>If yes, prefer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distribution (% of responses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Plus/minus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Should graduate & undergraduate courses use same system (number)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percent yes</th>
<th>If no, undergraduate should use:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Plus/minus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If no, graduate should use:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plus/minus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distribution (% of responses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Plus</th>
<th>Plus/minus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed systems allow more accurate grading than current:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you grade accurately enough to differentiate between grades with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plus system - Yes</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus/minus system - Yes</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on grade inflation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plus system - No impact</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decrease</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus/minus system - No impact</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decrease</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed systems give students more incentive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty rank:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>ACC Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus/minus</td>
<td>UNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia (A+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus</td>
<td>NCSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCDF</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report
Faculty Senate Research Committee
March 6, 1984

The Research Committee met in February to discuss the eligibility of faculty for University Research Grant Committee Awards and Provost Research Awards. Currently, all those holding full-time faculty appointments are eligible to apply. This includes full-time faculty in the visiting professorial and the research associate/research professorial ranks, and those holding full-time appointments at the rank of Lecturer.

Under the existing guidelines of the University Research Grant Committee Award Programs, new faculty members are to be shown the highest priority. Accordingly, since many in the special faculty ranks are new faculty, these individuals are given preference in this award program.

The committee membership was divided on this issue. Some members were satisfied with current University Research Committee guidelines. Others felt that preference should be given to those holding regular faculty ranks with special preference extended to non-tenured, new faculty.

Lacking a consensus of the membership on this issue, the committee is not recommending any action at this time.
The Committee met on February 14 and 21.

On February 14 we reviewed the discussions of our January 24 meeting with representatives of Piedmont Pathology Associates, Anderson Memorial Hospital, S. C. Blue Cross-Blue Shield, and the South Carolina Medical Association, and on February 21 firmed up a response to the meeting. The response was mailed on February 23, addressed to the first three parties above with a copy to the fourth party. The last sentence of the letter reads as follows: "We (the Welfare Committee) will announce to the March 6 meeting of the Faculty Senate that negotiations are underway and would hope to announce a favorable solution at the April 3 or May 1 Faculty Senate meetings, before the current semester ends." What we have done is to suggest several alternatives to alleviate a situation that seems to us to result in a cost disadvantage to state employees, and have asked the three parties to come up with a solution. At this point, we want to give them the opportunity to work things out, and I believe that they will; but at any rate we will report progress, lack of it, or a solution by the May meeting.

Aside from this particular situation, we are finding the whole matter of health care costs and State Employees' Health Insurance Plan to be a tangled web, and we plan to pursue it further. We will be meeting in the near future with a representative of the State Employees' Health Insurance Plan in the State Personnel Division to pursue such questions as the exact relationship to SCBCBS, how are benefits set, who determines what, etc. If you or your constituents have questions about the state plan that need to be presented, please pass them on to me or a member of the committee.

On February 21 we discussed three other items:

1. Results of survey of faculty with dependents enrolled in Clemson University, and possible followup. With only one department not reporting, the survey shows that among 938 faculty members, 147 (15.7%) have a total of 170 children/spouses enrolled in Clemson in the current semester. We will be following this up with an inquiry to the administration as to whether they would support a deferred tuition plan; and, if so, what steps would be necessary to determine the legality of such a plan.

2. Discussion of sick leave accumulation limits. Faculty members may not be aware that the limit on accumulated sick leave was recently doubled. We discussed the disparity this generated for those who have already lost a great deal of sick leave under the old limit, who now must begin accumulating toward the new limit, but decided not to pursue it at the present time.
3. Status of Instructors. Questions had been raised about Instructors hired before the 5-year limit instituted in the April 16, 1982 Faculty Manual. A February 15, 1984 memorandum from Provost Maxwell to Dean Luther Anderson, with copy to the other Academic Deans and Library Director, rules that they have a "grandfather" right, and the five-year limit does not apply to them. They are not guaranteed continued employment, but it is not required that they be terminated if they have had five or more years of service in rank.

We have one additional item that will come up under "New Business."

Instructors hired under the old policy.
UNIVERSITY PLANNING BOARD

A Report to the Faculty Senate

March 6, 1984

The University Planning Board met on March 2 and considered several topics.

First, an update was given on the Thurmond Center. Because of some legal complications it was not feasible to retain Lockwood Greene to conduct the review of the Master Plan. However, it has been possible to retain Mr. Jim Bonaface for this purpose. Mr. Bonaface was with Lockwood Greene during the original planning and is the person most familiar with the Master Plan. He will be on campus during the week of March 12 and will be meeting with various campus groups. These meetings will include a session with the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee and one with the University Planning Board.

Second, the Planning Board reviewed five proposed sites for an east campus laundry facility. The Board recommended a site on the south side of Thornhill Village close to McMillan Road. In addition to washers and dryers, the facility will also contain dry cleaning and linen drop-off areas. The building will be approximately of the same size and physical appearance as the other units in the village.

Third, the Board accepted the design development plan for the Sirrine Hall parking lot. When completed the lot will have a capacity of 260 vehicles including 245 employee parking spaces. This represents a gain of 33 spaces over the existing lot. Construction will begin shortly after graduation this spring and will be completed by the start of the fall semester.

Fourth, consideration of electronic message boards was delayed until additional information can be obtained from sign companies.

Finally, the Board reviewed a proposal from the Intramural Sports Office to construct shelters for Emergency Medical Technicians (EMT's) and their equipment on two intramural fields -- the old soccer field and the band practice field. The Board delayed action on this request for one meeting and asked Mr. McFadden to contact the College of Architecture to determine if students could design the shelters as a class project.

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for March 16 at which time the Thurmond Center will be discussed with Mr. Bonaface.

Respectfully submitted,

David J. Senn, Vice-President
Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Meeting 
February 3, 1984

Present: J.V. Reel, presiding; M. Barber; L. Brown; R. Hill; R. Knight; N. Lomax; W. Mattox; H. Morgan; B. Nowack; B. Skelton; S. Smith; Visitors: L. Collins (DAPS); Marvin Carmichael (Financial Aid).

I. The meeting was opened at 1:30 p.m. in Room 300 Sikes Hall.

II. Mr. Mattox discussed enrollment trends and prospects for the new class in 1984. There will be 1000 fewer high school graduates in South Carolina in 1984. Over 25% of the most recent freshman class sat for Advanced Placement examinations; 1983 was no exception and we should expect about the same number next year. So far for 1984, 1049 have been accepted. Of course, this will go down. So far 5590 have applied (down 600 from last year), 2705 have been accepted, 695 have been denied. Of those remaining, 46% predict a 2.0 or less.

To combat this general decline, increases have been made in scholarships and the Board has waived out-of-state tuition and fees for scholarship holders. In addition, an outstanding student admissions counselor has been recruited. Mr. Mattox asked the faculty to help recruit the able students by being available to work with these students. In addition, he asked that the colleges write to accepted students (the list is provided by the Admissions office) pointing out outstanding features of the college's program.

III. Retention was better this year than last year.

IV. Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Smith discussed the need for a Satisfactory Progress policy statement because of new Federal regulations published October 6, 1983, in preparation for the 1984-85 school year. It requires quantitative, qualitative, time reference standards. To meet this requirement, Reel appointed a committee of Lamar Brown, Chairman; Stanley Smith, Marvin Carmichael, Mary Barber, Ronald Knight, and Robert Hill to draft these standards. He also asked Linda Collins from DAPS to sit with the committee. He charged the committee to consult with colleagues and have a written report to his office by Friday, March 16, 1984.

V. Future meetings of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee are scheduled for Monday, March 26, 1984, and Tuesday, April 3, 1984, both in Room 300 Sikes Hall at 1:30 p.m.

VI. As there was no further business the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.
The information that follows on satisfactory progress should be viewed as a working draft. It represents the workings of the sub-committee as of its last meeting on March 2, 1984. Dr. Real has asked to see the report by Friday, March 16. The Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee will view the report Monday, March 26.

At least two issues may need more attention.

(1) The rules are not real easy to understand and even with computer programming assistance, the administration of the policy could be a heavy burden.

(2) This draft shows the policy as a University policy with a present application to financial aid. Some other schools have a satisfactory progress policy that is simply a requirement for receiving financial assistance and the policy statements have no particular meaning outside the financial aid office.

Stan Smith
March 2, 1984

SATISFACTORY PROGRESS FOR UNDERGRADUATES

The University satisfactory progress policy contains both qualitative and quantitative requirements. The qualitative requirement relates to the student's earned grade-point ratio and is identical to the continuing enrollment policy as stated in the University Announcements.

The quantitative requirement relates to an incremental measurement of progress along the continuum of a student's attendance. Under this concept the student has a maximum time frame in which to complete his or her degree.

Satisfactory progress is checked at the end of the spring semester (May). This check is made by comparing the student's cumulative credit hours earned to a minimum standard table showing expected progress. The expected progress is in proportion to the full time/part time enrollment of credit hours as of the last day to add a course. For each fall or spring semester, a full time student will have 12 credit hours added to this expected cumulative total. And part-time students, 3/4 and 1/2 time, will have 9 or 6 hours, respectively, added to the expected cumulative total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Fall or Spring Semesters of Enrollment</th>
<th>If enrolled at least 3/4 but less than full time</th>
<th>If enrolled at least 1/2 but less than 3/4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td>etc</td>
<td>etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A student who fails to satisfy the minimum progress check in May has the opportunity to earn credits in the immediately following summer school to meet the requirement.
Freshmen have 6 years of full time enrollment or the equivalent in part time enrollment in which to complete requirements for a degree. Students seeking a second degree that causes their attendance to exceed 6 years may request an extension of time.

New transfer students will have their entry point into the 6 year time frame calculated as follows:

\[ \frac{12 \times \text{credits transferred} \times 75\%}{12} = \text{Number of semesters remaining in which to earn degree} \]

Example: \[ \frac{12 - 43 \times 75\%}{12} = 12 - 32 = 12 - 2.6 = 9 \text{ (round to nearest whole number)} \]

1 maximum time frame is 12 semesters (6 years)
2 student given beneficial allowance to avoid injustices
3 minimum credit load to be full time

The initial entry point into the 6 year time frame for currently enrolled students and for former students who re-enroll will be calculated as follows:

\[ \frac{12 \times \text{Earned credits} \times 75\%}{12} = \text{Number of semesters remaining in which to earn degree} \]

Example: \[ \frac{12 - 93 \times 75\%}{12} = 12 - 70 = 6 \text{ (round to nearest whole number)} \]

The two examples above illustrate the method used in determining the maximum number of semesters permitted for earning a degree by students other than new freshmen. The incremental progress expected of these students has as the beginning or base number the individual's earned credits at the time he or she comes under the policy. The following example uses the above student with 43 hours of transfer credits and nine eligible semesters remaining to illustrate the incremental progress expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Fall or Spring Semesters of Enrollment</th>
<th>If enrolled if Full time enrollment</th>
<th>If enrolled at least 3/4 but less than full time</th>
<th>If enrolled at least 1/2 but less than 3/4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transfer student</td>
<td>If enrolled</td>
<td>If enrolled at least 3/4 but less than full time</td>
<td>If enrolled at least 1/2 but less than 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td>etc</td>
<td>etc</td>
<td>etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINANCIAL AID AND SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Effective July 1, 1984 the University Financial Aid Office will use the Satisfactory Progress Policy as one criterion for dispensing financial assistance.
A student who does not maintain satisfactory progress will be ineligible for financial assistance.

After termination of financial aid, a student may appeal and will be considered for financial aid only when one of the following conditions has been met:

a. Sufficient credits have been earned.

b. It is established through the financial aid appeals process that the student encountered some type of extenuating circumstances during the semesters in question which hindered academic performance (e.g., prolonged hospitalization, death in the family, etc.).

Students wishing to appeal must submit a letter to the Financial Aid Office stating their reasons for failing to meet the satisfactory progress requirement, and whether or not they have solved their difficulties.
President's Report
February 1984

1. As of this writing, the fate of the Open Forum is still uncertain. Many hours of discussion and negotiation have taken place. The guidelines have been revised and there are letters waiting to be published. I met with the Advisory/Executive Committee in the interim for further direction in the negotiations. I hope to have more information when we meet. As a result of some administrative decisions concerning editorial changes and guidelines, Bob Hill has resigned as the chairman of the Open Forum Committee. I have appended his letter to this report. I have not honored his request to append the two disputed letters at this time because I do not know what the status of the Open Forum is. If the Open Forum is not published, or if it is published with significant changes in the content of those letters, I will append them to the April report. If I circulate letters at this time it will further dim the prospects of ever getting this publication off the ground after distributing half the contents to a large segment of the University community (that doesn't leave much to read in the first issue!) However, if any of you would like to "preview" the contents, please see me or Bob Hill. Also, please note that we need to elect an additional faculty member to the Open Forum Committee.

2. The Advisory/Executive Committees met with President Atchley on Wednesday, February 15th to discuss a variety of land use issues, primarily associated with the Thurmond complex. Attached is a map identifying the approximate location of the proposed alternate site. The discussion generated much heat and some light.

3. The Student Senate passed a resolution similar to ours suggesting that Bowman Field not be used for parking. Senator Gowdy seems to be the "go-between" on this issue. There is some dispute over the feasibility of making parking and grass compatible. President Atchley assured me that our input was being considered and he would make a decision "in the best interests of Clemson University."

4. The annual "Beer Bust" will be held at the shelter at Camp Hope after the April 3rd meeting. Senators, alternates, spouses or (not and) dates are invited. The President and the Provost will also be invited. Funding this year courtesy of the Vending Machine Committee.

5. You may have received a request from your dean or department head for a current resume. I take responsibility for that. In response to suggestions from several faculty members, I suggested at the Council of Deans that we compile in a central place (preferably the library) the resumes of the faculty for general reference purposes. The Provost was most willing to follow through as long as it was clear where the suggestion originated (i.e., with me, not with him!). You will also be asked to provide an annual update. This derived from a discussion of the biennial report of faculty publications which is woefully behind schedule and has problems of over-inclusiveness (of trivia) and under-inclusiveness (of faculty who don't send stuff in). The resumes will be more current and more complete. If you ask, I will share a quote from an unidentified dean.
on the problems of uniformity in resumes. But not in print. A committee of the Council of Deans is considering what to do about the voluminous and tardy publication of the Faculty Publications list.

6. The disclosure of evaluation results has appeared regularly on the agenda of the Council of Deans. The latest modification, which I supported after some amendment, allows a supplementary classification of faculty by rank with evaluations listed by rank. This is in addition to, not instead of, the original disclosure. If you want the supplementary disclosure by rank you will get it for your own rank only. The final version requires that some faculty member in each department (of four or more) request the distribution of evaluations. Please follow through in your departments and make sure that some secure, tenured, full professor in your department goes to the department head and requests the distribution of evaluations. I would have preferred that it be automatic but did not dispute that issue since the Provost has been most supportive of our right to disclosure (as have several deans) in the face of some rather vocal opposition.

7. There are some scheduling issues currently under review. Several were brought to the attention of the Welfare Committee; additionally, the Schedule Committee is considering an extension of class time to free up some days at the end of the semester to help the registrar get everything squared away in time for commencement. This committee is independent of any commission in the current structure (not in the new structure) and has no faculty senate or student senate representation. Please consider whether you would like to act on either concern; the change in the class schedule or the representation issue. Under the proposed new structure, it would report to both the Undergraduate and Graduate Commissions.

8. I have had several folks raise concerns about the state health insurance fund. I hope to have some answers by the time we meet.

9. The tags which some of you may have found attached to your bicycle concerning the legal obligation for headlights and taillights contained a crucial two word omission; "at night". Jack Ferguson assures me that they would only enforce this rule at night when it applies, and that their main concern is with students riding around in the dark on bikes which constitutes a safety hazard.

10. Before the Senate meets, there is a scheduled meeting of the Commission on Faculty Affairs which expects to hear from the Marshal's Committee (on the commencement exercises), the ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation, and the Ad Hoc Committee on Administrative Evaluation of Faculty. I should have further information for you on March 6th.

11. With the implied consent of the Advisory Committee and the approval of the Provost and the Dean, I have authorized the College of Sciences to change their election schedule. They have four terms expiring in 1984, none in 1985, 2 in 1986. To "regularize" their rotation, we have authorized the election of 3 senators for 3 year terms and 1 for a 1 year term to shift one expiration to 1985. This change does not affect the rotation of any other college; since 35
senators divides by thirds into 12, 12, and 11, this changes it from 12, 11, 12 to 11, 12, 12.

12. Some concerns have been raised about who is eligible for University Research Grants and Provost Research Awards (e.g., department heads, visiting faculty, research associates). If you are interested we can pursue this matter. The Provost feels the decisions about eligibility belong in the hands of the University Research Grant Committee.

13. The Alumni Association plans to implement the Senate's suggestions on the administration of the Research Award beginning in 1985. We plan further discussion on the more complex issues surrounding the Alumni Professorships.

14. Don't forget:
   Joint meeting, Student and Faculty Senates, March 5th 8 p.m.
   Regular Senate meeting, March 6th, usual time and place
   Beer Bust, follows April Senate meeting, spouses invited
   Elections of Vice President/President Elect, Secretary, and one member of Open Forum Committee, March Senate meeting

15. I have survived 11 months of being your president. I can make it through one more. It's an exciting, demanding, rewarding, exhausting job. The last 6 weeks have been incredibly demanding in every conceivable respect. Look for stamina as the outstanding quality in the March election of my successor's successor. And despite the headaches, the sleepless nights, the endless meetings, phone calls and memos, thanks for the opportunity to be your president. Tune in to the April report when I may really get schlocky.

*Jerry Reel tells me that the college representatives on the scheduling committee are currently polling their faculties for views on changing the schedule. Please pass on your views. Ask your dean who represents your college on this committee.
The following is proposed for addition to the Faculty Manual on page II:20 in 3), line 10 after ".... problems." and before "The ...."

In order for the Provost and/or the Grievance Board to determine if the matter is grievable, the petition must include a specific statement of the nature of the grievance including:

a. The specific individual or individuals against whom the grievance is filed.
b. The dates upon which the alleged grievable matter occurred.
c. The specific provision or provisions of the Faculty Manual, paragraph (6), page II:31 under which the grievant believes the matter is grievable.
d. A list of supporting documents which are appended to the petition.
e. The specific relief which is being sought by the grievant.
In its October 26 edition, the Charlotte Observer reprinted a story from the Washington Post on Marcus Dupree. You may remember him—the University of Oklahoma star running back whose legs were once compared to those of a Clemson cheerleader (female). This is the same Marcus Dupree who found the pressures of big-time college football too much to take and withdrew from Oklahoma in mid-season to return to his hometown of Philadelphia, Mississippi. Dupree stated that he wanted to continue to play college football, but at an institution closer to home. He subsequently enrolled, several weeks into the fall term, at the University of Southern Mississippi.

Part of the sadness of the Dupree case is that he did not consider academics to be part of the deal of being a college athlete. But what makes this story a real tragedy is that neither did the University of Oklahoma expect much from Dupree in the classroom. Even the President of the University understood and accepted Marcus Dupree's status. He was not a student; at best, he was an enrollee with a great talent for scoring touchdowns.

Some things have changed for Dupree since he entered Southern Mississippi. For one, the constant stress of football stardom has eased, since NCAA transfer rules do not allow him to play football at his new school until the 1985 season. Other things, however, appear not to have changed at all. Dupree is no more a student at USM than he was at Oklahoma. Indeed, a photograph accompanying the Observer's story shows him attending his first class in a course on "Coaching Tennis."

At first glance, the Dupree case appears to be an extreme example of crass exploitation of college athletes. Despite the problems which led to probation for Clemson's football program, such blatant disregard for a young
person's education could not possibly happen here. Our athletes do attend classes, are provided tutorial assistance in courses in which they are having trouble, and are unable to find asylum in bogus courses.

Those of us who insist that education should be the primary purpose of a university should be greatly disturbed by a recent development at Clemson which could contribute to making the Dupree situation more commonplace on college campuses. The College of Education has proposed that nine one-credit courses in "coaching education" be added to the university curriculum. This package consists of coaching of baseball, coaching of basketball, coaching of cross country, coaching of track and field, coaching of football, coaching of soccer, coaching of strength and conditioning, coaching of volleyball, and coaching of wrestling. (Mysteriously, Dupree's course in the coaching of tennis is not included.) In these courses students will learn such essentials as "mechanics of bunting" (for the unschooled, baseball) and "mechanics of dribbling" (basketball, for sure).

If these courses are accepted at the time of this writing they have been approved by the University Curriculum Committee the university catalogue will be replete with 18 semester hours of coaching education courses. Within these 18 hours there will be only five "theory" credits, even though every new course description states that the course will be taught "utilizing the conceptual [theoretical] approach."

While Clemson would certainly not be the first institution of higher learning to offer such playground courses, the question must be raised: Must we follow the lead of the Southern Mississipps? Some coaching related courses are no doubt beneficial, and at least two of the presently offered courses appear to
be academically rigorous. But nine sport-specific coaching education courses? Perhaps even they would have some educational merit (though I suspect not), but they should be taught by the YMCA or the Clemson Recreation Commission, not by an institution with the word "university" following its name.

One of the stated objectives of these courses is to "provide an academic interest area to meet student needs." Aside from the obvious questions of whether the courses are "academic" or whether they are truly "needed", one must wonder which students they are intended to serve. Presumably, they will be open to all undergraduates. However, if the experiences of other institutions serve as any guidepost, the thought should at least cross our minds that "coaching education" may become an easy GPR builder and an asylum for athletes. If I may be permitted a slight rearrangement of an observation made by Robert Maynard Hutchins, former President of the University of Chicago, coaching education appears to have the same relation to education as bullfighting does to agriculture.

Another important issue raised by the coaching education package is the process by which curriculum matters are handled at Clemson. Every faculty member to whom I have spoken has been appalled that this university would even consider adding nine sport-specific courses to its list of offerings. Nevertheless, the proposed package has sailed swiftly toward adoption. It was reported to me that the University Curriculum Committee recommended approval of the entire package after a minimum of discussion and hardly a ripple of dissent. How could such a curriculum change, repugnant as is it to many faculty, win such easy and uncritical acceptance?

Although there may be many factors involved, it would appear that the politics of territoriality and turf-guarding limit possibilities for discussing curriculum proposals on their merits or lack thereof. Few colleges will
September 2, 1983

To: The Open Forum

From: John L. Idol, Jr., Professor of English

Subject: Trimalchio's Palace, or Tom Clemson Shakes His Head in Disbelief

Thomas Clemson saw the plight of South Carolina farmers and, out of "great sympathy" for them, worked to help them learn the skills and develop the means of research to make their lives and the lives of their families better. Had he been a man of less compassion, a man for whom high living was more important than deep thinking, a man blind to the worth of a good education rather than an advocate of a thorough training of the mind and body for life's pursuits, all of us who work and play here would be working and playing elsewhere.

If Tom Clemson's spirit were alive on every corner of the campus, it surely would have drooped in disbelief when IPTAY officials voted to spend $300,000 on a house for a coach and thereby remove from the educational resources of Clemson the potential for thousands of dollars for scholarships for students, say athletes competing for help to do graduate or professional studies.

Instead of thinking as Thomas Clemson would have thought, IPTAY officials, like Romans spoiled with too much wealth and prompted by the urge to show how well off they were, built a palace. Tom Clemson would have voted to build better men and women.

My hope is that Coach Ford and his successors will not live in Trimalchio's Palace but will ask that IPTAY funds be invested to help Clemson students carry on the work of Tom Clemson, who dreamed of bringing prosperity to his adopted state, a dream yet to be realized since South Carolina just barely escapes being the poorest state in the nation.
Since the last Senate meeting, a long and complex series of events have surrounded the issue of the Open Forum—whether to continue with the project and on what terms. Some of the dates are a little hazy, but let me try to bring you up to date.

The Open Forum was conceived by the Policy Committee and proposed to the Administration during Clarence’s term. When I took office it was officially "on hold". I met with the President in the summer and he authorized us to proceed, but that decision was not communicated down the line. When Fred Morgan left the Senate last fall, Bob Hill replaced him on the committee; at my request, the Provost made his appointment (John Kenelly). The committee proceeded to solicit letters and plan for the first issue.

Prior to the last Senate meeting, that issue was prepared and brought to Public Relations, which was totally taken by surprise. I called the President, and after he did some conferring he called back and said it was "go" but he and I needed to meet and work out details. When I met with him on Friday, February 3rd, he presented the proposed guidelines that were before you at the last Senate meeting. I passed those on to the Open Forum committee to review. The Senate considered those and suggested changes. Bob Hill and I met with Jack McKenzie, Boo Cheney and Harry Durham on February 8th to negotiate guidelines in line with your concerns. While not perfectly satisfied, I felt that we could live with those guidelines, at least on an experimental basis. At that point I thought the issue had been resolved.

On Friday of the same week, I was called to a meeting with Ross Cornwell, Harry Durham, Boo Cheney and Jack McKenzie. In the interim they had read the letters and had some real concerns over two of them—Steve Wainscott's and John Idol's. I was presented a letter from the President on the tone of letters which he expected to see and the administration's concern about the tone of debate and in some cases, the sensitivity of outsiders (i.e., Trustees, CHE, legislators) to the issues being raised. In addition, we wrestled with the continuing concern over the right to reply. As a result of that meeting, two suggestions emerged. One was a request to edit Steve's letter in a way that did not alter the content and to delete John's. The second was to allow comment on issues from another interested party who would be informed of the subject of the letter but would not see the letter itself. This is reflected in the issue which should be out today, where the Dean of Education comments on the coaching courses.

On the following Monday, Bob Hill gave me his letter of resignation from the committee which I have included with the March Senate mailing. The Advisory Committee of the Senate met the same Monday and debated the issue at great length, finally voting reluctantly to proceed with publication but urging me to ask the President to reconsider the publication of John Idol's letter. I met with the President the next day and shared that concern. He promised me a quick reply. Within the hour, Ross Cornwell called to suggest editorial changes in both Steve's and John's letters to make them acceptable for publication. I called both of them and received their reluctant assent to changes. Later that afternoon, Dwight Camper and I met with the College of Liberal Arts which raised issues of censorship and academic freedom, and expressed the
hindsight shared by many of us that if you want total control, you don't do it on someone else's nickel. Steve and John requested that brackets and dots be used to indicate editing of their letters. I passed that request on to Public Relations. Again, I thought that the matter had ended.

On Friday of that week, I was asked to meet with Don Elam, the new Vice President for Development, and Harry Durham and Boo Cheney to discuss the issue again, particularly with reference to John's letter. They indicated that a decision would be reached soon. I agreed to write a short statement on the background and intent of the publication.

I did not discover that the issue had gone to press with John's letter deleted and Steve's published without brackets and dots until late last week. It should be forthcoming today or tomorrow. I talked to Steve and promised to distribute the unexpurgated copies of both his letter and John's to the Senate today. Three of the authors--John, Steve, and Roger Rollin--have requested to address the Senate today to express their views.

This is an extremely complex and sensitive issue. I need the direction of the full Senate before proceeding further. I did, however, act with the advice and consent of the Advisory Committee before proceeding with both guidelines and publication. The options include further discussion of guidelines, discontinuance of the publication, proceeding under existing guidelines on a trial basis from both the administrative and the faculty side, and/or a resolution from the Senate expressing its concerns, reservations or other feelings about this subject. Such a motion will be offered today. I feel it is imperative that we resolve this issue one way or another at this Senate meeting.
RESOLUTION ON GUIDELINES FOR THE OPEN FORUM

WHEREAS the first issue of the Open Forum does not include all the letters originally approved by the Open Forum Committee;

WHEREAS the letter by John L. Idol, Professor of English and former Faculty Senator, was approved by him in slightly edited form, and yet was not included in the Open Forum;

WHEREAS editorial alterations of Professor Wainscott’s letter were to be indicated by brackets in the text, and yet were not so indicated;

WHEREAS the Open Forum guidelines’ implications of administrative intervention are now quite explicit and can properly be called censorship; despite protestations that it would be used “rarely”;

WHEREAS such censorship is, in the final analysis, an impediment to the free exchange of ideas in an academic community;

WHEREAS classified staff are more vulnerable to administrative retribution, both subtle and blunt, and such evidence in the first stages of censorship against the Open Forum Committee may likely intimidate serious participation by staff, as well as faculty;

BE IT RESOLVED by the Faculty Senate that the Open Forum Committee renegotiate the guidelines for publication of the Open Forum so as to allow more autonomy for the Committee in its editorial judgments.
Faculty Senate Resolution FS84-3-2
State Health Insurance Reserve

Whereas, the House Ways and Means Committee has proposed taking $26.7 million from the State Employees Health Insurance Reserve Fund to be used for general-fund state spending in the 1984-85 fiscal year, and

Whereas, the Insurance Reserve Fund is intended to keep the state employees health insurance plan actuarially sound, and much of the money in the reserve originated from premiums paid by state employees.

Be it therefore resolved that the legislature be urged not to use the insurance reserve for general-fund spending, but that any portion of the reserve which originated from state employees' premium payments be used for an immediate reduction in premiums and/or restoration of benefits.

Be it further resolved that the remainder of the Employees Health Insurance Reserve Fund be maintained as a cushion against rising costs, postponing the need for another premium increase.
MEMORANDUM

TO: N. Dwight Camper, Chairman
   Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Merrill Palmer
       Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure Probationary Period

SUBJECT: Tenure Probationary Period

Some time ago the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate appointed a
committee consisting of Arlene Privette, Larry Hudson, and myself to look at
the statements in the Faculty Manual concerning the tenure probationary period
in the light of our experience on the Grievance Board, and to report to the
Policy Committee. Our report follows:

We propose the following to replace the third paragraph under Part II,
Section L, page II:16.

"The tenure probationary period for a full-time, regular faculty
member shall not exceed seven years. All or part of a faculty member's
full-time tenured or tenure-track service at another institution of
higher learning and/or other professional experience relevant to the
appointment at Clemson may be included in this probationary period.
Inclusion of any such service shall be reviewed in accordance with a
department's regular tenure peer-evaluation process and shall be
mutually agreed upon in writing at the time of the initial Clemson
appointment."

If this change were made, then there would be little need for the
 provision for early tenure that follows. Thus the fifth paragraph under II:L
should be replaced with

"The decision to grant tenure shall be made during the
penultimate year of the probationary period and become effective
at the beginning of the next year."

This wording will correct two difficulties with the present paragraph.

1) It will allow Clemson to recruit outstanding faculty from non-
academic research facilities and to recruit faculty from institutions that
do not grant tenure for positions that are tenured at Clemson (as in Ag.
Extension), and to establish for such people a tenure probationary period
more appropriate for their professional experience.
2) It will allow Clemson to exclude from the probationary period tenure-track service at particularly lackluster institutions such as two-year technical colleges. Such service might well have occurred before the individual completed the terminal degree.

The University has a functioning peer-review process that is working well. This process can be relied upon to make decisions about the probationary period that will be in the interest of recruiting the best possible candidates for faculty positions while at the same time preserving the integrity of the seven year probationary period.
Faculty Senate Resolution FS-84-3-

FACULTY RESUMES

WHEREAS, the faculty have been requested to submit a current resume to be compiled for general reference so that the biennial report Faculty Publications can be supplemented or replaced, be it therefore,

RESOLVED, that all full-time faculty, including those in special faculty ranks and those holding administrative appointments, be asked to comply.
Resolution  

To: Dr. Bill Atchley,  
President  

From: The Faculty Senate  

Subject: The Provost's recommendations for modification of the General Education requirements

Whereas; The Administration of Clemson University in the reorganization of the university's policies and procedures of governance, recognized the responsibility and jurisdiction of the faculty in matters relating to curriculum, and

Whereas; The responsibility for representing the faculty in undergraduate curriculum matters was delegated to the Undergraduate Commission, and

Whereas; The Undergraduate Commission after due consideration rejected the Provost's proposed modifications of the General Education Requirements,

Therefore; The Faculty Senate hereby calls upon the President of the University, to rescind the decision to accept the Provost's changes in the General Education Requirements, until such time as the Undergraduate Commission shall have time to make its recommendations known to the President.

Submitted by W. Baron, Senator  
March 5, 1984
February 23, 1984

MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans, Directors and Department Heads

FROM: W. David Maxwell
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Modifications in the General Education Requirements

Upon my recommendation the President has modified the General Education Requirements in the following respects:

1. Course work in Agricultural Economics may be used in meeting the Social Science requirement.

2. Course work in a second Basic Science may be used in meeting the Applied Science requirement.

3. Experimental Statistics 301 may be used in meeting the mathematics requirement.

While it is recognized that these changes are debatable they have the support of the academic deans and the justification for them appears to be sufficient. Agricultural Economics is the origin of some of the most methodologically sophisticated intellectual tools and techniques in the social science, exposure to a second basic science would for many students apparently meet the basic goals of the science requirement as well as an applied science, and the same is true of Experimental Statistics 301 vis a vis the mathematics requirement.

WDM/ep

cc: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS
(Supersedes all Requirements Issued before July 18, 1983)

A. Composition and Speaking Skills 9 hours
   1. English 101, English 102, and three
      semester hours selected from approved
      English courses in advanced writing or
      public speaking.

B. Mathematics 6 hours
   1. Six hours taken from courses in
      Mathematical Sciences excluding
      Mathematical Sciences 100.

C. Science and Technology 11 hours
   1. A two semester sequence in the same
      physical or biological science each
      including a laboratory and at least
      an additional three hours in an
      applied science.

D. Humanities 6 hours
   1. Three hours selected from sophomore
      literature courses (200 level only)
      or foreign language literature
      courses (300 level or higher).
   2. Three hours selected from the following
      (excluding practica): art and
      architectural history, drama, foreign
      language literature (300 level or higher),
      visual arts, humanities, music, philosophy,
      religion, or sophomore literature courses
      (200 level only).

E. Social Sciences 6 hours
   1. Six hours selected from anthropology,
      economics (including crosslisted
      agricultural economics courses),
      geography, history, political science,
      psychology, or sociology (including
      crosslisted rural sociology courses).

38 hours

George V. Redi, Jr. 7/18/83  
Vice Provost  
Undergraduate Studies

George V. Redi, Jr. 7/18/83  
Chairman, Undergraduate  
Curriculum Committee

W. Dean R. Bell, Jr. 7/11/83  
Provost  
Date  
President
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Holley Ulbrich
   President, Faculty Senate

FROM: W. David Maxwell, Provost

SUBJECT: Curricula

The will of Thomas Green Clemson gives to the Board of Trustees specific authority "to fix the course of studies" and to change them "... as in their judgment, experience may prove necessary..." Later action by the Board (1893) delegated this Board authority and control to the President.

The Faculty Manual (VI:11) stipulates the final steps by which faculty input is channelled to the President on curricular matters:

Curricular proposals recommended by either University Curriculum Committee shall be submitted to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Provost shall forward these curricular proposals with his or her recommendations to the President of the University for final approval.

I see nothing in the two paragraphs above that circumscribes the authority of the President in such a manner that he would have only the options of either approval or disapproval in toto of a set of recommendations emanating from either of the University curriculum committees. Nor is there anything in the two preceding paragraphs that precludes the President from modifying proposals that are recommended to him before he approves them for implementation.

The power and authority of the University curriculum committees are great and they provide a valuable service to the academic community. Their recommendations are accordingly given great weight. They cannot prevent the President from acting in what he judges to be the best interests of the University, however, in curricular as in other matters.

WDM/ep

cc: President Bill L. Atchley
February 23, 1984

MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans, Directors and Department Heads

FROM: W. David Maxwell
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Modifications in the General Education Requirements

Upon my recommendation the President has modified the General Education Requirements in the following respects:

1. Course work in Agricultural Economics may be used in meeting the Social Science requirement.

2. Course work in a second Basic Science may be used in meeting the Applied Science requirement.

3. Experimental Statistics 301 may be used in meeting the mathematics requirement.

While it is recognized that these changes are debatable they have the support of the academic deans and the justification for them appears to be sufficient. Agricultural Economics is the origin of some of the most methodologically sophisticated intellectual tools and techniques in the social science, exposure to a second basic science would for many students apparently meet the basic goals of the science requirement as well as an applied science, and the same is true of Experimental Statistics 301 vis à vis the mathematics requirement.

WDM/ep

cc: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
The Academic Deans
Mr. J. F. Boykin, Jr.
January 4, 1984
Page Two

November 16, 1984
Deadline for faculty member in his second year of employment to receive a nonrenewal letter.

The following comments may assist you in determining what constitutes a "complete file."

1. Each file should include written statements by the peer review committee, the department head and the dean indicating that an evaluation has been made of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, research contributions and service contributions; the outcome of each evaluation; and the basis upon which the evaluation was made.

2. Each file should include a routing slip as the first item. Be sure that each action for which the faculty member is being evaluated is checked on the form and that each reviewing level indicates the action taken and signs the form. It is not necessary to send separate files on faculty members who are being evaluated for more than one action. It is simpler to use one file with one routing slip being sure that all the necessary information, as indicated in this memo, is included.

3. Each file should also include a current vita on the faculty member, and in the tenure requests, please include a copy of the faculty member's tenure agreement form or some document indicating the number of years credit granted toward the probationary period, the appointment date to a tenure-track position and the penultimate year.

4. In promotion requests, be sure that sufficient information is included in the file for a determination of whether the faculty member meets the general qualifications for the rank for which he is applying as listed on Pages II:5 and II:6 of the Faculty Manual.

Please distribute copies of this memo to your department heads. If you have any questions on any of the foregoing, please call Tolly Taylor in my office.

Attachments
RESOLUTION TO COMMEND THE CLEMSON PLAYERS AND PROFESSOR RAY SAWYER

WHEREAS the Clemson Players have achieved national recognition with their production of American Buffalo, which shall be performed twice at the Kennedy Center in Washington, D.C., on April 15;

LET THE FACULTY SENATE COMMEND the Players and their director, Professor Ray Sawyer, for what they may justly claim to be a "national championship" in drama.
Faculty Senate Resolution FS-84-3-1

Strom Thurmond Center and University Land Use

WHEREAS, the administration of Clemson University is considering the relocation of the proposed Strom Thurmond Center including the Thurmond Institute, the Performing Arts Center, and the Continuing Education Center, and

WHEREAS, the proposed relocation of these facilities and programs is significantly at variance with the University Master Plan, and

WHEREAS, the site as proposed in the Master Plan was carefully considered in the light of (a) the academic and public programs of the performing arts areas and of the Thurmond Institute, (b) the need to avoid unnecessary duplication of resources and personnel with those of Cooper Library, and (c) the cost savings which would result from consolidated services such as security, transportation, utilities, etc., be it therefore,

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate supports the present Master Plan location for the Strom Thurmond Center, and be it further

RESOLVED, that should extenuating circumstances necessitate a reconsideration of the site, the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the University Planning Board that an appropriate planning firm be retained to work closely with all affected programs within the University "... to restudy the site alternatives so that a definitive site organization concept can be made." Be it further

RESOLVED, that the academic, research, and extension goals of the University be the primary determinant of any contemplated changes in University land use and that any such changes be made with the informed involvement of all affected campus constituencies.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

February 7, 1984

I. Call to Order:

President Ulbrich called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. She reminded the members of the Executive and Advisory Committees of the meeting with President Atchley on Wed. the 15th at 3:30 p.m. in the Board room. President Ulbrich introduced Oran Smith, President of the Student Senate, as a special guest. She said that one of the most delightful experiences as Faculty Senate president was getting to know her counterpart in Student Senate and that she had learned as much from him as he had learned from her.

II. Special Order: Oran Smith, President of Student Senate

President Smith explained the duties of a president of Student Senate and the difference in the duties of Student Senate and those of Student Body President. He said that the president of Student Senate was the administrative officer of the legislative branch of student government. As the president, he chairs the Senate Affairs Committee, which is an advisory committee that is composed of the chairs of the eight committees that do the work of Student Senate. These committees include Academic Affairs, Athletic Affairs, Traffic and Grounds, Judiciary, Student Health Affairs, Organizations and University Housing. He also serves on numerous councils, commissions and committees at the University level. His duties on this level consist of offering help and giving student input. He likewise presides over the Student Senate.

On the other hand, President Smith said that the Student Body President oversees the actual carrying out of the acts of the Student Senate. He directs the funds that are raised from different projects to the student organizations. He coordinates special projects, some of which have been the visitors center and the balloon project. He handles public relations, presents awards and welcomes visitors.

President Smith said that in their Monday night meetings each week the senate make resolutions on student issues, amend the constitution and make rules. One of the largest jobs of the senate is the passing of the big budget of $115,000 which is then allocated to some 119 different organizations. They also examine the credentials for recognizing a group on campus as an official organization. An issue dealt with this year was the addition of a second crosswalk in the Calhoun Courts area. They will probably look at the charge by the telephone company of $0.50 on each long distance call made on student phones. President Smith said that they had been successful in the matter of getting traffic barricades changed to allow for bicycle traffic but not cars or motorcycles and that they had submitted a report on Councils, Commissions and Committees. The senate members had polled 767 students on the issue of plus-minus grading and found 559 against the system. He said they also wish to look into the policies of withdrawal from the University to see if they are too rigid and look at a
definition of satisfactory progress.

President Smith expressed pride in hearing the voices of the faculty in academic and athletic matters. He had written to Dr. B.J. Skelton on the matter of recurring questions surrounding the athletic program. He stated that he thought it was time for philosophies to be written down.

President Smith pointed out that the times for student-faculty conflicts were over and that most often students and faculty find themselves working together rather than in disagreement. He said that the idea of a joint faculty-student senate meeting sounded appealing and that issues such as plus-minus grading and advising were areas of common interest. He stated that he was happy that he had come to Clemson and that he liked the idea of it being a big family but that this should not be a way of overlooking things that are out of balance and in need of addressing.

III. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the January 17 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as corrected.

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Scholastic Policy:

Senator Bauer reported that the committee had met on January 17th and that the primary order of business was to look over the questionnaire to be used to poll the opinion of the faculty on plus-minus grading. The survey was distributed on Thursday to each college dean's office. Additional research is being done by the committee members on this issue. He hopes to report the outcome of the survey and of other searches at the March meeting of the Senate.

B. Policy:

Senator Camper reported that the committee had discussed the issues of some changes in the Faculty Manual regarding who has authority to make changes in the Manual, the evaluation of visiting faculty and some proposed changes in the faculty Grievance Procedures (Attachment-B). Objections were raised by senator Palmer on the matter of the procedure of writing a grievance petition not being incorporated into the Faculty Manual. He pointed out that a faculty member considering filing a grievance needed access to these guidelines. President Ulbrich said that this matter could be brought up at the March meeting in order that copies of the proposed wording could be distributed to the Senate.

C. Research: no report

D. Welfare:

Senator McGregor reported that the Welfare Committee had met on the 17th and on the 24th. On the 17th they dealt with the issues of faculty retirement practices, deferred tuition for children and/or spouses of faculty members and travel reimbursement. At the meeting on the 24th health care costs were discussed with several professionals and experts in the health area (Attachment C). President Ulbrich commented that there might be some interest at this
time in examining other options such as disability insurance and
dental insurance for state employees. President Atchley is interested
in input on fringe benefits.

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

Senator Camper presented the resolution on the Outstanding
Research Award and moved for its adoption (Attachment D). The
motion was seconded and in the discussion Senator Camper gave some
of the background as to why the award had been administered
previously by Sigma Xi alone. He recalled that prior to the time
when Sigma Xi had instituted its Outstanding Research Scientist
Award that there had been no recognition of research on the campus.
He said that when the Alumni Association wanted to offer an award
for research that the existing award was chosen for funding and
Sigma Xi became the administrator of the award. He also pointed out
that he felt that it was a natural thing at this time for the Alumni
Award to evolve to encompass a broader range of disciplines. The
motion passed.

Senator Hill presented the 'Open Forum' Guidelines and
Responsibilities (Attachment E) which he had received from the
President’s office on Friday. He explained that there had been some
confusion surrounding publishing the first edition of the 'Open
Forum'. The first edition was put on hold just as it was ready to go
to press. After President Ulbrich talked to President Atchley the
project was taken off hold but a set of guidelines were handed down.
Senator Hill pointed out several places in the guidelines where
alterations had been made of what had been assumed to be the
previous guidelines. The points of difference included the person
having responsibility for choosing letters and responses, the
regularity of printing, the power of veto and the change in
composition of the 'Open Forum' committee. Senator Hill asked for
instructions from the Senate in negotiating changes in the proposed
guidelines when he and President Ulbrich meet with Mr. Durham and
the Newsletter staff. Members of the Senate felt that the 'Open
Forum' Committee should have the responsibility for selecting and
censoring letters received and that any veto past this point should be
used very sparingly at a high administrative level. A veto should be
followed by an explanation.

President Ulbrich reported on the progress being made in the
Ad Hoc Committee on Councils, Commissions and Committees. She
said that a preliminary draft will be presented to the President's
Council this Friday. The changes, including the creation of the
Commission on Physical Facilities, were shared with President Atchley
and were received favorably. The proposed new commission would
included the Planning Board, committees on Campus Names,
Landscape, Safety and Fire Prevention, Traffic and Parking,
Hazardous Materials and Handicapped. The Committee also proposed
that the Commission on Public Programs include committees on Vending
Machines, Rare Possessions, Fine Arts, Marshal and Continuing
Education. President Ulbrich said that the result of the proposed
changes would be to have eight commissions. A proposed executive
board would consist of the President, the Provost and the chairman of
the eight commissions. The board would keep track of the agenda and committees and follow up on decisions.

F. University Commissions/Councils/Committees:

Senator Sieverdes reported that a self study on reorganization of the Commission on Student Affairs was studied at the Jan. 18 meeting of this Commission. The outcome was to let committees report directly to the Commission thus eliminating one level of reporting to executive boards.

Senator Burkett reported on the Jan. 19 meeting of the Committee on the Handicapped. The Committee considered the complaints concerning the lack of adequate seating for the handicapped in Littlejohn Coliseum and some solutions to the problem. A letter on this matter was sent to President Atchley. Another topic which came up and will be explored further next meeting was the possibility of a diagnostic center for students with learning disabilities. He said that one function of the committee is to keep up with the federal requirements regarding the handicapped.

Senator Hill reported on the meeting of the Committee on Continuing Enrollment. Mr. Mattox, the Admissions Officer, reported to the Committee on the problems of the subsiding applicant pool of students applying to go to college. An 8-10% decrease per year until 1990 is predicted. Some 5590 students have applied to come to Clemson for next year. This number is down by about 600. 2700 of these have been accepted and 695 rejected. Out of the remainder, 46% have a predicted GPR of 2.00 or less. Mr. Mattox also pointed out that some of the students who turn down Clemson give as their reason the inferior academic status of Clemson as compared to the college of their choice. Some members of the Committee said that this is a standard reply when the student has received a scholarship at the other institution and not at Clemson. Senator Hill said that the lack of sufficient scholarships will increase the problem of attracting the better student as the applicant pool decreases. He said that another problem discussed was the need for a definition of satisfactory progress to be in operation by March 15th. The Department of Education which controls student aid money requires the definition. They say that the college should write its own definition but that it should include the maximum time frame and the increments of a curriculum that are to be completed in a year. The definition must be applicable to all students. He pointed out that there could be serious repercussions if standards are set so high that it penalizes our minority recruiting or so low that anybody can pass.

He asked that careful consideration be given to the matter, recognizing that only a short time remains in which opinions of faculty, students and senators can be polled.

Senator Overcamp reported that the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research had not met but that the members are being polled on their opinion as to whether to discontinue midterm grades for graduate courses. Some considered these an unnecessary expense and of little value. He invited response on this issue.
Senator Taylor reported that the Honors Committee had taken up three issues in its last meeting. The Committee wants to invite Mayor Andrew Young to give a talk on Mar. 8 on "The South and the Third World". The schedule for Honors and Awards Day was completed. The Committee also discussed reasons why Clemson students are not competitive for Rhodes Scholarships. Jim Schindler, a member of the Committee, a Rhodes Scholar, and also a member of the regional selection committee for Rhodes Scholars gave some insight into this issue.

Senator Senn reported on the Feb. 3 meeting of the Planning Board (Attachment J). He stressed that the situation on the Strom Thurmond Center was moving very fast. He said that the Center encompasses the Strom Thurmond Institute, the Performing Arts Center and the Continuing Education Center. The golf course and the waterfront facilities are located in the same vicinity. He expressed concern that since the Performing Arts Center would be so far away from other campus activities, students might experience difficulties in getting back and forth between the main campus and these facilities. Senator Harris said that the Strom Thurmond Institute would use some of the same type facilities that the Library uses and that duplication would be expensive. Senator Senn pointed out that the present proposed site is not the same as was shown on the Master Plan two years ago.

V. President's Report:

President Ulbrich expanded the president's report (Attachment A) by a few items. She reminded the Senate members that the time for elections of new faculty senators was at hand and that the advisory committee representatives of each college should make sure that steps are taken to elect senators before spring break. She said that the Advisory-Executive committees would get together on next Monday to make nominations for president-elect and secretary to present at the March Senate meeting. She said that a minimum of $5.00 was required for payroll deduction for the scholarship fund collections because Business and Finance feels that collection of smaller amounts are cost prohibitive. She reported that there will be a $30.00 fine for parking in a visitors space. Cars without decals will be given a warning for the first offence. In order to avoid problems visitors should have parking permits. She said that she has a copy of the revision in the Trustees' Manual dealing with participation of trustees on search committees. A statement as to why students cannot receive medical excuses from Redfern is also available. The Athletic Council met and reviewed the outcome of the NCAA meetings and also heard a report on the academic tutoring program.

VI. Old Business:

Senator Overcamp presented the resolution on the Alumni Award (Attachment F), and made a motion that the resolution be passed by the Senate. The motion was seconded. A friendly amendment to include a review of the Master Teacher's Award was accepted. The motion passed unanimously. Senator Overcamp then presented the accompanying page of the attachment which discussed the criteria for eligibility and the
guidelines for selection. He said that presently there is no written selection procedure and that the proposed procedure is similar to that for selection of a chaired professor. Comment was invited but no formal motion was proposed.

Senator Gowdy brought forward the resolution on the use of Bowman Field (Attachment G) and a letter from Senator Coston on maintenance of turf. Senator Gowdy said that the Traffic and Parking Committee had passed a resolution asking that Bowman Field not be used for any other parking purposes other than for football games. He said that a number of people to whom he had talked felt that this was not reasonable and urged him to bring his resolution forward. After being seconded the resolution was adopted unanimously.

VII. New Business:

Senator Camper presented the recommendations from the Policy Committee on grievance procedures (Attachment H) and made a motion that these be accepted. The motion was seconded. Many senators felt that a person should have the right to appeal to the President. Feelings were expressed that this could be a disadvantage to the person if the President did not have sufficient time to review the case carefully. A motion was made and passed to extend the review period to 30 days. The amended motion passed by a vote of 20-1.

Senator Hill made a motion to accept the following resolution. "Resolved: that we, the Faculty Senate, express our sympathy to Mr. and Mrs. John Idol at the death yesterday of Mrs. Idol's mother, Maybelle South. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

VIII. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Muriel B. Bishop
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments
Senators Absent (Substitutes Present):
President's Report
February, 1984

1. A meeting has been set between the Advisory/Executive Committees and President Atchley to discuss property development issues. The date has not been finalized but it should take place shortly after the next Senate meeting.

2. The Ad Hoc Committee to review committees, commissions and councils is completing its work and should be reporting soon to the President's Council. Many of the suggestions of the Senate were incorporated into the draft document.

3. Questions were raised by some department heads about the value of evaluation disclosures and were discussed at the Council of Deans. No change was made as a result of that discussion.

4. The Director of Libraries, at the request of the Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees, has done an extensive review of the needs of the library in terms of staff, furnishings, equipment, serials and books. I have a copy of that report if anyone is interested. The Educational Policy Committee has made upgrading the library a priority item.

5. Scholastic Policy will be sending its survey to every faculty member on plus/minus grading. Please encourage your faculty to fill out the form and return it.

6. My apologies for several errors in the Senate Special that got by me in proofreading. I think the Advisory Committee clearly understands that the land use matters referred to them are far broader in scope than the chilled water plant, and the item from Policy on review of nontenured faculty has not yet been presented to the Senate for action.

7. The advisory committee will be meeting soon to make nominations for President Elect and Secretary for next year. Please pass on your suggestions as soon as possible.

8. Two committees under faculty affairs are at work on issues of interest to the Senate. The Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation has begun its work, and the Marshal's Committee is reviewing the graduation exercises. Please give them your suggestions. The Marshal's Committee is chaired by Doug Bradbury and is made up of the college marshals and the registrar.

9. The Alumni Council is anxious to have our input into the selection process for the Alumni Faculty Awards. There is a resolution and a suggested selection procedure on the agenda (both attached). Please consider these carefully.

10. My thanks to Dave Senn and all of you who participated for a very successful reception for the Board of Trustees.

11. There seems to be some confusion about the schedule of Senate meetings. Remaining meetings for the year: February 7th, March
6th, April 3rd. March 6th will include elections; April 3rd will be followed by the traditional "Beer Bust." The Senate will continue to meet monthly over the summer but the only meeting which has been scheduled thus far is May 1st.

2. By action of the Board of Trustees, there is now the option of Trustee representation on search committees for officers who report directly to the President as well as the college deans and the director of the Extension Service. The option lies with the Chairman of the Board after consultation with the President.
REPORT OF POLICY COMMITTEE
February, 1984

The Policy Committee met on January 24, 1984. The following items were discussed:

I. Faculty Manual Changes: The question of who has authority for approval and making changes in the Manual has been discussed. Specifically the first sentence of paragraph six (Section I:1) was discussed. It is our interpretation that "responsibility for the maintenance of the Clemson University Faculty Manual is vested in the Office of the Provost..." means that the Provost's office handles typing and printing; i.e., those chores associated with physical maintenance. There are sections of the Manual which are the responsibility of the Faculty Senate and of the Administration. We choose not to recommend wording changes at this time.

II. Evaluation of Visiting Faculty: Section II:17 of the Faculty Manual contains the following statement: "Department heads are required to conduct an annual evaluation of each faculty member under their supervision." It seems that this would automatically include Visiting Faculty. The number of visiting faculty is generally low, constituting a small percentage of the departmental faculty to be evaluated. Thus, evaluation of visiting faculty should not create excessive additional workload. Furthermore, such an evaluation would contribute to the continued professional development of the faculty member.

Therefore, the evaluation of Visiting Faculty should be conducted by the department head annually as prescribed by the Faculty Manual.

III. Faculty Grievance Procedures: A number of items concerning the Faculty Grievance procedures were discussed and several changes are presented under New Business for Senate consideration. Three items were discussed, but no specific recommendations are offered at this time.

A. Steps for Filing Grievances under GPII - an Ad hoc committee forwarded the following to us in an attempt to clarify the steps for filing a GPII:

"In order for the Provost and/or the Grievance Board to determine if the matter is grievable, the petition must include a specific statement of the nature of the grievance including:

a. The specific individual or individuals against whom the grievance is filed.

b. The dates upon which the alleged grievable matter occurred."
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c. The specific provision or provisions of the Faculty Manual, paragraph (6), page II:31 under which the grievant believes the matter is grievable.

d. A list of supporting documents which are appended to the petition.

e. The specific relief which is being sought by the grievant.

It is the opinion of the Policy Committee that these steps should serve as guidelines to the faculty member considering filing a GP II and should be available from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and from the Grievance Counselor.

B. Military Leave - A question concerning the wording of the first paragraph (Section IV:16) has been raised. We are obtaining further information before bringing a formal recommendation.

C. Size of Grievance Board - The number of GP cases this year has created delays in processing and heavy workloads for the Board Members. A partial solution may involve increasing the size of the Board. This item remains under consideration.
The Committee met on January 17 and 24.

A. On January 17, the Committee dealt with three items:

1. Reviewed the paper "A Study of Faculty Retirement Practices in Selected Higher Institutions," by George W. Latzenhiser. This was a survey sent to 600 randomly selected public and private institutions of higher education. The return was 54 per cent (325 institutions). Questions were in the following categories:

   Academic Recognition  
   Method of Approval  
   Written or Printed Recognition  
   Physical Space  
   Secretarial Services and Supplies  
   Library Support Service  
   Activity/Entertainment/Recreational Services  
   Retirement Salary Plan  
   Insurance Benefits  
   Forms of Recognition

   Clemson's answer to questions in the various categories was compared to the National response. Clemson's recognition of and benefits to retired faculty compared quite favorably with those of other schools, and the Committee felt that no further action should be recommended at this time other than for departments to be sure that their retired faculty know the benefits available to them (see Faculty Manual Sections II:6, III:21, and VI:3). It is felt that departments and colleges have the principal responsibility to take advantage of this "fantastic resource" within the guidelines of the Manual.

   If anyone is particularly interested in this survey, it is available for review from the Welfare Committee Chairman.

2. Discussed deferred tuition for children or spouses of faculty. Depending on interpretation, there could be a conflict with state law which states that "no perquisites of office or of employment shall be allowed in addition to salary." Reduced tuition probably would be in violation of current state law. There were no current data from which the number of affected faculty could be determined, so a survey is being taken. All departments have reported except Agricultural Engineering, Agronomy and Soils, Food Science, Horticulture, Management, Textiles, Aerospace Studies, Ceramic Engineering, Chemical Engineering, and English.

   Approximately 120 faculty members have spouse and/or child(ren) enrolled at Clemson in the current semester. How many would be interested in deferred tuition payment, possibly by payroll deduction, is not known but the quick and rather complete response to the poll, along with unsolicited comments on some forms, indicate that many faculty would be interested in a deferred tuition option. After survey results are complete, so that we know how many people we are talking about in a given semester, we will follow up with feeling out the administration and will bring a resolution or recommendation to the senate if it seems warranted.
3. Discussed (a) travel reimbursement as income (January 2 Newsletter) and (b) travel in personal vehicle as air or motor pool on trips over 300 miles (Barnette memo of 12/9/83). On (a), travel expense reported as income does not add to base for retirement, which is based on salary. For 1984, mileage reimbursement reported for one-day trips can be claimed as a business expense at 20.5¢/mile. However, meals on a non-overnight trip cannot be claimed as a business expense, but are reported as income.

On (b), Barnette's interpretation of current regulations, if motor pool cost is lower than air fare, personal vehicle cannot be used. The House Ways and Means Committee version of the 1984-'85 state budget contains a provision that, if motor pool vehicles are not available, personal vehicle can be used at a reimbursement rate of 20.5¢ per mile, or, if a motor pool vehicle is available, personal vehicle can be used by personal choice at a reimbursement rate of 0.20¢ per mile. Members of the South Carolina State Employees Association may want to urge support of this provision by that group. Faculty who would like to see a simple option permitting faculty to use personal vehicles by choice for any distance, instate or out, with reimbursement at motor pool rates, should let Mr. Melvin Barnette know.

B. On January 24 the Committee met with Drs. Hollingsworth and Pierce of Piedmont Pathology Associates, P.A., Mr. Kirk Oglesby, Administrator of Anderson Memorial Hospital, Mr. Charles Johnson, Executive Vice President of the South Carolina Medical Association, and Dr. R. E. Hartvigsen, Associate Director of Corporate Medical Affairs for S. C. Blue Cross-Blue Shield. The Committee will be meeting next week to sort out our conclusions and recommendations from that interesting, sometimes heated, but generally amicable discussion of health care costs, third-party charges, Piedmont Pathology Associates' relationship to Anderson Memorial Hospital, and S. C. Blue Cross-Blue Shield's view of that relationship. We will hope to have a more detailed report, along with any recommendations, at the March meeting of the Senate.
Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Outstanding Research Award

The committee agrees that it would be appropriate for this award to be made for research which fits the definition of "scholarly or scientific inquiry" (American Heritage Dictionary), which is a broader criterion than that established by Sigma Xi but which still does not extend to creation of original works of art, e.g. painting, sculpture, fiction. While the latter are appropriate scholarly activities in many fields, they do not fall within the domain of research as we understand it.

In order to broaden the base of disciplines participating in the selection process, we suggest that the award be jointly administered by two academic honorary societies; Sigma Xi, which is devoted to scientific research, and Phi Kappa Phi, which represents all academic disciplines. We further suggest that a joint committee be established with three representatives from each society and an alternating chair. This committee would develop selection guidelines subject to the approval of both organizations and the Alumni National Council; solicit nominations; review candidates; and make a selection each year (if a suitable candidate is available) for the Outstanding Research Award.

These suggestions have been shared with the Presidents of both Sigma Xi (Joe Dickey) and Phi Kappa Phi (Ed Clark) who find them acceptable, subject to final approval by their respective memberships.

Holley Ulbrich, Tom Overcamp, Joe Dickey, Dwight Camper
"Open Forum"
Guidelines and Responsibilities

1. "Open Forum" is published by the University through the Internal Communications Program as special editions of the University Newsletter, similar to the "News Specials" and "Senate Specials" produced by the Newsletter staff.

2. The purpose of "Open Forum" is to provide a medium for reasoned discussion by members of the faculty and staff, both on campus and off campus, of issues important to the University community at large.

3. "Open Forum" consists of letters and responses to letters from individual employees and, when appropriate, editorial comments.

4. "Open Forum" is published on an irregular basis, depending upon the number of letters accepted for publication and budget considerations.

5. The "Open Forum" Committee recommends to the Newsletter editor letters and responses to letters for publication in "Open Forum".

6. Inasmuch as the irregular publication frequency of "Open Forum" may hinder the timely exchange of differing points of view on a topic, the "Open Forum" Committee or the editor, in the interest of fairness and accuracy, may invite responses from persons responsible for areas addressed in letters accepted for publication.

7. The "Open Forum" Committee consists of equally representation from the faculty and staff. Members are selected using procedures developed by the Faculty Senate and the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, respectively. The editor of the University Newsletter is a non-voting, ex-officio member of the committee.

8. Inasmuch as "Open Forum" is published as special editions of the University Newsletter, the Newsletter editor reserves the right to edit letters and responses to letters for length, style, grammar, and consistency and to reject submissions that are libelous or in bad taste.

9. While the goal of "Open Forum" is to promote free discussion on a wide range of University topics, it is recognized that under certain circumstances, because of the sensitive nature of the commentary involved, printing a particular letter would not be appropriate nor in the best interest of the University. Such letters will not be printed.

10. "Open Forum" does not publish letters dealing with personal grievances or other matters irrelevant to the University community at large.

11. To be considered for publication, submissions for "Open Forum" must be typed, double spaced, and not longer than 300 words, unless prior arrangements are made with the "Open Forum" Committee. Each submission must include its author's signature, University address and University telephone number.

12. Submissions should be sent to 103 Fike Center, Clemson University, Clemson, S.C. 29631.
WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate is most appreciative of the efforts of the Alumni Association to encourage and reward teaching, research and public service through the Alumni Professorships and the Alumni Master Teacher, Outstanding Research Scientist and Outstanding Public Service Awards, and

WHEREAS, in the last two years controversies have arisen in connection with these awards because of the eligibility requirements and the selection procedures, be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the Senate requests that the Alumni Association clarify the eligibility criteria and review and the selection procedures for Alumni Professorships and for the research and public service awards.

Be it further RESOLVED, that the Alumni Association be requested, after completing such a review, to make available to the Faculty Senate a statement of these criteria and selection procedures to be disseminated to the faculty and edited for inclusion in future revisions of the Faculty Manual.
Questions to clarify in eligibility criteria and suggested changes in the selection procedures for Alumni Professors

I. Eligibility criteria

It is the understanding and expectation of the Faculty Senate that the eligibility criteria are and indeed should be established by the Alumni Association. However, it is not entirely clear to us what those criteria are because of the great variations in the mix of teaching (undergraduate and graduate), research, service and administration responsibilities to which various faculty are assigned. It is our understanding that only persons whose time is spent in undergraduate teaching are eligible. This would exclude deans and department heads as well as persons on primarily research and/or extension appointments. This needs to be clarified. In particular, does one forfeit an alumni professorship by taking on an administrative position? (We would suggest that if this is indeed the case, that a person who is in an acting rather than a "permanent" position not be so penalized.) Likewise, if such a person's responsibilities should shift for a long period to a primarily research assignment, would his/her eligibility be reviewed? Is a person off campus (on leave or sabbatical) at the time of selection eligible?

II. Selection guidelines.

We feel that the process should be more open in terms of announcing a vacancy or new position, soliciting nominations, and using a faculty screening committee. Even though these procedures might slow the process or delay the announcement of the award, we feel that the faculty, the students, and the Alumni Association would be better served by such a process. An open procedure with faculty participation would alleviate many of the concerns which have been expressed in recent months. In addition, it would provide encouragement to faculty to excel in those areas for which the award is designed.

These committees need broad representation. We feel that there should be a screening committee in each college, whose composition, method of selection, and terms of office shall be determined by the faculty and set forth set forth in the college bylaws, an Alumni Award Screening Committee. This would allow for the very different sizes and missions of the nine colleges and is consistent with the procedure for establishing other college-level committees. However, it would be appropriate to specify that the committee should have representation from undergraduates, graduate teaching assistants who have contact with undergraduate students (in those colleges which use graduate teaching assistants), and a faculty majority. Department heads, as faculty members, should be eligible to serve on this committee.

The primary responsibility of this committee would be to solicit nominations and screen candidates for the position of Alumni Professor in accordance with the criteria set forth by the Alumni National Council. The committee shall then forward a list of not less than two names, ranked or unranked, to the Dean of the College, who shall in turn forward one name from that list for each vacant Alumni Professorship to a University selection committee. This committee should be made up of faculty, students and alumni, selected respectively by the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate, and the Alumni Council. This committee should select two names for each vacant position to forward to the Provost, who shall make the final selection.
MEMORANDUM TO: Dr. J.N. Gowdy, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
FROM: D.C. Coston, Department of Horticulture  

Based on discussions with the people in my department who work with turfgrass these are considerations regarding Bowman Field.  

1. Maintaining a high quality turf and parking are probably not compatible.  
2. Problems with parking include hot tires on vehicles burning grass, oil and gasoline dripping from vehicles, and compaction of soil that causes long term problems with turf.  
3. A possible solution might be turfstone pavers as shown on the accompanying page. This approach would help in reducing soil compaction. These pavers are placed in the ground, soil placed in the holes in the pavers, and grass grown in the holes. The grass spreads and covers the entire area. Vehicle tires ride on the concrete part of the pavers with little or no damage to the grass. However, use of these pavers would probably eliminate use of the area for intramural sports. At present I do not have an estimate of cost. An alternative (perhaps less expensive) to this product would be the use of concrete blocks.  

I will be out of town February 6. If there is need of additional information, please let me know.  

mh  
Enclosure
WHEREAS, the area known as Bowman Field is essentially the "front lawn" of Clemson University, and

WHEREAS, a well-conditioned Bowman Field contributes significantly to the beauty of the Clemson campus, be it therefore

RESOLVED, that no parking be allowed on Bowman Field, including the area in front of Holtzendorff YMCA Center and the area in front of Mell Hall. This restriction includes parking for all occasions, including athletic events, registration, academic open houses, etc. with no exceptions.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE POLICY COMMITTEE ON GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE CHANGES

1. Right of Appeal to the President. As pointed out by the Provost, Grievance Procedure II does not provide for any appeal from the decisions he makes. Thus, the following item is suggested to be inserted on p. II:31 of the Manual.

"New No. 7. 7) Either party may appeal the decision of the Provost to the President of the University, provided that he/she does so within seven calendar days after receipt of the Provost's decision. The appeal must be in writing. If an appeal is made, the President shall review the record of the grievance (as submitted to the Provost), the recommendation of the Grievance Board, if any, and the decision of the Provost. The president may also interview any individual involved in the grievance for the purpose of clarifying any part of the record if he/she so desires. The President shall render a final decision on behalf of the University within fifteen calendar days after receipt of the written appeal. Copies of the decision of the President shall be sent to the Provost, the faculty member, the Grievance Board and to other parties directly concerned.

If no appeal is made to the President in accordance with the time limitation specified herein, the decision of the Provost shall be the final University decision."

2. Notification of Grievance Committee's Recommendation. Currently, Grievance Procedure II does not provide that a copy of the Committee's Recommendation be forwarded to the faculty member. Grievance Procedure I provides such a mechanism (see first paragraph, p. II:28). It seems that the same sentence can be inserted in Grievance Procedure II - item 5, p. II:30, add "The faculty member shall be given a copy of the Committee's Recommendation at the time it is forwarded to the Provost."

3. Filing under both GP I and GP II simultaneously. Consider the situation where a case is filed under GP I and GP II simultaneously and that much of the same evidence and material will be considered in both GP I and GP II Procedures. Should a joint committee be convened? Apparently, GP I has priority over GP II because of the legalities involved. Ben Anderson submitted the following draft for consideration:

"If a grievance is filed in a timely manner under Grievance Procedure II, and it is determined by the Provost that the same faculty member has a grievance pending under Grievance Procedure I at that time based upon the same or a related factual situation, the Provost may suspend the processing of the grievance filed under Grievance Procedure II until a final decision on the grievance pending under Grievance Procedure I has been rendered on behalf of the University. Also, if a grievance is filed in a timely manner under Grievance Procedure II, and subsequently the same faculty member files a grievance under Grievance Procedure I which is based upon the same or a related factual situation, the
Provost may suspend the processing of the grievance filed under Grievance Procedure II until a final decision on the grievance filed under Grievance Procedure I has been rendered on behalf of the University. The Provost shall notify the grievance board as well as all parties to the grievance in the event that the Grievance Procedure II process is suspended.

If a grievance filed under Grievance Procedure II is suspended as stated above, the time limitations stated in the procedure shall be suspended until such time as the Provost resumes the processing of the grievance."
The University Planning Board met on Friday, February 3. Three agenda items were considered during the meeting: the Strom Thurmond Center, a site location for a steel truss bridge, and recommendations from the University Landscape and Site Development Committee.

As expected, the major portion of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of the Strom Thurmond Center which includes the Thurmond Institute, the Performing Arts Center, and the Continuing Education Center. Dr. Ed Byars was present to brief the Planning Board on the current status of the complex. During the discussion a number of important points were made:

1. At its meeting on January 27, the Board of Trustees authorized and directed the administration to proceed with obtaining architectural/engineering plans for the construction of the Strom Thurmond Institute Building and a master site plan for the Thurmond Center Complex.

2. The Board of Trustees is "anxious to reassure Senator Thurmond that something will get underway soon." The Trustees separated the Institute Building itself from the rest of the Center. They would like a groundbreaking ceremony to be held within six months. Senator Thurmond would like to include President Reagan in the ceremony.

3. President Atchley, Senator Waddell, and Senator Thurmond all apparently favor a new lake site for the Thurmond Complex to the original master plan site on campus. The Council of Deans has indicated a strong preference for the original site. Dr. Byars stated that the location for the Center Complex would be left up to the architectural/engineering firm. Considerable discussion followed by Planning Board members with the consensus seeming to be that the A/E firm will "put it where they are told to put it."

4. As a result of the decision made by the S.C. Attorney General's Office the University must use state procurement codes (i.e., open bidding) even though funds for the Institute do not involve state monies. Dr. Byars indicated that this decision would have a strong impact on plans for the Institute, "we're back to square one."

5. Dr. Byars stated that if we want the Institute at all, it must be commercially viable. Sufficient funds have not been raised at this point to begin construction. The reason for building the condominium units is to fund the other components of the Thurmond Complex. According to Byars, there is no risk; all units will be pre-sold. Investors will own the units and will rent them to individuals attending continuing education conferences and other campus events. The condominiums are not intended for permanent residency.
In addition to the above points, the Planning Board discussed a number of other related matters including: (a) user requirements for Thurmond Institute resources and records, (b) relationship of Institute programs to Center Library resources, (c) programmatic impacts of removing the Center facilities from the main campus, e.g., faculty offices, class scheduling, instructional support problems, attendance at visiting lectures all associated with the performing arts center, (d) the nature of and accommodations needed for various on-campus conferences, (e) the possibility for obtaining state funds for non-commercial aspects of Center Complex, (f) the practice of selling and/or leasing University land for condominiums, and (g) the relocation of physical plant warehouses, storage areas, Old Stadium Road, and new utility systems for a lake-site development.

In its recommendation to President Atchley, the Planning Board stated that since a site is desired which is in variance with the Master Plan the architectural/engineering firm should be charged to work with various campus constituents (e.g., academic deans, faculty, continuing education, etc.). A restudy of the Master Plan should be conducted before A/E specifications are developed and construction plans are finalized. The Board further recommended that the original Master Planning firms (Lockwood Greene, Ed Pickney Assoc.) conduct the review of the Master Plan.

The Board reviewed a proposal to locate a steel truss bridge between Thornhill Village and Calhoun Courts. Two possible site locations were recommended and a particularly interesting bridge has been located in South Greenville County. The proposal was developed by Professors Don Collins and Gayland Witherspoon of the College of Architecture. The Planning Board delayed action on the proposal so that other opinions could be solicited and other possible sites considered.

Finally, the Board accepted as information only a report from the University Landscape and Site Development Committee. The report recommends several projects in a prioritized listing for implementation as soon as their feasibility is determined by the Planning Board. It is unlikely that funds for these projects will be available within the next two or three years.

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for March 2, 1984.

Respectfully submitted,

David J. Senn, Vice-President
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

January 10, 1984

Senate Chambers

I. Call to Order:

President Ulbrich called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. Conflicts again prevented Mr. Robinson and Mr. Turner from visiting with the Senate. No plans were made to invite them this senate year.

II. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the December 6 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as corrected.

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Scholastic Policy:

Senator Bauer reported that the committee had received permission to survey the faculty for their opinion on plus-minus grading. He reported that the committee had decided to work with the Advising and Course Placement Committee on issues related to the responsibilities of faculty members in advising.

B. Policy:

Senator Camper reported that the committee met on December 7 and took up several items of business, including the status of the workload analysis, evaluation of temporary faculty, several proposed revisions of grievance procedures in the Faculty Manual, the size of the Grievance Board and clarification of the process of writing a petition to the Grievance Board. Recommendations on grievance procedure changes and evaluation of temporary faculty will be considered at the February meeting.

C. Research: no report

D. Welfare:

Senator Mcgregor reported that the Welfare Committee has meetings scheduled for Jan 17 and 24. Health issues and deferred tuition for family members of faculty will be items of business. He requested aid from senate members in determining the number of family members of faculty that are currently enrolled at Clemson. A survey will be made on a departmental basis. Another item to be discussed is the use of personal vehicles for University related trips when air fare or use of motor pool vehicles would be cheaper.

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

Senator Hill reported that the Open Forum committee has
sufficient material to proceed with publication before the next senate meeting.

Senator Dickey reported that the committee assigned to study the eligibility and selection process for the Outstanding Research Award had not formulated a report. He stated that the feeling of the members of Sigma Xi is that if they sponsor the award then selection will be made from projects using traditional scientific procedures; namely hypothesis, experiment, etc. President Ulbrich asked for a report from the committee at the next meeting.

President Ulbrich reported that an ad hoc committee on the Council would have the responsibility for the regularity and the agenda of meetings of the President's Council.

F. University Commissions/Councils/Committees:

Senator Senn reported that the Planning Board had studied the location of the new chilled water system (Attachment B). He reported that the members were informed about the plans for locating the future complex containing the Performing Arts Center, continuing education center and Strom Thurmond Institute on the lake rather than in the site originally shown on the Master Plan. He stated that decisions on the location of the new chilled water facility would have to take this complex into consideration. A number of senators expressed concern over the lack of publicity on the proposed changes. They felt that there was a need for channels whereby input could be made by those in the University who were being directly affected by moving this complex and by certain other developments. A motion was made by Senator Dickey to have the Faculty Senate Executive-Advisory Committees pursue the matter of the location of the complex and of the development of forestry lands bordering the lake behind the Jacobs Chuck Co, off highway 123. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Senator Dickey reported that the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research had discussed the plus-minus grading policy as applied to graduate courses but had taken no formal action. President Ulbrich pointed out that the Commission on Undergraduate Studies had requested that the Faculty Senate study the issue more extensively and then resubmit proposal to both the Undergraduate and Graduate Commissions.

Several other commissions, councils and committees had met but had no reports to present at this time.

V. President's Report:

In addition to the items listed in the President's Report (Attachment A) President Ulbrich announced that the Executive-Advisory Committees would meet Mon. Jan. 16 at 4:00 p.m. in the conference room of Sirrine Hall.

Senate members were encouraged to attend the reception for the Board of Trustees Jan. 27 from 5:00 to 7:00 in the Alumni Center.

President Ulbrich said that Athletic Council had, on 24 hours
notice, met for 2 hours on Jan. 4. There were a number of important and complex issues discussed despite such short notice and no previously published agenda. The agenda had, however, been distributed to members of the Council in December. The issues pertained to the NCAA meeting for this week. President Ulbrich felt that regularly scheduled meetings with an advance agenda would allow the members to be better prepared for these meetings.

VI. Old Business:

A motion was made by Senator Overcamp to remove Senator Gowdy's resolution (Attachment C) from the table. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. Senator Gowdy then made a motion to postpone this matter indefinitely. He stated that he wanted time to consider the matter further. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Senator Overcamp presented the report of the Ad hoc committee studying the scholarship campaign (Attachment D). He requested that certain aspects of the discussion be made in executive session. The senate voted to enter executive session at 4:35 p.m. and came out at 4:55 p.m. A motion to adopt the report was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

VII. New Business:

President Ulbrich reported that she has not met with George Moore concerning the selection process for Alumni Professors but will do so on Thursday. Various senate members asked questions on the process by which candidates names are submitted, to whom these names should be submitted, is there a quota by colleges, are administrators eligible and what is the role of the Alumni Association in the selection process. President Ulbrich said that this matter would be discussed in the Executive-Advisory Committees meeting on Monday and brought before the Senate at the next meeting.

Senator Hill addressed the general question of introduction of courses into a curriculum after the courses have been rejected by a majority of the faculty in that curriculum. President Ulbrich made the point that we do not use the privilege of filing a minority report as often as we might. She felt that this might alert the University Curriculum Committee that there had been some dissent. Senators Hamby and Burkett, from the College of Education, stated that no pressure had been applied for faculty to accept the courses in coaching education. They said that these courses had been favored by the majority of the faculty voting.

VIII. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 5:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[T. H. Bishop]
Attachments
Senators Absent (Substitutes Present):
  Maureen Harris (Frances Colburn)
  Larry Hudson
President's Report
January 1984

1. This has to be the quietest month of the presidency, for which I am truly grateful. Council of Deans has met once. Cabinet will not meet again until the day before the Senate meets. Athletic Council has not met since the first meeting with the new representatives, but it should be meeting early in January.

2. The Council of Deans referred the Coaching Education courses back to the College of Education with some comments and questions. This is a relatively rare action. The Council of Deans cannot prevent a curriculum/course change, but they can comment and request additional consideration. An ad hoc committee of the Council of Deans is considering recommended changes in the curriculum development process. These will be brought to the Senate when they are ready to consider.

3. The Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation is now complete. Henry Pate has agreed to chair. Members: Alan Schafer, Jim Matthews, Steve Chapman, Dory Helms, Henry Pate, Pam Kline, Tom Wooten, Gordon Halfacre, and John Komo. I think this is an excellent group. They will be reporting to the Commission on Faculty Affairs. That report will be shared with the Senate. An interim report will be forthcoming in February and a final report at a later date.

4. We still need letters to the Open Forum if we are going to get it off the ground.

5. The Provost has agreed to pay for duplicating a survey on plus minus grading if we will limit it to one page. It will be sent to deans who will be asked to distribute it to teaching faculty; return line will indicate that you send it to a designated senator in each college.

6. The Provost has approved the changes relative to office hours and faculty class absence forms. He indicated that the office hours policies should be reviewed by the deans and forwarded to him.

7. Don't forget the reception for the Board of Trustees at the Alumni Center, Friday, January 27th, 5 p.m. Spouses and alternates invited.

8. Once again we have scheduled Bobby Robinson and Joe Turner as our guests at the Senate meeting in January.
The University Planning Board met twice during the month of December. Both meetings dealt with a site selection review for the chill water system expansion. Senator Tom Overcamp represented the Faculty Senate at the first meeting. Representatives from Peritus Engineers and Marshall Clarke Architects were also present at both meetings.

At present, the University's chill water supply is insufficient to meet existing demands. Moreover, an expansion of the system is crucial if the new Chemistry Building is to be functional. Delaying a decision on the water system would jeopardize start-up on the new Chemistry Building. The Commission on Higher Education approved the project in 1982 and the Budget and Control Board authorized the University to use its bonding sources to finance the project. The initial structure will be capable of accommodating two 1500-ton chillers and their cooling towers. The facility is capable of being expanded to accommodate additional chillers.

The problem which arose for the Planning Board was that the engineering firm recommended a site which was at variance with the master plan. The engineers recommended a site south of Cherry Road immediately opposite the south P & As parking lot. Several members of the Board saw serious problems with this proposed site. The Planning Board finally resolved the issue by recommending to the President that the new facility be located as far to the east as possible on the south side of Cherry Road. Because of the steepness of the grade at this location construction of the new facility will be somewhat more difficult. However, this location will be less conspicuous than the site originally proposed, will permit greater flexibility in terms of future land use, and will preserve a very large oak tree at the west end of Cherry Road.

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for February 3, 1984.

Respectfully submitted,

David J. Senn, Vice-President
WHEREAS, the area known as Bowman Field is essentially the "front lawn" of Clemson University, and

WHEREAS, a well-conditioned Bowman Field contributes significantly to the beauty of the Clemson campus, be it therefore

RESOLVED, that no parking be allowed on Bowman Field, including the area in front of Holtzendorff YMCA Center and the area in front of Mell Hall. This restriction includes parking for all occasions, including athletic events, registration, academic open houses, etc. with no exceptions.
The October 19 appeal, addressed to the faculty and staff, from President Atchley asking for contributions to the Alumni Loyalty Fund was to obtain funding for a new type of scholarship, "alumni, faculty, friends, and staff scholarships". These scholarships are expected to be about $1,000 and will be awarded first for the fall 1984 semester. This new scholarship fund is not related to a much smaller scholarship called the "faculty-staff scholarship" which was administered through the Development Office prior to the combining, four years ago, of that office and the Alumni Office. That scholarship ceased at the time of the reorganization.

All the funds contributed in response to this appeal, both unrestricted donations and those specifying "scholarships", will be held in a general fund in an investment account until July 1, 1984, when they will be deposited into an account for disbursement as the "alumni, faculty...scholarships". The total amount to be allocated for this scholarship fund will be determined, along with allocations for other programs funded from unrestricted donations (Poole scholarships, alumni professorships, faculty research grants, etc.) at the annual January meeting of the National Alumni Council. At that time, the university administration will present a funding proposal to the National Alumni Council which will include the new scholarship fund as well as increases for other scholarships. This is the normal procedure for dividing unrestricted donations to the Alumni Loyalty Fund. The Alumni Office prefers unrestricted gifts since this gives them a larger pool of money from which to meet the university's needs each year. This year the emphasis is on scholarships but, in future years, the university could request increased funds in another area.

However, anyone wishing to restrict a donation to this new scholarship fund can do so by noting "alumni, faculty...scholarship fund" on their check or CUBO form. And those who have already signed an unrestricted CUBO can amend that form to ensure that all future payroll deductions are designated for this scholarship fund.

President Atchley's letter was the only solicitation for this new scholarship fund. Persons, including faculty and staff, who have contributed in the past to the Alumni Loyalty Fund received a routine annual request for contributions a few weeks prior to Dr. Atchley's letter. This is probably the basis for some faculty members' belief that they received two solicitations for this scholarship fund.
All contributors, by check or by payroll deduction, received the same acknowledgement from the Alumni Office. George Moore, executive officer of that office, states that it is his office's policy not to give out the names of contributors until they are included in the annual published list of contributors and said that his office did not provide the Provost with a list of contributors. He also said that the $5 minimum for payroll deduction was set by the payroll office. According to Moore, the Alumni Office is actively considering the creation of a new fund for soliciting gifts from non-alumni; one possible name is the University Fund. Donations from alumni would continue to be channeled into the Alumni Loyalty Fund but fund raising among non-alumni would be for this new fund. This issue will be considered at the January meeting of the National Alumni Council.

The ad hoc committee was unable to determine how the Provost obtained the names of some of the donors who responded to the President's letter. However, we have no evidence that would suggest that he is retaining a list of contributors or that one's decision to contribute or not will lead to any "reprisal" on his part.

Because of the questions that have arisen concerning this finance campaign, the committee believes that the following suggestions, if implemented in future fund raising from faculty and staff, would result in a more effective campaign. These are: 1) designate a fund with a more appropriate name than Alumni Loyalty Fund into which contributions from university employees would be received and provide clear instructions for those contributors who prefer to restrict their donations to scholarships; 2) avoid any action that could suggest that pressure is being put upon employees to contribute; and 3) establish a lower minimum than $5 for a payroll deduction.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

December 6, 1983

I. Call to Order:

President Ulbrich called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. Conflicts prevented Mr. Robinson and Mr. Turner from visiting with the Senate at this meeting. They will be invited to speak at the January meeting.

III. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the November 15 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as corrected.

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Scholastic Policy:

Senator Bauer reported that the committee had revised the statement on curriculum requirements for students for the catalog. Advisory procedures were discussed. The committee made plans to work with other groups involved with the problems of advising. President Ulbrich suggested that this committee consult with the Advisory Committee on Course Placement (Virginia Stanley, Chairperson) which will meet on Dec. 15.

B. Policy: no report

C. Research: no report

D. Welfare:

Senator Mcgregor reported that the Welfare Committee continues to study the problems of medical costs and of deferred tuition for families of faculty members. The president of the S.C. Medical Association, the hospital administrator of Anderson Memorial Hospital and a representative of the Piedmont Pathologists' Association have been invited to meet with the Welfare Committee next month.

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

President Ulbrich reported on the situation surrounding the proposed ad hoc committee on teaching evaluation. She said that the Provost had expressed feelings that this was a matter that should be handled by the Teaching Resources Advisory Committee. President Ulbrich consulted the Senate Advisory committee, which felt that since this latter committee was still studying the student evaluation of teaching from last spring and that since alternate methods of documenting teaching were critically needed, then another committee was needed to handle this task. She had invited four faculty...
members, who declined and four administrators, who accepted, to serve on the committee. Provost Maxwell questioned the composition of the committee, quoting the Faculty Manual requirement for Faculty Senate committees to be composed of a majority of faculty senators. President Ulbrich said that since invitations had already been accepted that an option would be to let the committee report to the Commission on Faculty Affair. The Advisory Committee and the Commission on Faculty Affairs have both been polled and agreed to this change. Names of other faculty were suggested for adding to the committee. Strong feelings were expressed that an immediate need existed for addressing the matter of alternate procedures for evaluating teaching, since no student evaluation had been done this fall and since this process is thought to be too expensive. The feelings were expressed that although student evaluations are an important part of any evaluation package, alternate evaluation procedures which are recognized as acceptable by the Provost should be available.

F. University Commissions/Councils/Committees:

Senator Sieverdes reported that the Commission on Student Affairs had reviewed the recent Substance Awareness Week activities and concluded that the week was successful. The Commission also discussed the need for new fraternity housing. Three methods for solving the housing need were discussed; remodeling the present fraternity quadrangle housing, building new housing, either houses or lodges off campus, or remodeling older houses off campus. The first of these ways was felt to be a reasonable approach.

Senator Bauer reported on the meeting of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. This Commission voted to delete from the catalog the separate listing of lecture and laboratory hours in the curriculum. These hours will still be listed in the course description. The Commission discussed the possibility of publishing the catalog every two years instead of once a year.

Senator Gowdy reported that the Traffic and Parking Committee had met and had defeated a motion that Bowman Field not be used for parking on any occasion. A motion to improve the drainage on the field passed. The cost of drainage facilities was estimated at $20,000. A motion to eliminate visitors' parking after 5:00 p.m. was also defeated. The Traffic and Parking Committee will be studying the parking situation in regards to the distance which faculty could legitimately walk to work without undue inconvenience.

Sufficient interest was expressed in Senator Gowdy's resolution on the use of Bowman Field so that President Ulbrich moved this item to New Business.

Senator Senn said that the Planning Board would meet in December to discuss the location of the a chilled water facility.

Senator Hill (Fine Arts Committee) reported that because of increased costs of concerts the Committee planned to offer 4-5 concerts for next year rather than six as it did this year. He said
that the spring concerts would emphasize chamber music of Bach and Handel since the 1984-85 year is the tricentennial birthdays of these composers.

President Ulbrich moved three items to New Business: Architecture Search Committee, Gowdy resolution and Scholarships.

V. President's Report:

President Ulbrich commented that the items listed in the President's Report (Attachment A) were self-explanatory. The following items were added to the President's report:

She reminded the Senate of the annual reception which the Faculty Senate holds to honor the Board of Trustees members. Invitations have been sent to the members of the Board of Trustees and their spouses, the President's cabinet and their spouses, Deans and their spouses and to some others. She also reminded the Senate members that alternates and their spouses are included as well as the senators and their spouses. The reception will be on January 27 from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. in the Alumni Center. This reception follows the Board of Trustees' meeting and precedes the President's Ball.

President Ulbrich said that the last 'We are Proud to Say' show would be held in Tillman Hall on Wednesday at 4:00 p.m. Faculty are encouraged to attend.

President Ulbrich stated that the Ad Hoc Committee on Grievances had met and had made a number of constructive suggestions for treating several of the problems. She referred the recommendations to the Policy Committee and to an ad hoc committee.

The proposed commission for staff personnel will be composed of classified staff. The proposal came before the President's Cabinet and will be presented to the Council in January.

In the future, Senate records will be stored in the Library. Anyone having copies of old records was requested to send these to Mr. Kone in the Library.

The out-of-state tuition differential will be waived for scholarships of $250 or more.

The committee on review of commissions, councils and committees is considering the suggestions sent from the Faculty Senate.

A petition on the Russian program seeking to establish rules on class size required for discontinuing programs was referred to the Scholastic Policies Committee.

A letter from Provost Maxwell on faculty retirement practices was referred to the Welfare Committee.

A letter from the secretary of the faculty of the University of North Carolina requested that our faculty consider the possibility of eliminating freshman eligibility for varsity athletics. The need for more information on the grades of freshmen athletes, dropout rate, etc. was brought out in the discussion. President Ulbrich will reply in the meantime on our earlier disposition of this question with respect to football.

VI. Old Business:

Senator Camper (Policy Committee) presented a resolution to delete the last sentence in the policy statement on faculty absences from classes as contained on page 2 of Section III of the Faculty Manual and
presented in Attachment B. Senator Camper made a motion that the Senate accept this change and the motion was seconded. In the discussion conflicting opinions were expressed concerning the existence of and the need of a class absence form. Some said that their department had a form. Others said that their department did not. The motion passed by a strong majority. The second resolution presented by Senator Camper had to do with faculty office hours (Attachment B). Senator Rudowski presented an amendment to the resolution asking that "each department shall establish in writing and be responsible for the enforcement of its own faculty office hour policy". A "friendly" amendment by Senator Hill to substitute the word "administer" for "be responsible for the enforcement of" was accepted. A lively discussion on who administers the policy, flexibility of posting office hours, whether there should be rules on ethical matters of this type, etc. followed. The amendment to have the policy in writing was favored 14 to 10. Strong sentiments were expressed that faculty should be available to students at regularly established office hours. The motion to accept the amended resolution, that faculty have office hours, passed by 16-9. President Ulbrich stated that the wording of these two policies would be reviewed by the Faculty Manual Committee.

VII. New Business:

A motion by Senator Baron to table Senator Gowdy's resolution on prohibiting the use of Bowman Field for parking for any reason passed by a vote of 16-11. Feelings were expressed that more information was needed to establish what problems might be created by such move. Senators Gowdey and Coston were asked to seek out additional information.

A motion was made by Senator Nocks of Architecture asking that the Senate go on record as approving the expansion of the Search Committee for the Dean of the College of Architecture to include two outside members rather than the one allowed by the Faculty Manual. One of these members would come from the South Carolina Chapter of the AIA and the other from the Clemson Architectural Foundation. He explained the reason for the requested expansion as being due to the professional nature of the degree and the need for input from these professional organizations. The committee also includes a faculty member from each department and a student. The motion passed unanimously.

A third item under New Business had to do with the matter of complaints from a number of faculty about the way in which contributions by faculty to the Scholarship Fund were handled. The complaints referred to an attitude of "score keeping" and recognition of payroll deduction but no recognition of other forms of contributing to the Fund. President Ulbrich appointed Senators Dillman, Overcamp and Harris (Chairperson) to draft a resolution. Advice was offered to the committee by the Senate members.

VIII. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Attachments

Senators Absent (Substitutes Present):
  John Welter
  Larry Hudson
  Joe Dickey
  Jose Caban (Mark Hudson)
  Fred Stutzenberger
  Bob Taylor
1. With only three weeks between Senate meetings I am writing this just a week after the last Senate meeting. I hope that the bicyclists among you have noted that the barricades have, indeed, been moved.

2. An ad hoc committee on internal communications, chaired by Ed Byars, is looking at long range needs in terms of telephone communications and computer networking on campus. This might include a different kind of telephone service, access to computer work stations for all faculty, staff, and students, electronic mail, and other services.

3. I met with the President last week. He is most willing to meet with the Advisory/Executive Committee. We will plan on a meeting in January. Please pass on any matters you would like to have raised.

4. Rulings by the IRS on travel and meals will have to be followed by all state agencies including Clemson University beginning January 1, 1984. You will have reported as income on your W-2 1) excess travel reimbursement (state reimbursement of 23 cents a mile, less 20.5 cents for Federal tax purposes and 20 cents for state tax purposes) and 2) meals away from home when you do not stay overnight.

5. The Student Senate has suggested that we and they hold a joint session. We might consider limiting it to resolutions of joint interest, which would take a good bit of planning and organization. I would like to pursue this idea. Since Oran Smith visited our November Senate meeting, I reciprocated by attending the November 21st meeting of the Student Senate. It was most enlightening. I felt the students were thoughtful and very aware (probably more so than we) of parliamentary procedure, more of a necessity in a 70 member Senate. I commend it to any senator who is free on a Monday night and would like to see students legislating rather than playing, napping, cramming, or building floats.

6. President Atchley is pursuing the comparative salary study information for us. I hope to have more information by the Senate meeting.

7. I have invited Jim Matthews (Dean, College of Education), Steve Chapman (Associate Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences), Dory Helms (College of Sciences, chair of TREC), Alan Schaffer (Liberal Arts, Chairman of Association of Department Heads), Bill Baron (Senator, Engineering), Henry Pate (alternate senator, Education), Clay Hipp (Commerce and Industry, former senator), and Gastor Fernandez (Liberal Arts) to serve as our ad hoc committee on teaching evaluation. I have asked Henry Pate to chair the group. If you would like additional members, and particularly additional faculty members, please pass on suggestions. I have requested that they report in February.
The Faculty Senate won the football game by forfeit, having fielded a team of 5 to the Student Senate's one by 7:15. Since they did finally find four players, we scrimmaged with them, but for good and sufficient reasons we neglected to appoint a scorekeeper. The sum of $50.39 was contributed to United Way.

My thanks to the 5 valiant senators who upheld our honor and glory at 7 a.m. on a cold day and a muddy field.

9. Please remember that Bobby Robinson and Joe Turner will be our guests. Think about what you would like to ask.

10. Provost Maxwell has written personal notes of thanks to all of the 38 faculty/staff who have signed up so far for payroll deductions for the Faculty/Staff Scholarship Fund. Please consider whether you can participate in this effort to recruit top students to Clemson in an increasingly competitive market.

10. The Faculty Senate's annual reception for the Board of Trustees will be held after their January meeting on the 27th, Friday, 5 p.m. at the Alumni Center. Dave Senn will have further details. Spouses are included, also alternate senators and their spouses.
POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

A. The following statement is contained on page 2 of Section III of the Faculty Manual:

Faculty Absence from Class. Teaching faculty are obligated to meet their classes regularly at the appointed times. When there are valid reasons for being absent from class (e.g., illness and other emergencies, or travel on University business), the faculty member should notify the affected classes in advance if at all possible. Suitable arrangements, such as substitute instructors, library assignments, or other appropriate utilisations of class time, also should be made. In such circumstances a faculty class absence form must be completed.

The Policy Committee suggests the following for consideration and adoption:

Whereas, the responsibility of the teaching faculty is clearly stated in the first sentence of this paragraph, and

Whereas, the "faculty absence form" is not used in all teaching departments, be it therefore

Resolved, that the last sentence of the paragraph, "In such circumstances a faculty absence form be completed," be deleted.

B. The Faculty Manual does not have a statement specifically dealing with office hours for faculty. The Committee agreed that a statement on this subject is needed, especially since the Manual does address faculty absence from class. Therefore, the Committee suggests the following for consideration and adoption:

Whereas, the utilization of non-classroom time is left to the discretion of the individual faculty member, and

Whereas, the duty schedules of the full-time teaching faculty are necessarily flexible, and,

Whereas, faculty should be accessible to students with respect to course work, be it therefore

Resolved, that the following statement be included in the Faculty Manual:

"Recognizing the desirability of students' having reasonable access to faculty with respect to course work, each department shall establish and administer its own faculty office hour policy."
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

November 15, 1983

I. Call to Order:

President Ulbrich called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the October 18 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as corrected.

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Scholastic Policy:

Senator Bauer reported that the Scholastic Policies Committee had met with Dr. B.J. Skelton and Mr. Dick Mattox of the Admissions Office at the November meeting. The problems associated with setting up the student data base were discussed. Dr. Skelton said that the person in DAPS who had the responsibility for writing these programs had left and that the position had not been filled. Dr. Skelton reported to the committee that when this position was filled the programs would be prepared. Senator Bauer said that there was a feeling that at that point the information needed by the faculty for purposes of advising would be available. The committee also discussed admission criteria with the people from the Admissions Office. Mr. Mattox handed out an information sheet which contained the admission criteria used by Clemson. The preliminary statistics on the effect of the new scholastic policies and advisory procedures were discussed. Advisory procedures will be a topic for the next meeting of the committee.

B. Policy:

Senator Camper reported that the Policy Committee had met twice since the last Senate meeting. Topics addressed were reports of numerous unannounced class absences by faculty and the lack of a policy on scheduled office hours for faculty. The report of the Committee (Attachment B) contains the policy on absences as stated in the Faculty Manual and points out the need for a statement dealing with office hours for the faculty. Senator Camper recommended that the last sentence in the statement be deleted since no form of this type exists. Senator Camper said that problems associated with changes in the Faculty Manual, faculty status of department heads and faculty workload analysis would be discussed in the December meeting of the Policy Committee.

C. Research:

Senator Overcamp requested that the report on the Acquisition Policy of the Library be presented under New Business.
D. Welfare:

Senator McGregor's report from the Welfare committee (Attachment C) contains items of interest on insurance, possibilities of a deferred tuition plan for Clemson employee family members, employee health benefits, the concerns of the faculty on summer school pay and the policies on tenure, promotion and reappointment. The Welfare Committee requested that President Ulbrich address the Provost informally on the matters of what constitutes an adequate dossier and the basis for reversal of unanimous recommendations.

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

Senator Sieverdes reported that the Ad Hoc Committee appointed to study the classes in Russian had found that due to the small enrollment Russian would not be offered but that the description of the courses would be left in the catalog. Concern was expressed by Senator Senn over the ruling by the Provost to drop Russian and Anthropology on the basis of low enrollment. President Ulbrich referred the matter of elimination of programs to the Scholastic Policies Committee.

Senator Camper (Ad Hoc Committee on Outstanding Research Scientist Award) asked Senator Dickey to report on the findings of the committee which, in response to a letter from Dean Amacher, had been appointed to study the Outstanding Research Scientist Award. Senator Dickey said that the award was open to anyone, not just a member of Sigma Xi. He reported that at the present time the members of the selection committee are all members of Sigma Xi. The Society of Sigma Xi became involved in the award when the Alumni Association decided to give a research award to balance the teaching award and since Sigma Xi already had an outstanding research scientist award, they were requested to administer this joint award. Further study will be made on eligibility for the award and the administration the award after Senator Dickey has more information from the national office of Sigma Xi.

Senator Wainscott (Open Forum) made a request for articles to be printed in the first issue of the Open Forum. He asked that these articles be forwarded to either Professor Kenelly, Camper or Hill by the first of December.

F. University Committees/Commissions/Councils:

Senator Bauer reported that the Commission on Undergraduate Studies had met and had voted to keep its membership the same. The Commission members voted against the proposal that directors of programs not chair the advisory committees for these programs. The Commission voted to remove the Faculty Senate member from the University Scholarships and Awards Committee. In the discussion following the report, several senators felt that this was one place where faculty senate input would be useful.

President Ulbrich took time at this point to welcome guests, Oran Smith, Student Senate President, Jane Thompson, Tiger staff
and Jack McKenzie, Editor of the Clemson University Newsletter.

Senator Melsheimer reported that the Faculty Manual was in the last stages of revision and that publication time was near. He asked that the revisions on the agenda be delayed to Old Business.

Senator Taylor reported that the Commissions on Public Programs had met and had discussed several items.

Senator Camper (Student Union Board) reported that the Union Board in its usual efficient manner had completed plans for the first part of next semester's activities.

Senator Senn’s report on the topics covered at the meeting of the Planning Board is included as Attachment E. Senator Senn suggested that, with the new chemistry building being in its last stages of planning, this might a good time for the Tiger and the University Newsletter to acquaint the University community with the progress. He also suggested that the construction of the Orange Aid station also be publicized.

Senator Gowdy (Traffic and Parking Committee) reported that one side of the traffic barricades had been opened to allow for bicycle traffic. He reported that the traffic light system at highway 93 and Sikes would be changed to accommodate student traffic without competing vehicular traffic. A request was made by Senator Bauer that the committee consider the use by others of the visitor parking spaces during off hours.

V. President’s Report:

President Ulbrich commented that the items listed in the President’s Report (Attachment A) were self-explanatory. She asked that the election of members to the Security and Lighting and to the Fine Arts committees be delayed to New Business. She added to the President’s Report the letter from Provost Maxwell (Attachment G) responding to Senator Waddell’s comments on the flexibility which the University has on faculty salaries. President Ulbrich mentioned points of interest that came up in the President’s Cabinet and the Council of Deans. These included changes in Greivance Procedure II, class absence forms, and faculty workload. President Ulbrich reminded the Senate that Provost Maxwell would be a guest of the Senate at the January meeting. She also said that department heads should have distributed to each faculty member in the department a written statement of the policy of the college on the way in which overhead money is handled. President Ulbrich asked for comments on the article in the Anderson Independent concerning the balloons released at the Clemson-Maryland game. She also mentioned that she had a copy of the Crader report, an internal evaluation on student evaluation of faculty and that this copy was available for review by senators.

VI. Old Business:

Senator Bauer (Scholastics Policies Committee) made a motion that the plus-minus grading policy (Attachment J) be adopted. The motion was
seconded and Senator Bauer pointed out that there were several favorable aspects of the proposed grading system. These included the increased accuracy that should come from 12 grading points rather than 5, the incentive for the students to be better motivated to work for a higher grade that was closer to attainment on the plus-minus scale than on the ten point scale and the fact that since the University average does not change the system does not encourage grade inflation. He made the point that the faculty member who chose to stay with the five point system could do so. Those opposing the system pointed out that the new system would need a new set of descriptive words since excellent, above average, average, below average, unsatisfactory were not sufficient. After considerable debate the vote was in favor of adopting the plus-minus system.

Senator Melsheimer moved that the two revisions (Attachment H) to the Faculty Manual be approved by the Senate and the motion passed unanimously.

President Ulbrich reported the suggested changes in commissions, councils and committees structures that had been approved by the Student Senate. These suggested changes included moving the Traffic and Parking Committee to the Commission on Student Affairs but having it report also to the Commission on Faculty Affairs, having the Planning Board report to the President’s Council and putting a student representative on the Board, adding the Student Senate president to the President’s Cabinet and having the chairman of the Athletic Council in the President’s Cabinet. They also moved to appoint a student to the Council of Deans, and to use fewer ad hoc committees.

VII. New Business:

Senator Overcamp presented the report on the Library Acquisitions Policy including the Collection Development statement (CD-1) and the Level of Collection Intensity Policy, (CD-2) (Attachment J). He moved the adoption of the report and its recommendations. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made and passed to change the length of term of committee representatives elected by the senate to one year. Frances Colburn, an alternate senator from the library, was elected to fill the vacancy on the Security and Lighting Committee. Bob Hill, a senator from Liberal Arts was elected to fill the vacancy on the Fine Arts Committee.

A motion was made and passed to refer the matter of the evaluation of temporary faculty by the department heads to the Policy Committee for study.

Senator Rudowski made a motion to change the name of the Depositories Committee to the University Library Committee (Attachment K). The motion passed.

VIII. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 5:24 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Muriel B. Bishop
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments
Senators Absent (Substitutes Present):
  Welter
  Hassan Behery
  Verner Burkett (Henry Pate)
  Wesley Burnett
  Robert Hill (Steve Wainscott)
1. John Kenelly has been appointed to the Open Forum Committee by the Provost.

2. The concerns raised about the liability of the advisor and monitoring satisfactory progress have been referred to the Scholastic Policies Committee and to the Committee on Advising and Course Placement. (See attached memo.)

3. I discussed teaching evaluation with the Provost. He recommended referral to the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee. The Advisory/Executive Committee prefers to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee and invite one or more deans and department heads to serve. We will be putting a committee together.

4. Beth Reuland was elected to a three-year term on the Security and Lighting Committee in 1982. It is required that it be a faculty member but not necessarily a senator. Beth is now in a staff position and is no longer eligible. Because this is an area of special concern to library staff, the Advisory Committee nominates Frances Colburn, an alternate senator from the Library. I would like you to consider recommending that this be changed to a one-year term in the future.

5. The Ad Hoc Committee on Committees, Commissions and Councils will be meeting November 16. Please let me know if there are any additional concerns you would like addressed.

6. I discussed Faculty Manual revision procedures with the Provost. Future revisions will be routed through the Faculty Manual Committee. The Policy Committee will be reviewing the statement on pp. I:1-2 of the Manual identifying those sections which are covered by the "mutual agreement" clause.

7. The Student Senate passed a resolution similar to ours on bicycles and barricades.

8. Davis McGregor and Larry Bauer will be spearheading an informal survey of forestry and agriculture consulting policies at other land-grant institutions. Chris Sieverdes is an Ad Hoc Committee of one to do some fact-finding on the deletion of the Russian program.

9. I asked the Provost about the in-house annual salary report. It is in progress. The comparative salary study of peer institutions requested by the Commission on Faculty Affairs was endorsed by the President's Council but needs to come to the Cabinet for implementation.

10. The Athletic Council has met. John Geldard was elected secretary. We discussed class attendance for athletes and approved a motion endorsing the current student attendance policy and requesting that coaches minimize class absence by responsible scheduling of practices and contests. We also voted to uphold the current policy of reduced price tickets only for employees working half time or more.
11. In response to a faculty request, we discussed the faculty status of department heads with respect to their eligibility for named professorships, alumni professorships, and election to university committees/commissions by their colleges and/or the Faculty Senate. I referred this matter to Alan Schaffer, Chairman of the Association of Department Heads.

12. A question has been raised about broadening the base of eligibility for the Outstanding Research Scientist Award. This was referred to the Research Committee.

13. The Commission on Faculty Affairs met on October 20 and endorsed a number of the recommendations on committees, commissions and councils made by the Senate. The Marshal's Committee was asked to review the commencement exercises. Further direction was given to the Ad Hoc Committee (Chris Przirembel, Chair) reviewing the Faculty Evaluation Forms.

14. Please review the Provost's statement on tenure and promotion policies in a recent issue of the Newsletter to see if you wish to make any comments or response.

15. There is now a display of faculty publications at the Library.
POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

A. The following statement is contained on page 2 of Section III of the Faculty Manual:

Faculty Absence from Class. Teaching faculty are obligated to meet their classes regularly at the appointed times. When there are valid reasons for being absent from class (e.g., illness and other emergencies, or travel on University business), the faculty member should notify the affected classes in advance if at all possible. Suitable arrangements, such as substitute instructors, library assignments, or other appropriate utilizations of class time, also should be made. In such circumstances a faculty class absence form must be completed.

The Policy Committee suggests the following for consideration and adoption:

Whereas, the responsibility of the teaching faculty is clearly stated in the first sentence of this paragraph, and

Whereas, the "faculty absence form" is not used in all teaching departments, be it therefore

Resolved, that the last sentence of the paragraph, "In such circumstances a faculty absence form be completed," be deleted.

B. The Faculty Manual does not have a statement specifically dealing with office hours for faculty. The Committee agreed that a statement on this subject is needed, especially since the Manual does address faculty absence from class. Therefore, the Committee suggests the following for consideration and adoption:

Whereas, the utilization of non-classroom time is left to the discretion of the individual faculty member, and

Whereas, the duty schedules of the full-time teaching faculty are necessarily flexible, and,

Whereas, faculty should be accessible to students with respect to course work, be it therefore

Resolved, that the following statement be included in the Faculty Manual:

"Recognizing the desirability of students' having reasonable access to faculty with respect to course work, each department shall establish and administer its own faculty office hour policy."
The Committee met on November 8.

Davis McGregor reported on a Group Insurance Committee meeting, which received a highly favorable report on the Clemson group life insurance policy administered by Prudential. About half of Clemson's employees belong to the group. The Committee's recommendation was to declare a 10 per cent dividend and a 20 per cent bonus to all employee participants on record on May 30, 1983 and still employed, and to offer double the dependents optional coverage from $2,500 to $5,000 at an increase in premium from the present $1.25 to $2.00 per month.

The Committee discussed the possibility of a payroll deduction, deferred tuition plan for Clemson employee family members. Before a recommendation is considered the Committee will check on general faculty interest, the number of children or spouses of university employees currently enrolled, and the reaction and suggestions of the Business and Finance office.

The Committee continued its discussion of employee health benefits as a follow-up of our meeting with Ron Herrin of the Office of Payroll and Fringe Benefits. The problem of laboratory fees that are in excess of state insurance coverage, and that carry both a hospital and a private practitioner charge seems particularly prevalent. The Committee will invite the President-Elect of the South Carolina Medical Association to meet with us or to suggest someone to meet with us to discuss this. We also discussed the possibility of having a separate rating within the state health insurance system if Clemson's experience record is more favorable than the state system as a whole.

Vice Provost Jerry Reel met with the Committee on September 6 to discuss Summer School in general and faculty Summer School pay specifically. As reported last month, the summer sessions pay is being increased by 10% for next year, although the 30% maximum still holds. Chairman McGregor discussed with Provost Maxwell the matter of the Provost's Research Awards (total $50,000) which was taken from Summer School receipts last summer. Provost Maxwell explained that Summer School is really not self-supporting when all operating, administrative, and indirect costs are considered, and that any Summer School receipts in excess of faculty salary and fringe benefits are absorbed by Business and Finance toward partially meeting the additional costs. In 1983, receipts from Summer School were sufficient to pay the direct costs of professors' salary and fringe benefits and still pay for some of the operating and indirect costs, including the Provost's Research Award. Had funds not gone back to faculty in the form of the awards, they would have been absorbed for other costs. The Committee decided not to take any further direct action or make any recommendation at this time, but to continue to check with Dr. Reel, who is in contact with other schools and is making a strong effort to strengthen Summer School and to see that Clemson is on a par with similarly-situated universities in regard to faculty compensation for summer sessions.

The Committee discussed the question of Provost Maxwell's guidelines, or lack of them, in respect to faculty promotion, tenure, and reappointment. The consensus was that we not make a direct response to the Provost's paper, "An Overview of Tenure and Promotion" in the October 26, 1983 Newsletter, but that we ask President
Ulbrich to transmit to the Provost the faculty's concern that:

1. We do not know what the Provost desires in support of promotion, tenure, and reappointment recommendations. What constitutes a "properly prepared dossier" in the eyes of the Provost? If this has been made known to the Deans and Department Heads, it has not reached the faculty or peer committees of many departments.

2. When the Provost (and/or President) makes a promotion, tenure, or reappointment decision different from a unanimous recommendation from the faculty member's peer committees, Department Head, and Dean, the Committee feels that the faculty member and those involved in the initial favorable recommendation deserve a clear and specific statement of the reasons for the reversal of the recommendation and, in cases where promotion or tenure is denied at the Provost's level, suggestions of remedial measures that the Provost sees as improving the probability of approval in subsequent requests.

The Committee feels that a commitment by the Provost on the second measure above is compelling, and would alleviate much of the discouragement presently prevalent among faculty in regard to promotion and tenure.
Five topics were discussed at the November 11 meeting of the Board.

Continuing its discussion of the previous meeting, the Board reviewed a memorandum from Mark Wright, campus planner, dealing with changes to the interiors of buildings. The Board agreed that it would only review significant functional changes within a building. Such changes could alter pedestrian concentrations, communication networks, vehicle patterns, parking requirements, and other aspects of the exterior environment.

Following a review and discussion of architectural drawings, the Board approved the design development phase of the new chemistry building. Design development is a stage of refinement and detailing of earlier schematic designs. Final drawings for the building are nearing completion.

A lengthy discussion was held regarding a proposal from architecture and civil engineering to erect a steel truss bridge on campus. Many of these bridges are being dismantled and replaced by newer and stronger bridges. Clemson could obtain such a structure from the state highway department without cost but would be responsible for all expenses associated with the bridge’s erection, site development, maintenance, etc. Justification for such a project centers on its educational and historical values. The Board perceives a great many problems with this proposal but is asking the departments involved and the ASCE student chapter to refine their proposal and provide more detailed cost information before the Board makes a recommendation on it.

Bill McLellan, athletic director, commented on the final two topics of the meeting. Because of cost considerations the "port-a-johns" have been left on location throughout the football season. To remove them following each game would increase the cost of this convenience considerably. All units will be removed following the last home game. Blueprints for the new "Orange Aid Station" were also shown to the Board. This three-story structure will be constructed immediately and is part of the total stadium expansion contract. The first level will house all aspects of the police department, campus security, and parking offices. The upper levels will contain a store selling Clemson clothing, souvenirs, and ice cream. The store will be an extension of the University Bookstore.

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for January 13, 1984.

Respectfully submitted,

David J. Senn, Vice-President
November 2, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Holley Ulbrich
   President, Faculty Senate

FROM: W. David Maxwell, Provost

SUBJECT: Senator Waddell's Comment re' Salary Increases for Next Year

I have been thinking about Senator Waddell's comments to the Faculty Senate about salary increases for next year and there are a couple of complications of which the audience might not be aware.

Often when legislators speak of a certain percentage salary increase they are in actuality speaking of percentage increase in instructional salaries (the sum) rather than the average or median increase in the salary of the individual. The distinction is important because new positions, any excess of the cost of replacements over terminations, and any net increase in percentage time or F.T.E. on instructional account must all be covered by the increased sum before any of it is available for salary increases. Thus a 7% increase in instructional salaries (the sum) may well mean an average or median salary increase of considerably less than 7%.

Secondly, if the "machinery" is not altered from that of previous years the Legislature appropriates only 75-80% of the authorized increase in instructional salaries (the sum). This means that unappropriated funds must be located to cover the "shortfall" if we are to expend the total authorized sum.

You may wish the Senate to be aware of these complications.

WDM/ep
November 10, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Holley Ulbrich
    President, Faculty Senate

FROM: W. David Maxwell
    Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Appeals in Grievance Procedure II Cases

As you know, Grievance Procedure II does not provide for any appeal from the decisions that I render under this procedure.

This bothers me. In effect it blocks any meaningful access of the faculty member to the President of the University on perhaps the most important issue that the faculty member may face in his or her entire professional career. It also is the only instance in which an action that I take affects administrators reporting directly or indirectly to me but cannot be appealed to the President.

I realize that Grievance Procedure II, in making my decisions final, was designed to ease the workload of the President. I don't think we fully realized at the time, however, that issues so vital to the faculty and to academic administrators would arise under this procedure and how frustrating it would be for parties to be denied an appeal to the President.

I have discussed this matter with the President and he has agreed to a modification of Grievance Procedure II that would permit appeals to him from my decisions. I have attached a draft of a new paragraph #7 that could be inserted on p. II:31 of the Faculty Manual.

I would appreciate it if you would ask the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Manual Committee to consider this proposed change. If accepted I would suggest that the change become effective for grievances filed after May 15, 1984.

WDM/ep
Attachment
cc: President Bill L. Atchley
    Mr. Ben Anderson
    Academic Deans
    Dr. J. V. Reel
    Dean A. E. Schwartz
   207 SIKES HALL • CLEMSON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29631 • TELEPHONE 803/656-3243
7) Either party may appeal the decision of the Provost to the President of the University, provided that he/she does so within seven calendar days after receipt of the Provost's decision. The appeal must be in writing. If an appeal is made, the President shall review the record of the grievance (as submitted to the Provost), the recommendation of the Grievance Board, if any, and the decision of the Provost. The President may also interview any individual involved in the grievance for the purpose of clarifying any part of the record if he/she so desires. The President shall render a final decision on behalf of the University within fifteen calendar days after receipt of the written appeal. Copies of the decision of the President shall be sent to the Provost, the faculty member, the Grievance Board and to other parties directly concerned.

If no appeal is made to the President in accordance with the time limitation specified herein, the decision of the Provost shall be the final University decision.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: W. David Maxwell
SUBJECT: Crader Study on Student Evaluation of Classroom Teaching

Because of its length (more than 100 pages), two copies of Dr. Crader's study on the validity and reliability of the student evaluation of classroom teaching have been sent to Dr. Ulbrich with the request that she route this study to those of you who are interested. The dean of each college has also been sent a copy of the study.

The Commission on Undergraduate Studies has recommended to me that our next round on this evaluation be done in the Spring of 1984 and I have accepted this recommendation.

If you are interested in reviewing the Crader study, please ask Dr. Ulbrich to put you on the distribution list. Any comments that you have, after reviewing the report, should be sent to Dr. Doris Helms, Chairperson of the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness committee or to the Faculty Senate representative on the Commission on Undergraduate Studies.

pmh
The faculty Senate recommends that Clemson University adopt the following grading system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Grade Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty Senate
From: S. S. Melsheimer
Chairman, Faculty Manual Committee
Subject: Section VI:G of Faculty Manual

November 11, 1983

The highlighted changes on the attached two sheets reflect changes in Section VI:G from the version previously approved by the Senate. These changes have been approved by the Faculty Manual Committee. As noted at the last Senate meeting, these changes have already been approved by the Board of Trustees, although the sentence on VI:31 has been clarified since the last version seen by the Senate so as to minimize any possibility of misinterpretation of its intent. I recommend that the Senate approve this Faculty Manual section with the language as shown.
G. Selection of the President of the University and other Academic Administrators

In the selection of the President of the University, the Board of Trustees recognizes the interests of the University Faculty and Extension Personnel by providing for the appointment of the President of the Faculty Senate and Extension Senate, and one senior faculty member (elected for this purpose by the full professors) to the Screening Committee. The Screening Committee develops a list of approximately ten available candidates and submits their names to the Selection Committee. The Selection Committee is comprised of five members; three Trustees, the President of the Faculty Senate, and the President of the Student Body. The Selection Committee receives the report and recommendations of the Screening Committee and makes further recommendations to the full Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees elects the President of the University to serve at its pleasure. The Board also reserves to itself final review authority over the appointment of officers of the University who report directly to the President and over the appointment of the deans of the University.

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

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

For the selection of an assistant dean, associate dean, or director within a college, a committee which includes at least one student from that college shall be formed. A majority of the members of the committee shall be chosen by the faculty of that college or equivalent administrative unit (for the Associate Dean and Director of the Cooperative Extension Service, a majority of the members of the committee shall be chosen by the Extension Senate); the minority may be appointed by the dean of the college or an equivalent administrator. The dean of the college shall make the appointment from the list submitted by the committee, subject to the approval of the Provost and the President of the University.
H. Review of Academic Administrators

University policy adopted by the Board of Trustees in January 1981, establishes procedures for the review of academic administrators. Administrative officers of the University serve at the pleasure of their respective supervisors. Thus, appointment to an administrative position, whether it be to a department headship, a directorship, a deanship, etc., does not assure continuance in office for any specific period of time. Status as tenured or untenured faculty, however, is not affected by the termination of administrative appointments of such individuals.

In the normal performance of their duties, administrators are subject to evaluations of their performances by their supervisors. To insure the accuracy of these evaluations, the performances of department heads, academic deans, and the Provost shall be subject to formal reviews at regular intervals. Such evaluations shall involve the faculty most affected by a particular administrator as well as that administrator's supervisor.

Before the end of a department head's fifth year in office, the appropriate dean shall conduct a formal review of that head's performance. This review shall include interviews and/or other forms of consultation by the dean with each tenured and tenure-track faculty member of the department. At the discretion of the dean, the affected department's faculty Advisory Committee may be enlisted to assist in the conducting of the formal reviews. When the review process has been completed, the dean shall make a report to the Provost.

Likewise, the Provost shall review the performance of deans, consulting with department heads and directors as well as with representative faculty where feasible. Likewise, the President of the University shall review the performance of the Provost, consulting with the academic deans and with representative department heads and faculty, where feasible.

I. Honorary Degrees Policy

Clemson University confers honorary degrees in recognition of eminent achievement in scholarship or creativity, or of high distinction in public service, including meritorious contributions to the University. The awarding of honorary degrees is to be regarded as a
Report of the Research Committee on Acquisition Policy of the Library

The Research Committee was requested to report on the acquisitions policy of the University Libraries. Specific requests were directed to determine the formula used for budget allocations and the collection development policy. Information on these two items was obtained from Mr. Joseph Boykin, Director of Libraries.

Formula

The formula that has been used by the internal library committee for recommending a budget for monographs is:

\[ x = 0.4 \left( \frac{A + 3B + 6C}{A_T + 3B_T + 6C_T} \right) + 0.2 \left( \frac{D}{D_T} \right) + 0.1 \left( \frac{E + 3F + 6G}{E_T + 3F_T + 6G_T} \right) + 0.3 \left( \frac{H}{H_T} \right) \]

A = Student credit hours (undergraduate) for that college or department.
B = Student credit hours (masters) for that college or department.
C = Student credit hours (Ph.D.) for that college or department.
D = FTE faculty for that college or department.
E = Number of courses offered (100-200 level) for that college or department.
F = Number of courses offered (300-500, 300-400/600 level) for that college or department.
G = Number of courses offered (600-800 level) for that college or department.
H = Cost of monographs in that area.
This formula is based on four categories: weighted student credit hours (40%), cost of monographs (30%), full-time faculty (20%) and number of courses offered (10%). The formula is based on departmental units or sub-units in some cases (e.g. Physics, Microbiology, Biology, Chemistry, Geology) or on college units in other cases (e.g. Engineering, Education, Architecture). In addition there are separate funds for certain interdisciplinary areas (e.g. Energy, Life Sciences, General Science) and for other categories (e.g. Reference Books, Replacement, Postage, GPO NTIS).

Collection Development Statement

The Libraries have formulated a Collection Development Statement of Basic Principles (CD-1) developed in 1980. This gives broad guidelines for the development of a collection in any area. It is based on the 1960 policy set forth by the Board of Trustees and the 1979 Clemson University Mission Statement to the Commission on Higher Education and was endorsed by the University Faculty Library Committee which was the appropriate committee under the former committee structure of the University. This statement was to be reviewed every three years.

In addition to this statement, there is a companion policy entitled Levels of Collection Intensity (CD-2) which was developed in 1980 and also endorsed by the University Faculty Library Committee. This statement is based on categories recommended by the American Library Association. The categories and a brief definition are given below:

A. Comprehensive Level - A "special collection" with the aim, if not the achievement, of exhaustiveness.
B. Research Level - A collection to include major published source materials required for dissertations and independent research.
C. Study Level - A collection to support undergraduate or graduate course work or to sustain independent study.
D. Basic Level - A highly selective collection to introduce and define the subject and to indicate the varieties of information available elsewhere.
E. Minimal Level - A collection with few selections beyond very basic works.

Under present policy, no area is collected at A level. Level B is limited to those subject areas offering doctoral degrees, some long range research or public service programs, and a few well-defined subject areas pertaining to the Clemson area.

A copy of the CD-2 statement by Library of Congress classification is attached. The statement was to be reviewed annually.

Recommendations

The Collection Development Statement (CD-1) and the Level of Collection Intensity policy (CD-2) should be reviewed by the Depositories Committee or by the appropriate committee if the Depositories Committee is replaced under the current review of committees.
Policy Statement CD-2

Date: July 2, 1980

Review: This statement will be reviewed at least annually.

Subject: Levels of Collection Intensity

A Comprehensive

none

B Research

NA
QA
QC
QD
E 1-13
TQ 201-705
QK 101-3
QL 475-989
QL 1-13
QL 362-739
QL 750-991
QP 1-348
QP 501-801
QR 1-9
QR 100-183
QR 360
RR 641-686
RT
S 1-760
S 900-972
SB
SD
SF
T 55.4-6
TA
TD
TE
TH
TN
TJ
TK 1-9000
TP
TS 1300-1865
TS 1950-1981
TX 341-641

NOTE: In the C level, those call number groups that support the M.A. programs in history and English will be collected in more depth than the other groups listed.

C Study

B-BD
BF 1-1000
HI 1-1800
C-CB
D-DR
DS 56-75
DS 81-82
DS 96
DS 701-897
E
F 206-475
F 1000-1170
F 1201-1379
G
H-MA
H-HJ
H-HX
I-A-JX
J
K
L
LA
LB
LC
LD
M
N
NB
NC
ND
NE
P
PA 1-431
PC 2001-3798
PE
PF 3001-5999
PM 1-1005
PM 1010-1590
PM 1600-1934
PM 2000-2298
PM 3311-3503
PM 4001-4321
PM 4399
PM 6001-8929
PR 1-9899
PS
PT 1-2688
PZ 1-10
Q
QD
QK 14-199
QK 14-355

NOTE: In the C level, those call number groups that support the M.A. programs in history and English will be collected in more depth than the other groups listed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QA 14-355</td>
<td>zoology (history, geographic distribution, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>human anatomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR 351-499</td>
<td>nervous system and the senses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR 10-81</td>
<td>microbiology (general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR 82-100</td>
<td>microbiology (systematic division)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR 101-175</td>
<td>bacteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR 201-351</td>
<td>pathogenic bacteria of specific diseases &amp; different classes of animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA 1-618</td>
<td>medicine and the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA 791-1270</td>
<td>medical geography, medical centers, forensic medicine, toxicology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>internal medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>dermatology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>therapeutics, pharmacology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>pharmacy and materia medica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>fish culture and fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>hunting sports and wildlife management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 61-995</td>
<td>patents, engineering graphics, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 1-373</td>
<td>hydraulic engineering (general, dredging and harbors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC 401-1645</td>
<td>river, lake and water supply engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK 9001-10601</td>
<td>nuclear engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK 9900-9971</td>
<td>electricity for amateurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>motor vehicles, aeronautics and astronautics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>mining engineering - metallurgy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS 1-937</td>
<td>manufacturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS 1080-1268</td>
<td>paper manufacture and trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS 2120-2159</td>
<td>cereals and grain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS 2220-2283</td>
<td>tobacco industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>handicrafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX 1-300</td>
<td>home economics (general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX 301-339</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX 654-840</td>
<td>cookery, dining room service, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>military science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 1215-1361</td>
<td>national bibliography, U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G+**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA 421-790</td>
<td>public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG</td>
<td>gynecology and obstetrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ</td>
<td>pediatrics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Local geographic material will be collected on the research level.*

**NOTE:** Medical material in bioengineering, biomaterials, basic cancer research and nutrition will be collected on the research level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS 940-1047</td>
<td>leather industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS 1870-1935</td>
<td>rubber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>naval science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 4-15</td>
<td>history of books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 551-661</td>
<td>copyright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 662-1000</td>
<td>library science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 1001-1121</td>
<td>national bibliography, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 1201-1212</td>
<td>national bibliography, American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 1365-2959</td>
<td>national bibliography - Canada, Latin America, Europe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E  Minimal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BT-BV</td>
<td>theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>diplomats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>official documents (except J's listed under D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-KE</td>
<td>law, general, U.K., Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFA-KFW</td>
<td>law, U.S. - states (except KFSC law, South Carolina - D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 5000-5665</td>
<td>Byzantine and modern Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 8001-8595</td>
<td>medieval and modern Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 1001-3029</td>
<td>Celtic languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 1-986</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 1001-1984</td>
<td>Italian language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 3801-3976</td>
<td>Catalan language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 5001-5698</td>
<td>Portuguese language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Germanic philology, Scandinavian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF 1-1558</td>
<td>Dutch and Flemish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG 1-1998</td>
<td>Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG 3500-9678</td>
<td>other Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH-PH</td>
<td>various non-western languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN 2300-3035</td>
<td>theater outside the U.S. (except PN's under D and C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN 3151-3300</td>
<td>theater, special aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ 4001-5999</td>
<td>Italian literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ 9000-9999</td>
<td>Portuguese literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT 3701-9999</td>
<td>other Germanic literatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>botanic, thomsonian and eclectic medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RX</td>
<td>homeopathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RZ</td>
<td>other systems of medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 40-550</td>
<td>printing, writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 1001-4980</td>
<td>national bibliography - Asia, Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No assignments - will depend upon subject

Approved by: [Signature]

Richard M. Hoyer
Acting Director of the Library

Date: July 2, 1980
November 15, 1933

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Victor A. Rudowski, Department of English

RE: Changing the name of the Depository Committee

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate, in addition to favoring the restoration of the collegiate character of the library committee, also recommends changing the name of that body from Depository Committee back to University Library Committee.

Victor A. Rudowski