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I. Call to Order:

President Ulbrich called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. Presentation by Senator James Waddell:

President Ulbrich, in her introduction of Senator James Waddell, chairman of the Clemson University Board of Trustees, compared Senator Waddell’s political expertise to that of Henry Kissinger. Kissinger was quoted as saying that he had learned his political skills as a university professor on a campus where the politics were so intense because the stakes were so small. President Ulbrich said that although the stakes were larger in the South Carolina Senate the area of political activity was far more intense. She commended Senator Waddell, in his position as both chairman of the Board of Trustees and as vice-chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, for his willingness to listen and to have dialogue, for his attention to detail and for his willingness to explore alternatives in the solution of problems. She stated that Senator Waddell was the first Chairman of the Board of Trustees to speak to the Faculty Senate and that since he had also addressed the Student Senate on the previous evening that he also had the distinction of being brave enough to face three senates in a twenty-four hour period.

In his opening remarks, Senator Waddell reminded the senate that he was indeed an alumnus of Clemson University having received an honorary degree in 1983. He introduced Mr. Jim Fields, a Clemson graduate, who is Clerk of the Senate and is also director of research for the Senate Judiciary Committee. Senator Waddell reminded the faculty senators that Clemson University is a unique institution with a unique obligation to the people of South Carolina. He commended the student senate members as being a conscientious, and inquiring group of young people of whom he is very proud and stated that the faculty are the backbone of the University.

Senator Waddell commented that he had thought that his constituency of the state represented one of the most diverse groups of people ranging from people with the highest per capita income in the Beaufort and Hilton Head areas to the worst type of poverty in five counties that stretches from the ocean to the soybean and cotton fields of Allendale county. He said that his constituency at the University; first the students, second the faculty, third the administration and fourth the alumni of the University and fifth the people of the state that support and utilize the facilities and services of the University are just as diverse a group. He stated that his experience in the Senate had taught him that it is hard to satisfy everyone and that if you can do 50-50 then you can survive. He told the Senate that the future leadership of the state of S.C. lies in the hands of the faculty of the University and that if the resources are not available for the faculty to carry out their job then the institution will fail the state in producing
outstanding leaders. He said that the demands for the dollar are becoming ever increasingly tough to come by and that as we compete for dollars that are scarce we must look for new ideas and innovative approaches to raise funds to attract and keep outstanding faculty and students.

Senator Waddell said that he set as one of his first goals after becoming chairman of the Board, the job of hiring a person whose duty was fund raising-Vice President for Development. He said that we have been delinquent in the number of scholarships which we have to offer and that there are not sufficient endowed chairs to keep and hold the faculty needed to satisfy the future leadership of South Carolina.

Senator Waddell stated that another priority that he had set was to seek new means and new methods to carry out the role of the University in the public service area. He said that the University has a unique mission in the field of agriculture to encourage new thoughts and to educate students in a broad spectrum of 'high tech' areas ranging from genetics to aquaculture. He said that these are areas in which the Board of Trustees sets policies. He said that the Board is charged with annually reviewing the goals and objectives of the University and seeing that the administration is carrying out these goals and objectives. He said that we must take a hard look at ourselves and set the priorities on where the dollars go. About 60% of the University’s funding comes from state funds. He said that parents, elected officials, administration and faculty have a sacred obligation to give our youth the best education as possible.

Senator Waddell pointed out that many difficulties are encountered in the competition for state funds. He gave as an example the $780,000 in salary enhancement funds that were given to the University in 1982. The following year the Commission on Higher Education lumped these funds along with everybody else’s money so that only $300,000 of these funds were retained. He stated that he saw the Commission on Higher Education as being charged with the review of programs, making recommendations on where to locate programs and serving the useful purpose of providing guidelines on the cost of programs. He said that Clemson should not operate any program the cost of which is excessive to the cost of operation of that program in another institution of higher education. He noted that the increase in the number of institutions of education from 5, in 1954, when he first entered the General Assembly, to 16 was a major reason for increased competitiveness for the 16% of the total state budget that is devoted to higher education. Senator Waddell pointed out that his main disagreement with the Commission on Higher Education was that the Commission had never made a study of what it actually costs to run an institution like Clemson University. He stated that running Clemson University is highly different from running Francis Marion where there is no need for a college fire department, a college police department or a municipality involving the college. He pointed out that not only were the costs different but that the subject matter was different. He said that Clemson has never received an allocation for our technical courses that anywhere near approaches the cost of teaching these courses.

Senator Waddell said that the equipment item was one of the most critical items to be faced in the budgets of universities. He pointed out that this year’s budget contained $600,000 as a one time improvement on equipment. He hoped that this would be added into next year’s budget but when added it may only be diluted so that $200,000 will be left for
equipment.

Senator Waddell expressed the feelings that most of the members of the General Assembly had not visited on a college campus since they graduated and that they perceived faculty as working only the few hours listed as a class schedule. On this basis they felt that the pay that faculty received was excessive. He said the same attitude was seen in the $10,000 salary for state senators. He said that he felt he was far more valuable than the $10,000 salary and that he fought for a salary increase every year. He blamed the attitudes of the members of the General Assembly on the lack of intimate contact with what goes on on the campuses. He said that some of the members do not realize that research and development are very important areas and that one should look at the whole spectrum of activities that makes up a well-rounded program.

Senator Waddell also addressed the lag in primary and secondary education where youngsters graduate without being able to read, to calculate or to speak the English language. He stated that Clemson University is not the place for remedial courses and that young people must come to institutions of higher learning with the proper preparation. He said that each of us must look to see that tax dollars go as far as they possibly can. He suggested that policy matters should follow the chain of command; from faculty to deans, to president and eventually to the Board.

Senator Waddell said that he felt that innovative changes must be made to keep up with the obligations to the people of S.C. and to the nation. He suggested that these changes might well be the responsibility of youth also.

Senator Waddell reminded the Senate that the mood of the General Assembly is not like that during the days of Sputnik when fear of the Russians catching up with us was all that was needed to get money for the preparation of more young people for the areas of science and math. He pledged his support for higher education getting a bigger share of the budget in order that we meet the present need for trained scientists. He also stated that he would look carefully at faculty salaries and areas that need corrective actions. He reminded the Senate that the state has survived one of the toughest financial times without running a deficit. He said that this state did not have to pick up 300-500 million dollars in additional revenues as have other states. He classified himself as a fiscal conservative in that he believes strongly in the balanced budget theory.

Senator Waddell summarized the needs of the University as being, first a need to show that we are productive and then to justify the need for more state dollars. He said that second, we must generate funds through foundations and that we must seek funds to attract more scholarships and chairs needed by students and faculty.

The floor was then opened to questions. In answer to Senator Sieverdes' question on the status of the proposal to eliminate the second medical school, Senator Waddell pointed out that this was one of the hottest issues in higher education. He said that progress had been made in working towards a cooperative agreement and that he hoped that one school would specialize in one field and the other in another. He stated that two schools were rather expensive for a small state but since we have both that there was little chance of dismantling one. He described the issue as a 'sacred cow' and pointed out the astronomical cost per student as compared to the cost per student at USC or at
Senator McGregor brought up several issues in a question pertaining to certain real estate developments in which the University is or could become involved in. He asked whether the University's activities in this area would be a sacrifice in the name of dollars for education so that the University could become real estate people in order to get funding for the University. Senator Waddell said that granting right of ways through University lands routinely came before the Board. He said that there were several proposals before the Board concerning the Strom Thurmond Institute but none of these have been approved by the Board of Trustees. He assured the Senate that the trustees feel that the properties of the University are entrusted to them by the people of S.C. and by the will of Thomas Green Clemson and that the Board of Trustees will not do anything for the sake of the almighty dollar that will deter from the goals and objectives of the University.

In response to Senator Taylor's question on the Marine Research Facilities, Senator Waddell said that since he was also the Chairman of the Fish, Game and Forest Committee that he was familiar with the fact that the committee appointed by Senator Ravenel consisted of three commercial shrimpers and that the committee spent three hours looking into the situation before they wrote their report. Senator Waddell called to task both Clemson University and the University of South Carolina for not taking advantage of the facilities created as a cooperative effort. He said that neither the College of Charleston nor the Citadel had taken advantage of the facilities. He urged Clemson to take advantage of the facilities that are being developed for aquaculture. He stated the marine resources are important to the state and the development of these resources have not received the support that they should. He said that the staff of the aquaculture facility needs state funding and that there is where he differs with Ravenel who feels that federal funding should be the main source of support. He said that these facilities related to Clemson's charge in both education and public service as a major land grant college.

In response to questions Senator Waddell said that the Board has asked that all graduate programs be reviewed and that some hard decisions may have to made down the line if a program is not serving the needs of the state. He referred a question regarding centers of excellence to Dr. Maxwell. He said that we could not be excellent in everything and that we must look at the needs of the people of S.C. and decide where the dollars should go.

Senator Waddell responded to a question on sanctions placed on the athletic program with the statement that the problem had been addressed and that the requirements of NCAA had been exceeded. He said he hoped that the issue was behind us now. He stated that the Board of Trustees would be governed in its actions by the Trustee's Manual.

Senator Hill brought to Senator Waddell's attention the remedial English course and the fact that this course relates to the problems in the athletic department in that a large number of athletes are enrolled in this course. Senator Waddell said that changes in requirement for admission to the institution would be in effect by 1986 and that this should change the situation. He said that the state would have to move forward in the requirements to graduate from high school. He stated that 23% of the people in S.C. are functionally illiterate and that this is a terrible problem for the state to have to bear. His goal is for 85% of the people to be able to read at the fifth to sixth grade level by the
time he leaves office.

The incentives for giving to academic areas that are comparable to those offered by IPTAY were discussed and Senator Waddell stated that he had some ideas that he hoped would have support. He said that we could take a lesson from IPTAY and hit middle America for ten, twenty or thirty dollars a year. He stressed that fund raising should be coordinated so that one area does not accept less than what could have been done for the overall programs.

At Senator Waddell’s nudging the question of pay raises for faculty surfaced. He said that he had come 'loaded for bear' on this question. He stated that the General Assembly has enough funds for a 6% raise. He pointed out that the increase in new dollars above last year's revenue was 197,000,000 dollars but not to be misled by reports of 17% increase in funds form sales tax. He said that in a normal year the sales tax generated 9% and that it was up 3% last year. He stressed that we are in good shape but that 104,000,000 dollars of these new funds go right away to the Education Finance Act, for salary increases and for free textbooks. 10,000,000 dollars will be stashed away because of the spending limitation. He said that by 1984-85 this spending limitation could amount to 100,000,000 dollars. He said that this would be good if the state had not been playing 'catchup' for the last forty years.

Senator Waddell said that universities have great flexibility in allocating salaries. He said that higher education is the only administration where the flexibility is written into law. Other state agencies must adhere to the law. Provost Maxwell agreed but stated that because of salary caps and limitations that this was not completely flexible.

III. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the September 20 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as corrected.

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Scholastic Policy:

Senator Bauer reported that the Scholastic Policies Committee met on Oct. 4 and talked briefly on the Student Data Base problem. He said that this problem would be discussed further when Dr. Skelton meets with the committee in November to discuss admissions in general.

The committee prepared a statement as to whether the University Announcements constitutes a contract with the student. He plans to take the statement to the University Council for review. The committee expects to get feedback on this matter. In regards to a Schedule Committee problem reported by Senator Privette, the committee asked that Faculty Senate representation be assured in any discussions of the schedule. A discussion of the plus-minus grading policies was delayed to New Business.

B. Policy:

Senator Camper discussed two items which were considered in the Policy Committee meeting on Oct. 13. The first item was the consideration of office hours for faculty. He pointed out that the Faculty Manual does not make a definitive statement on faculty office
hours and that a statement is needed. The second item was the consideration of faculty absences from class. The manual does address this issue. Senator Camper said that reports of unannounced absences of faculty from classes were made and that there is a need for some fact finding on both matters.

C. Research:

Senator Overcamp reported that the committee met on October 11 to study the Library Acquisitions Policy. The committee will present a report next month.

D. Welfare:

Senator McGregor reported that the committee had not met.

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

Senator Hill reported that as chairman of the Open Forum committee, he had contacted the Provost concerning a third member to be appointed to the committee and had received no reply. He urged that letters be sent for publishing in the Open Forum and stated emphatically that the Open Forum was not a forgotten issue. President Ulbrich has contacted the Provost and a third member will be forthcoming.

Senator Overcamp reported on the status of the proposed Industrial Biology program. He said the intent to offer such program had been submitted to the Commission on Higher Education and that the faculty of the Biological Sciences would spend three to six months developing the curriculum.

F. University Committees/Commissions/Councils:

Senator Bauer reported that the Recreation Advisory committee had met on Oct. 10 and had appointed a chairman and a secretary. Items of business to be considered next meeting are whether coaches pay for the use of Fike facilities for summer camps, whether the dike can be used by joggers and the extended use of recreational facilities in the summer by faculty and staff in the summer.

Senator Sieverdes reported that the Greek Affairs Committee had met and had considered the matter of black fraternities and sororities seeking national representation. He pointed out that because of the small black student population on campus there is a problem in having sufficient number of members to sustain rush and the other activities.

Senator Senn reported on the activities of October 4 meeting of the Planning Board. The Board discussed the responsibilities of the Planning Board and the responsibilities of building committees such as the Chemistry Building Committee in planning new buildings. The decision was that the Planning Board dealt primarily with the exterior (location, appearance) and should be involved at two points: (a) a review of preliminary drawings, and (b) a design and development review. Building committees should deal primarily with the interior (programmatic) aspects of the new building planning. This discussion was expanded to include the role of the Board in the overall decision
process in other planning processes such as the Visitors Center. Senator Senn said that the Board received updated information on fifteen projects it had considered during the year. Included in these projects were the east campus convenience store and the pedestrian safety measures taken in front of Sikes Hall. Other items discussed included the role of the Planning Board in the University governance. Opinions were expressed that the Board was an advisory board to the President and should remain outside the President's Council. Some support was offered to a suggestion that the chairman of the Board should be on the President's Council. Another item of business discussed was the outdoor comfort stations.

Senator Camper (Student Union Board) reported that the Board continued to meet on a weekly basis and that they had total responsibility for all aspects of the Bob Hope show.

Senator Harris reported that the Depositories Committee had voted in late September to be disbanded and replaced by a Library Committee.

Senator Gowdy reported that the Traffic and Parking Committee had met and had discussed the matter of the baricades impeding bicycle traffic. He said the matter would be introduced as a resolution under New Business.

Senator Palmer reported that the Committee on the Handicapped had met and had discussed the lack of access to the Coliseum and to the YMCA theatre.

Senator Dillman reported that the Safety and Fire Prevention Committee had met and voted to stay in existence but that they would not meet on a regular basis. He said that there was a need to review the Safety Manual which was written in 1974. The following matters were referred to the committee. President Ulbrich requested that the committee look into the practice of scheduling fire drills during class periods. Senator Overcamp brought attention to the fact that the fire alarm was not audible in some locations on campus, one being the exercise room of the YMCA. Senator Harris asked that the Committee look into the emergency light failure which occurred during a recent power outage in the Library.

V. President's Report:

President Ulbrich said that most of the items in the President's report (Attachment A) were self explanatory. She called attention to the change in the December meeting of the Senate to December 6 which is the last day of classes. She mentioned that some secretaries had written to the Governor concerning the reclassification system. They felt that corrections of inequities might best be made at the state level. President Ulbrich reported that the Provost wanted to know if there was interest in a faculty exchange program with other institutions. Intense interest was expressed. Dean Waller stated that an exchange program already existed on a limited basis. The consensus was that this information had not been publicized and that the Provost should pay the fee for the program in question and that the opportunities in this program should be publicized.
VI. Old Business:

Senator Baron presented a resolution on teaching evaluation. An amendment made by Senator McGregor, to strike the second and third paragraph and to change the first word in paragraph four to 'therefore' passed (Attachment-B). Senator Melsheimer reminded the Senate that the Scholastic Policies Committee had pointed out to the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee that the student evaluation procedure had no mechanism for evaluating the outcome on the student of the educational process used by the teacher. Referral of the study of different mechanisms to evaluate teaching effectiveness to an ad hoc committee was requested.

A resolution (Attachment C) on procedures for making changes in the faculty manual passed unanimously after minor changes. There was an agreement that the Advisory Committee should act on any response from the Provost in view of the short time before the Faculty Manual was revised.

VII. New Business:

Senator Palmer presented the resolution on bicycles and barricades. The resolution was amended to request that a sign be placed at the barricade stating that no motorcycles be allowed to pass through (Attachment D).

The Advisory Committee presented the names of Senators Gowdy and Dixon for election of a replacement of Doyce Graham on the Computer Advisory Committee. Senator Gowdy withdrew and Senator Dixon was elected by acclamation.

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee to review committees commissions and councils was studied in detail. Several substantive changes were made. The motion to adopt the revised document (Attachment E) passed. Senator Hudson distributed a paper describing the functions and the composition of the Cooperative Extension Senate (Attachment F).

Senator Bauer agreed to delay the recommendation on plus/minus grading (Attachment G) until the November meeting.

VIII. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Muriel B. Bishop

Muriel B. Bishop
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments
Senators Absent (Substitutes Present): D.C. Costen (George Carter); John Welter; Hassan Beherey; Jimmy Sheriff; Wesley Burnett; Arlene Privette
(Mary Barber); Fred Stutzenburger
November 3, 1983

Virginia Stanley
Chair, Advising and Course Placement Committee
400 Tillman Hall

Dear Virginia,

In my earlier memo to you on some advising issues which have been under discussion at the Commission on Faculty Affairs, I inadvertently sent you an earlier draft of Dr. Przirembel's memo outlining the concerns to be addressed. Attached is a final draft of that memo, which outlines the concerns more thoroughly. The Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate (chair: Larry Bauer, Ag. Econ.) is also considering these issues. You may wish to consult with him or Dr. Przirembel for further discussion of these issues.

This referral is a little unusual in that the request came from the Commission on Faculty Affairs, which I chair, for an appropriate entity to address these issues. I brought it up at the Cabinet and the President directed me and Dr. Maxwell to deal with the matter. In consultation, it was his recommendation that we use your committee, adding a department head to its membership if necessary to provide an additional perspective on advising issues. Thus, while your committee reports to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, I would also like to request that your findings and recommendations on this particular issue be shared with the Faculty Senate and the Commission on Faculty Affairs.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Holley Ulbrich
President, Faculty Senate

HHU:max
xc:Provost Maxwell
Chris Przirembel
Larry Bauer
MEMO TO: Professor Larry L. Bauer  
Scholastic Policies Committee

THROUGH: Professor Holley H. Ulbrich  
President, Faculty Senate

FROM: Christopher C. Pizirembel  
Member, Committee on Faculty Affairs

DATE: October 7, 1983

The existing official statement on academic advising states the following:

"Each student is assigned to an academic adviser in his/her major area. It is the responsibility of the student to consult with the adviser during preregistration and to obtain the adviser's signature for adding and dropping courses at any time. The adviser will assist the student in scheduling courses so as to fulfill the requirements of the degree program. Nevertheless, it is the responsibility of the student to fulfill the relevant requirements of the degree. Advisers also maintain files on individual advisees to assist in academic planning."

This statement is currently not available in any University publication. However, it will be printed in the Spring 1984 Schedule of Courses, and the 1984-85 Undergraduate Announcements.

The official interpretation of this statement by Dr. J. V. Reel, Jr., Vice Provost, indicated that the faculty adviser may register verbal disapproval of a proposed academic program, but does not have the privilege of refusing to sign pre-registration forms or add/drop forms.

It is hereby requested that the Scholastic Policies Committee formulate an academic advising policy which will allow the faculty adviser to refuse to sign registration forms when a proposed program or an add/drop action either is not providing for satisfactory progress toward the indicated degree or is not in the student's best academic interest. Furthermore, consideration should be given to including satisfactory progress in a given program as a condition for continued enrollment.
Additional factors that should be considered in the deliberations concerning the above issues include: (1) clarification of the legal responsibilities of the faculty adviser, (2) explicit mechanism to enforce the adherence to specified course prerequisites, (3) validation of faculty signatures, and (4) archival nature of the registration forms.
PRESIDENT'S REPORT
November 1983

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.
PROPOSED RESOLUTION
TEACHING EVALUATION
Submitted by W. Baron
September 20, 1983

One of the principal objectives of the University is to educate undergraduates. Both the faculty and administration recognize that the teacher is an essential element in the educational process and thus, have made the demonstration of "effective teaching" an important criteria for promotion and tenure. We also recognize the fact that the recognition of good and bad teaching is important to the individual student. Thus, the demonstration of "effective teaching" is important to a department head's meeting his or her responsibility to see that good teaching is provided.

At the present time the only standard University procedure for evaluating teaching is the student evaluation form. There is however, some question as to whether or not the evaluation form is being used in a meaningful way; that is for the purpose of identifying both the good and bad teachers. The poor teacher can choose to keep the evaluation results to oneself, the good teacher is being evaluated by a non-peer group of questionable capability.

Therefore, be it resolved, that the results of the student evaluation form shall be made available to both the faculty member being evaluated and his or her department head and then retained as a permanent part of the faculty member's file, and

further be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee shall convene an ad-hoc committee for the purpose of recommending to the Senate a comprehensive plan for teaching evaluation.

It is suggested that this committee shall consist of a dean, two department heads and four faculty members, only one of which may be a faculty senator. The committee members on the committee shall be invited to serve by the Senate.
AMENDED RESOLUTION
TEACHING EVALUATION

One of the principal objectives of the University is to educate undergraduates. Both the faculty and administration recognize that the teacher is an essential element in the educational process and thus, have made the demonstration of "effective teaching" an important criteria for promotion and tenure. We also recognize the fact that the recognition of good and bad teaching is important to the individual student. Thus, the demonstration of "effective teaching" is important to a department head's meeting his or her responsibility to see that good teaching is provided.

Therefore be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee shall convene an ad-hoc committee for the purpose of recommending to the Senate a comprehensive plan for teaching evaluation.

It is suggested that this committee shall consist of a dean, two department heads and four faculty members, only one of which may be a faculty senator. The committee members on the committee shall be invited to serve by the Senate.
WHEREAS, the Faculty Manual is a document whose contents are to be agreed to by the Faculty Senate and the Provost before being submitted to the Board of Trustees for final approval, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate and the Provost did agree to the establishment of a Faculty Manual Committee to review and edit all changes in those contents, and

WHEREAS, the Provost inserted two additional entries into the approved changes in the aforesaid Manual without the review of the Faculty Manual Committee and the approval of the Faculty Senate, and did forward such unauthorized changes to the Board of Trustees for approval, be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the Senate requests that the Provost henceforth follow the approved procedure for making changes in the contents of the Faculty Manual.

Be it further RESOLVED, that this action of the Senate is in no way to be construed as a judgment upon the substance of those changes, or a desire to preempt the right of the Administration to recommend Board Policy in the selection of a President and similar matters, but rather to preserve the integrity of the process by which the Faculty Manual is modified, and the right of the Faculty to pass judgment on what matters should be included therein.
WHEREAS, Clemson University is an acknowledged leader in energy research, and

WHEREAS, energy conservation contributes to the maintenance of the nation's energy resources, and

WHEREAS, the practice of commuting by bicycle contributes to energy conservation, and

WHEREAS, traffic barriers which force bicycles off the street discourage the use of bicycles for commuting, be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate request the administration to position traffic barriers in such a way as to permit the passage of bicycles on the roadway. Be it further

RESOLVED, that we also request that signs be posted by the barricades prohibiting the passage of motorcycles.
Suggested Changes in University Committees, Commissions and Councils
Faculty Senate Response

I. Suggestions regarding the President's Council.
   1. Someone needs to oversee the day-to-day functioning of the Council and the commissions, including a designated secretarial support person to handle records, coordinate activities, and serve as a central clearinghouse for committee/commission memberships. This person should also be responsible for keeping record, archives, records of actions, and an updated constitution. New members should receive a folder with the Constitution, membership list and bylaws, if any.
   2. The Council needs bylaws specifying meeting dates, responsibility for agendas and membership list, terms of office for members, etc.
   3. Any University Councils or Boards outside the Council should be represented on the Council for reporting purposes. Particularly mentioned at several points (if not otherwise integrated into the structure) were the Athletic Council and the Planning Board.
   4. The agenda needs to reflect more constituencies than just the six commissions. In particular, the Faculty Senate, Student Senate, GSA, Extension Senate, Athletic Council and Planning Board need to not only be represented but also listed on the agenda as groups who need to report their activities and, as needed, their recommendations to this body.
   5. Staff representation needs to be provided.

II. General rules governing procedures.
   1. Terms of office need to be clearly spelled out. Each committee/commission should provide to some central clearing-house (President's Council?) a current updated roster of members and expiration date of terms each time there is a change. Expiration dates need to be clearly established with the timing of college meetings and Senate terms (Faculty/Student/Extension) in mind.
   2. The right to send substitutes and for substitutes to vote on all University Councils, Committees and Commissions should be clearly established. If a group lies outside the President's Council, it should be made clear whether the general rules applying to the President's Council are applicable to that group as well. In particular, the right of particular constituencies to send voting substitutes--Faculty Senate, Student Senate, GSA, Council of Deans, Association of Department Heads--should be clearly spelled out.
   3. The Association of Department Heads should be formally recognized as a part of the governance structure and provided representation as a group where appropriate.
   4. There should be formal annual reporting requirements for all committees and commissions, covering the chairperson, membership, number of meetings, issues discussed, actions taken/recommended, etc. This would be facilitated if as many committees as possible were incorporated under the commissions. Independent committees, which should be held to a minimum, would report directly to the President's Council which would maintain a file of annual reports.
5. A sunset policy to get rid of unneeded committees would be desirable. Each committee should periodically review its mission and membership and its need to continue to exist.

6. The role of the extension senate and particularly the dual representation of extension faculty in both the Extension Senate and the Faculty Senate needs to be reviewed.

7. An individual who is in fact being "advised" on policy by a particular committee not only should not chair the committee, should be nonvoting as well. The role of the Campus Master Planner as a nonvoting resource person for the Planning Board and of the Athletic Director on the Athletic Council are a good models to follow. This recommendation has wide applicability, but is particularly relevant to the Recreation Advisory Committee, the Summer School Committee, the Honors Program Committee, and the Cooperative Education Committee. These are committees that have come to our attention on this point but are in no way exhaustive. A person seeking advice an direction is not usually the appropriate chair and can serve far better as a committee resource in another capacity.

III. The Commission Structure.

1. We endorse the concept of staff representation, perhaps through a Commission on Staff Affairs. This should not preclude staff representation in other areas not under its own commission where appropriate.

2. We also endorse the creation of a Commission on Physical Facilities (or Physical Planning and Environment). A proposal to that effect is attached (Attachment A). If the University Committee on the Handicapped is to report anywhere, this would be the most logical commission, since many of the problems and recommendations are related to adapting physical facilities to their particular needs. On some matters, however, it would be appropriate for this committee to forward recommendations to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies.

3. Of the committees proposed to serve under this commission, the Safety and Fire Prevention Committee has met frequently. Some of its work is being carried out by a more recently created appointed Committee on Radioactive and Hazardous Wastes which is appropriately made up of persons with relevant professional expertise. The former committee should either be abolished or merged with the Committee on Radioactive and Hazardous Wastes.

4. Another Board proposed for absorption by this commission would be the Planning Board. The actions of this Board are of great interest to the entire University Community and should be more widely shared, perhaps through the President's Council. Its membership should be more broadly based; at present it is dominated by the nonacademic administration. Representation should be provided for the Council of Deans, the Association of Department Heads, more than two faculty representatives, and adding the President of the Student Senate.

5. An alternative structure has also been suggested as follows:
   a) Commission on Undergraduate Studies
   b) Commission on Graduate Studies
   c) Commission on Research (additional committees suggested below)
   d) Commission on Public Service and Information (combining
Public Programs and Public Service

- Commission on Faculty Affairs
- Commission on Student Affairs
- Commission on Staff Affairs
- Commission on Physical Facilities

Note that this corresponds to the three functions (2 teaching commissions, one on research, one on service); the three constituencies, and the facilities in which those constituencies carry out those functions.

6. Again, there is strong feeling that the majority of the independent committees be incorporated into the commission structure.

IV. Specific commissions: Undergraduate Studies.

1. This commission is well-managed, but is too large and unwieldy and has difficulty communicating with its inordinately large number of committees, some of which could report elsewhere. The nine colleges could be represented by two deans, two department heads and five faculty members. Department head representation is particularly important since they deal with many of the issues coming before this commission on a day-to-day basis. With a streamlined commission, two undergraduate student representatives would be sufficient.

2. The depositories/library committee could be shifted to Graduate Studies and Research or the Research Commission if that structure is adopted. Attachment B proposes a replacement Library Committee, with a different mandate and composition.

3. The Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee is at least as much a professional development/personnel evaluation issue as it is an undergraduate issue and should be shifted to the Commission on Faculty Affairs and coordinate more effectively with the Faculty Development Committee. Teaching is an important area of professional development. This committee also needs some representatives who are there because of specific professional expertise in the area of testing and evaluation rather than the current "one per college". Because of the issues involved, Senate representation should be provided.

4. The Medical Technology Committee is specific to a single college and should be made part of the governance structure of the College of Sciences.

5. The Pre-Professional Health and Pre-Veterinary Medicine committees should be replaced by a single committee responsible for professional health transfer programs--medical, dental, physical therapy, pharmacy and veterinary.

6. Advising and Course Placement should be deleted; does not appear to function.

7. Cooperative Education has been more informational than advisory. It should meet more regularly and broaden its scope which has been too engineering-oriented. Since it is to some extent advisory to the Director of Cooperative Education, that person should be an ex officio member but not the chair. The same problem with respect to the chair is true of the Summer School Committee.

V. Specific Commissions: Graduate Studies and Research.

1. It is recommended that a large number of independent committees which work in the area of research be brought under
this commission for purposes of reporting and accountability. These would include the Biomedical Research Support Grant Committee, the Institutional Biosafety Committee, the Laboratory Animal Welfare Committee, the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, the Patent Committee, and the University Research Grant Committee. Attachment C presents some background on the nature and functions of these committees. It is recommended that the Computer Advisory Committee be under the Commission on Research, but also report on relevant matters to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies; This committee is too important to leave outside the structure and the President's Council.

2. The Commission is too large. We considered a number of options for streamlining and suggest the same model as the Undergraduate Commission: two deans or associate or assistant deans, two department heads, 5 faculty (the total representing the nine colleges), library representative, chairman of Faculty Senate Research Committee, two graduate students; chaired by Dean of the Graduate School with two ex-officio, nonvoting members; Associate Dean of the Graduate School, Director of University Research.

3. The chairman of the Senate Research Committee should be an ex-officio (voting) member of the Research Advisory Committee as well as the Commission.

4. The Committees under the commission should be identified in the Faculty Manual, e.g., Graduate Awards Committee, Graduate Admissions Committee.

VI. Specific Commissions: Faculty Affairs.

1. With recent changes, this commission is of a reasonable size, a good mixture, and provides adequately for communication with its committees. We recommend that the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee be moved to this commission, which is already involved with the Faculty Evaluation Form. We may wish to consider a Faculty Development Committee which looks at development in all three areas—teaching, research and service—with more stress on support for publications and seminars, looking at development programs elsewhere, looking at sabbatical leave policy and exchange possibilities, etc. There could then be a separate Evaluation Committee with a mixture of persons with a faculty background and persons with expertise in testing and evaluation to address/supervise the student evaluation of teachers at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and also the evaluation process for faculty by administrators.

2. The Salaries and Fringe Benefits Committee rarely meets and largely duplicates the work of the Senate Welfare Committee. We would recommend that it be disbanded.

VII. Specific Commissions: Commission on Public Service

1. The research functions of this commission need to be coordinated with those under the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research.

2. One proposal would split the functions of this Commission between the Commission on Research and the Commission on Public Service and Information. Continuing education needs to either come under the latter (if the structure is changed) or under the present Commission on Public Service (if the structure is retained).
3. As it stands, this Commission represents the activities of two colleges with the domination by the larger (Directors from CAS serve as chairs of the committees). These committees duplicate the work of more active committees internal to the College of Agricultural Sciences.

VIII. Specific Commissions: Commission on Student Affairs.

We don't have much information on the workings of this commission, but it also appears to have a rather unwieldy structure which could be streamlined.

IX. Specific Commissions: Commission on Public Programs.

1. Only remaining committee under this commission is the Fine Arts Committee. The Commission does not seem to play a policy role; it should either be given a clear and specific policy mission or merged with a broader commission, e.g., Public Service and Information, which would cover all our outreach functions including continuing education, extension, and public programs/public relations. The Union Board should report to this commission as well as to the Commission on Student Affairs.
Attachment A

Proposed Commission on Physical Facilities and Environment

The Commission on Physical Facilities and Environment studies the current status of physical facilities and related features of the campus, projects future needs and changes in the campus master plan, and recommends policies and procedures concerning use, location, adequacy, safety, and expansion of university physical facilities and ancillary features. Members of the commission are the Vice President for Institutional Development (Chairperson), Campus Master Planner, Director of Physical Plant, Associate Director of Athletics, Chairman of the Planning Committee of the Board of Trustees, Vice-President of the Faculty Senate, President of the Student Body, President of the Student Senate, Chairpersons of the Committees on Landscaping and Site Development, Security and Lighting, Traffic and Parking, and Campus Names, and five faculty members elected in rotation by the nine colleges and the library.

Committees:
- University Physical Facilities Planning Committee (replaces present Planning Board)
- Landscape and Site Development Committee
- Traffic and Parking Committee
- Security and Lighting Committee
- Campus Names Committee

The following committees which report elsewhere would also forward relevant policy recommendations to this commission.
- Hazardous Wastes Committee (Research Commission)
- Housing Committee (Student Affairs)
- Library Committee (?Commission not determined)
- Safety and Fire Prevention Committee (if it still exists)
MEMO

TO: Holley Ulbrich

FROM: Tom Overcamp

SUBJECT: Need for a University-Wide Library Committee

DATE: October 4, 1983

The library's policies are currently under review by the Depository Committee. This committee has representation from five to six colleges. Three faculty members are from three different colleges on a rotating basis. One faculty member is selected by the Senate. For the past few years we have selected the Senator representing the library faculty which has "given away" some representation of the academic colleges in library matters. One undergraduate student and one graduate student from colleges unrepresented by faculty are also members. In addition, the Director of the Libraries and the Director of Development are members.

I feel the structure and composition of the committee does not give adequate input and representation for the faculty concerning the policies of the library. I propose that we reinstitute a Library Committee which would be advisory to the Director of the Libraries on policy. The committee should have as a minimum the following members:

1 Director of Libraries
1 Acquisitions Librarian
1 Reference Librarian
9 A faculty member from each college
1 Undergraduate student
1 Graduate student

Although additional representatives could be designated as seen fit, this committee is approaching the maximum size for a working committee to engage in active dialogue concerning this important resource to the University.

This committee could report to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, but it may report more effectively through the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research.
MEMO

TO:      Holley Ulbrich

FROM:    Tom Overcamp

SUBJECT: Independent Committees and Commissions

DATE:    October 4, 1983

The following independent committees are involved with research and research-related topics:

1. Biomedical Research Support Grant
2. Institutional Biosafety
3. Laboratory Animal Welfare
4. Protection of Human Subjects
5. Patent
6. University Research Grant
7. Graduate Curriculum
8. Computer Advisory

The first four committees are statutory committees that exist to administer federal programs. The Biomedical Research Support Program administers a grant program under the National Institutes of Health. According to the chairman, this committee operates under strict federal rules with little, if any, latitude in setting policy.

The Institutional Biosafety, Laboratory Animal Welfare and the Protection of Human Subjects committees are committees required under federal regulations to conduct research and/or receive federal research funding in their respective areas. These committees have oversight functions in the proposal and research areas. According to the chairman of these committees, the composition of the committees is set by federal regulations. The terms are indefinite because of the technical nature of the regulations.

To streamline the structure of the commission/council government, I recommend placing these committees under the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research for purposes of reporting policy recommendations in their respective areas. On the other hand, it must be clearly stated that these
are statutory committees that act independently of the commission in their
day-to-day work. The committees should give an annual report to the
Commission. To assist in this, the chairman of the committees should be
an ex officio and non-voting member of the commission.

The Patent Committee operates in a policy mode and in its day-to-day
functions in decisions on the disposition of patent applications, patent
agreements and royalties. At the present it is actively considering changes
in the patent policy to include computer software copywritten material. As
with the previous four committees, I recommend that the Patent Committee be
placed under the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research for policy
matters. The routine functions should be reported to the Commission on an
annual basis. The chairman of the Patent Committee is currently an ex officio
member of the Commission.

The University Research Grant Committee independently administers founda-
tion funds in the URG program and administers the Provost Research Grant
awards. It establishes its own policies on grants, selects grantees and
administers the programs. Since it establishes policy that affect research,
it should have a reporting function through the Commission on Graduate Studies
and Research. On the other hand, it must retain independence to carry out its
programs. Communications on the purpose of the Provost Research Awards were
initially less than satisfactory. It has improved but the selection criteria
are not well-understood. Certain aspects of the committee's functions including
changes in the application and selection criteria should be reported through
the Commission.

The Graduate Curriculum Committee is currently independent of the Commission
on Graduate Studies and Research. It's functions and reporting is clearly
indicated in Article IV of the Faculty Constitution. At present, there is no
clear delineation of the authority of the Committee and the Commission on general
Graduate School policies that affect curriculum such as changes in University
degree requirements for graduate degrees. This area requires further thought.
A similar problem probably exists at the Undergraduate Commission and Undergraduate
Curriculum Committee.

The Computer Advisory Committee is an independent committee that could be
under the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research or several other commissions.
Historically the Computer Center used to be under the Dean of the Graduate School.
The computer use is now very widespread in undergraduate and graduate education,
research and commercial use. The computer is too important to the campus as a
whole to allow the Computer Advisory Committee to remain outside the commission/
council structure.
THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SENATE

The Cooperative Extension Council of Clemson University consists of the President of the University, the Provost of the University, the Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences plus extension specialists (faculty) and county agents. The functions of the Cooperative Extension Council are to refer to its Executive Committee, the Cooperative Extension Senate, for investigation and action any matters as may affect the interests and welfare of its members.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SENATE IS AS FOLLOWS:

a) County Extension Agents and Area Agents - Agriculture --- 3 members per district

b) County Extension Agents - Home Economics
   3 members per district

c) Extension Specialists (faculty) - 4 members

d) Representative-at-large - 1 member appointed by the Director of Cooperative Extension

e) Ex-Officio members - the presidents of the County Agents Assn., the Home Economics Assn., the 4-H Agents Assn., the Specialist Assn., and the Extension Secretaries Assn.

Members of the Extension Senate serve three year terms and may not succeed themselves.

LWH
10/12/83
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>
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

September 20, 1983

I. Call to Order:

President Ulbrich called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the August 23 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as corrected with a clarification added to Senator Taylor's motion on the composition of the Screening Committee for the selection of administrative officers.

III. Committee Reports:

A. Scholastic Policy:

Senator Bauer reported that the committee met on August 25 and looked at the UCLA faculty senate report. The committee took no action on the proposal. The committee began work on a draft of a statement to be incorporated into the University Announcements concerning the particular issue of this catalog which students are required to follow in planning their programs. Presently no statement appears. Plans were made to invite Dr. B.J. Skelton and Mr. Dick Mattox to the October meeting of the Committee to discuss admission policies.

B. Policy: no report

C. Research:

Senator Overcamp reported that the committee met on September to study the Library Acquisitions Policy. The study will be continued at the meeting on October 4 at 3:30 p.m. Room 101 Riggs.

D. Welfare:

Senator McGregor reported that the committee had met two times since the last Senate meeting to work on one item- the proposed Long Range Planning Committee. A subcommittee was chosen and the members of this committee worked on a revised version of the charge of the proposed committee. The goal of the committee members was to produce a version that would be acceptable to more people. Following President Ulbrich's suggestion, the members had looked at the 1981 Self Study and had found reference to a suggestion that the University establish a long range planning committee (Attachment A). The present revised version (Attachment B) contains portions of President Atchley's version, portions of Provost Maxwell's version and portions of the description shown in the 1981 Self Study. President Ulbrich asked that the discussion of the revised version be
considered under Old Business.
Another item reported by Senator McGregor was the meeting with Dr. Reel concerning summer school pay. He stated that nothing specific resulted but that the committee intends to pursue the matter of summer research funds that come from summer school monies. Dr. Reel did say that there would be an increase in the percent applied to summer school credit hours (for three credit courses, 2.75 per credit hour up to 30% maximum).

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

President Ulbrich gave a report on a new committee which consists of the Executive Committee plus former presidents Hood and Melsheimer. This committee will review the missions of the councils, commissions and committees of the University for the purpose of verifying the need of so many committees and to study the possibility of simplifying the present complex and overlapping structures. The committee will meet on October 10 to draft a report of its studies to report to the Senate at the next meeting.

President Ulbrich stated that the study had been initiated by President Atchley at her request. She felt that the Senate would be best prepared to bring in material for a response in view of the fact that Senate members serve on so many of these councils, commissions and committees. She requested that the Senate members be prepared to discuss this subject at the Oct. meeting. A questionnaire (Attachment C) was passed out to the Senate members for completion by the next meeting. The questionnaire will also be sent to past senators and to those faculty members who are elected to committees by the Senate.

F. University Committees/Commissions/Councils:

Senator Sieverdes (Alcohol and Drug Abuse Committee) reported that the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Committee in its Sept. 20 meeting made plans to emphasize substance abuse through a Substance Awareness Week which is scheduled for Oct. 23-27. The Pickens County Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse will cooperate in sponsoring the event. Planned events for the week include displaying a car that was wrecked in an alcohol related accident, showing the movie, Days of Wine and Roses, a movie on drugs and alcohol, and a debate on the topic of raising the legal age for purchasing alcoholic beverages. The committee considered ways in which the topic of substance abuse could be presented in the classroom by the faculty.

Senator Dickey (Commission on Graduate Studies and Research-Committee on Graduate Students) reported that in its recent meeting this committee formed various subcommittees and voiced appreciation to those graduate students who were involved in compiling the graduate students handbook.

Senator Bauer reported that the Recreation Committee has not met this year.

Senator Overcamp (Commission on Graduate Studies and Research-Research Advisory Committee) reported that the major item of
business in the Sept. 9 meeting was to look at the Research Policies document. The committee will meet on Sept. 16 to redraft portions of the document.

Senator Bauer (Commission on Undergraduate Studies) reported that the Commission, at its meeting on Sept. 19, changed the wording of the statement in the Announcements concerning the awarding of a single degree with a double major to liberal arts students to read that any B.A. student could be awarded a single degree with a double major.

He said that Dr. Reel delayed the discussion on the Student Senate report on plus-minus grading until the Faculty Senate has had time to consider the report. Sen. Bauer suggested that this study might be given to the Scholastic Policies Committee.

Senator Camper (Student Union Board) reported that considerable activity occurred in this group of very active students which planned the activities of the Student Union. He stated that the group actually meets for an hour each week. Senator Camper reported on the lectures to be given commemorating the posthumous induction of Thomas Green Clemson S.C. Hall of Science and Technology. He asked that Governor Riley's Proclamation be incorporated into the minutes (Attachment D).

Senator Taylor (Honor Committee) reported on the items discussed at the committee's last meeting. The Honor College has trouble obtaining a list of students who are eligible for participation in Honor College activities. He said that the Committee chairman appealed for leverage by the Faculty Senate on the situation of high priority to be given to the development of programming services that will allow retrieval of information from the student data base. Senator Taylor pointed out that the Honor's College needs help in attracting students with higher SAT scores and high GPRs. He also pointed out that the quality of the student affects the environment in which the faculty work. He said that the University is not competing well for better students. Senator Melsheimer pointed out that it is desirable to be able to use the student data base to update student checkup sheets for advisory purposes. President Ulbrich agreed to pursue the matter of finding when programming services with these capabilities would be available.

Senator Senn (Planning Board) reported that the Board acted on four matters at its Sept. 2 meeting (Attachment E) and that all four items have been approved by the President. J. Allen talked on the proposed visitors' center and the proposed sidewalk markers for the cassette walking tour. The decision was to eliminate the markers for the tour until a later time when more input was available. The second item dealt with the relocation of the Hanover House. The committee felt that relocation of the house should be accompanied by restoration and renovation to give authenticity of the colonial period in which the house was originally built. Senn pointed out that the house should have a half basement. The house could then be used for educational and architectural studies. The next item of business was the old sheep barn which is located adjacent to the Hanover House. Senn pointed out that the barn is presently used by the grounds crew. A proposal was made to relocate and renovate the barn. Allen pointed
out that the relocation of both these structures was desirable whether Calhoun Courts expanded in that direction or not. The fourth item on the agenda was the request by the city of Clemson to purchase eleven acres of University property on highway 76 north of the Army Reserve Center running up to highway 93. Three reasons were given for denying this request. The first was that the University retain the total acreage (part of 39 acres) for future expansion by the University. Second the Master Plan shows several specific uses for parts of the section of land although all sites are not yet designated for use. Third, this area may become the major entrance to the University if Perimeter Road is extended.

Senator Privette mentioned that at a meeting of the Schedule Committee the idea of shortening both the full semesters and the summer school semesters was discussed. She wanted to know if there were others who might be concerned. She suggested that input should be made into this matter immediately. She said that there were few faculty representatives on this committee. Pres. Ulbrich reminded the senators that they could request that matters be referred to the Senate.

Senator Bishop (Commission on Student Affairs) reported that the major issue treated by the Commission at its August meeting had to do with a request by a faculty member that families of faculty and staff be allowed to use Fike Field House facilities at other times than those designated. The consensus was that students should not be hampered from using the facilities for which they are paying by having small children underfoot. The feelings were also expressed that the safety of the children or of younger teenagers was involved. The request was turned down. The meeting for Sept. was cancelled since there were no immediate actions needed.

President Ulbrich took a poll on the committees that have not yet met. Among these were Public Programs, Depositories, Fire and Safety, Recreation and Greek Affairs. Some of these had meetings scheduled for the near future. Ulbrich also reminded the senators to send substitutions for any meetings that are scheduled at times when they cannot attend.

V. President's Report:

President Ulbrich expanded on the President's Report (Attachment F). She said that Ray Thompson is meeting with groups of the secretarial staff around campus to go over the changes in the classification. The problems arose when the Secretary I and the Clerk Typist positions were changed by the new state classification position. She said that a visit by someone from Personnel could be arranged if rumblings among the staff were heard. She mentioned that only two positions were downgraded out of a possible two hundred in the original document. These changes were made to make descriptions of academic positions more in keeping with jobs in the outside labor market.

President Ulbrich said that she had attended the Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees and that the revisions and amendments to the Faculty Manual were approved but that two additional
amendments originating from the administration that had not come before the Senate were approved with note from Ulbrich that these were not actions by the Senate. One of these actions was the inclusion of an extension representative on the screening committee for the positions of President and of Provost. The second was that the formation of a search committee was not necessary where there was just a change in title of a position.

Sen. Melsheimer pointed out that the changes in the screening committee were not in conflict with what was in the manual since the administration already had the power to appoint an extension persons to the screening committee. He said that the matter of changing the title did involve a little more license and might have more sweeping results than was intended. He felt that this sentence needs clarification by the Faculty Manual committee. Senator Ovecamp pointed out that in portions of the Faculty Manual mutual agreement of faculty and administration was required. President Ulbrich said that the administration had made these changes without the advise and consent of the Senate and that this had been noted by the chairman of the Educational Policies Committee. Several senators expressed concern over the mechanism by which these revisions by the administration have entered the Faculty Manual without the Faulty Senate being involved in the decision. Since the section of the Manual includes some very important items on promotion that may lead to a reduction in number of grievances, Senator Melsheimer said that these sections should be distributed very quickly. President Ulbrich referred the matter of Faculty Manual changes without Senate consent to the Advisory Committee.

President Ulbrich welcomed two new members to the Senate. Jose Caban replaces Mike Vatelaro in Architecture. He will serve on the Scholastic Policies Committee. Dale Linvill is the new senator from Agricultural Sciences. He will serve on the Policies Committee.

Senator Bauer inquired about the announcement of the new members of the Athletic Council. Ulbrich said the President was out of town.

President Ulbrich announced that the Provost is emphasizing faculty contributions to the Alumni fund for recruiting scholarships. This will be in the form of payroll deductions. The suggestion was made that the contributions could be directed to the Faculty Staff Scholarship Fund. Ulbrich pointed out that additional state funds were available to improve the quality of the student at state supported schools. She pointed out that since we already have cut off the lower levels of SAT and predicted GPR that we plan to emphasize recruiting top level students. Pres. Ulbrich pointed out that there are very few scholarships that will compete for attracting very good students and that we need to make a significant expansion of these funds. In response to a question concerning waiving instate tuition, Pres. Ulbrich pointed out that this would make a serious reduction in the E&G operating funds. This question came after the suggestion was made that, since IPTAY waived out-of-state fees for athletic scholarship holders then all scholarship holders, should have out of state fees waived. Ulbrich also pointed out that most of our scholarship holders were in state students.

President Ulbrich stated that she had made inquiries into the condition
of Bowman field caused by football parking, since the field is the first thing visitors see upon entering the campus. A very interesting discussion followed her remarks, the gist of which was that no grass will stand up under the condition of cars driving across it on football weekends. There was mention of the fact that the scars left by cars were far worse than the 'cowpath' left by the students.

President Ulbrich mentioned that there would be two reviews of the Road Show. The first will be on Sept. 25 at 6:00 p.m. and the second will be on Oct. 2 at 6:00 p.m. Both will be held in Tillman Hall.

President Ulbrich stated that the Provost had been very responsive to the matter discussed in executive session last meeting.

President Ulbrich reminded the senators that Bobby Robinson and Joe Turner were to be invited by the Executive Committee to meet with the Senate at its October meeting.

President Ulbrich moved three items to New Business in the Agenda. These were the disclosure of ranking in faculty evaluation, the faculty evaluation form, and the replacement of Susan Brown on the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Committee.

VI. Old Business:

Senator McGregor (Welfare Committee) reported on the revision of the Long Range Planning Committee proposal. He requested that this version be labeled by date, Sept. 14, 1983 (Attachment-B). He moved that this version of the University Long Range Planning Committee be substituted as the Senate's recommended proposal on Long Range Planning and that it be commended to the administration for adoption. The motion was seconded by Senator Coston.

Senator McGregor noted that the progression of proposals beginning with the action of the Faculty Senate on July 12 (Attachment-G), the Provost's proposal, the memo from President Ulbrich to the Provost expressing the Senate's dissatisfaction with the Provost's proposal and finally the proposal handed out to the Faculty Senate by President Atchley on August 23. The latter version was referred to the Welfare Committee. A subcommittee consisting of Senators Hudson, Romier and Hamby (chairman) took all the different versions and starting with the Self-Study, came up with a broader version which has some of the same thrust as the first version from the Faculty Senate. The latest version is specific in some of the details that were missing in other versions. It has a provision for each committee to make a report each year. The revised version also requires that sources of information upon which the committee must base its opinions be made available to the committee.

The subcommittee felt very strongly that the committee responsibilities described did not put it in the category of a 'super curriculum committee'.

Senator Baron reminded the Senate that the proposal for this committee was made a year ago when there seemed to be a strong indication that there would be reductions in staff and in programs. He said that the idea was that this committee would work with the Provost as a kind of "think tank" on major problems such as phasing out programs and staff. He said the idea was to have a plan for a 4-5 year period. Baron stated that originally the idea was that the committee would be relatively unrestricted and unregulated. He felt that the Provost version would create a highly regulated committee which would serve functions already addressed by other committees. He suggested
that the Senate drop the matter for a cooling-off period.

Senator Senn suggested that although the Welfare Committee did envision a different committee that the President’s document does reflect reality and that over a long period of time we can work towards a version that approaches more nearly what we want. He reminded the Senate that the President’s document did reflect a small but positive step and that we do need to respond to the President. The motion passed with weak opposition.

A brief discussion followed on the Industrial Biology program and its status. Senator Taylor stated that the intentions of the University to initiate this program had been presented to the Commission on Higher Education and that after approval the details of the program would be generated by the faculty.

Senator Camper (Policy Committee) reported the results of studies made by this committee on the new faculty evaluation form developed by an Ad Hoc committee under the Commission of Faculty Affairs. He said that the Policy’s committee had recommended that we stay with the present form until it could be tested further rather than launching into a new form. By staying with the present form indications of where changes should be made could be recognized. He said that the committee felt that the five categories on the present form were better than three on the new form. They likewise felt that even though there were no numbers associated with the ratings that the broader range of values allowed a system of classification that would better distinguish individuals. Camper said that the committee favored reporting means and averages.

Camper made a motion to retain the present form of faculty evaluation, realizing that the format does not include numerical ratings. His motion also included the rejection of the form proposed by the Commission on Faculty Affairs.

Senator Palmer expressed dissatisfaction with the present form since, as he said, the words excellent, very good, good, fair, marginal and unsatisfactory have different meaning from one administrator to another. He also noted that some faculty who were rated as good or very good were not recommended for tenure. He pointed out that there needed to be definitions of the words that were more uniform in meaning.

Senator Rudowski pointed out that numerical ratings and listing means and averages would give more meaning. Senator Taylor was in favor of supplying to the faculty members a list of how many members of the department were ranked in each of the six categories. Senator Rudolski stated that the numerical ratings were not incompatible with but could supplement the present form. A number of senators expressed dissatisfaction with the vagueness of the terms but agreed that six categories could better express the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty than could three. The motion passed with 18 in favor and 7 opposed.

Senator Taylor made a motion to provide each faculty along with his/her evaluation a listing of the precise number of faculty in that department in each of the six categories.
Senator Dillman made the point that for small departments this could involve disclosure of private information. Opinions were expressed that this method might eliminate everyone receiving very good, but it was also pointed out that if indeed everyone in a department was 'very good' then it was not necessary to have someone in each rating or at the bottom of the scale. The motion passed with no opposition.

Senator Rudowski made a motion that a method be found to express numerical ratings and that the average and the median scores of the department be furnished to the faculty member. Senator Taylor pointed out that the use of so many decimal points in a numerical score carried an illusion of too much accuracy. Further comments were made by other senators that the same pitfalls reside in numerical ratings as in the terms presently used; that is a person could still receive a rating of 4.1 (good), be denied tenure and then enter a grievance because of a 0.1 point difference in his score and the score of someone who got tenure. Senator Palmer stated that it is hard for a department head to rank on the same scale two faculty whose areas of discipline are so different. Senator Stuzenburger pointed out that tenure and promotion do not necessarily depend upon the department head but that often it is the opinion of the peer faculty that determines this. Senator Rudowski pointed out that numerical ratings fluctuate from year to year and from administrator to administrator. The motion was defeated by a vote of 14 in favor and 15 opposed.

VII. New Business:

The motion was presented to elect Senator Bob Hill to replace Fred Morgan on the Open Forum. The motion was seconded and passed.

Senator Barron presented a resolution which he asked to be deferred until the next meeting. The resolution was for the University to establish criteria to be used in the evaluation process to identify good teaching. He stated that the student evaluation does not do this and that neither does the faculty evaluation made by the department head.

VIII. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Muriel B. Bishop
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments
Senators Absent (Substitutes Present): Robert Hill (Steve Wainscott)
• Elimination of the overly restrictive policies of the state personnel and purchasing offices;
• Elimination of confusion now existing about indirect costs;
• Equitable salary levels and salary increases for research productive faculty;
• Lower teaching loads for research faculty;
• Minimized committee and administrative demands on the time of research faculty; and
• The return of a larger portion of indirect costs to the departments originating the research.

Summary

This section on statements from other University Self-Study Committee reports contains numerous specific recommendations to be considered when filling in the details of a future picture of the University. Cutting across the three functions -- teaching, research, and public service -- the content summarized here provides strong evidence that when viewed as an entity the University is grappling with limited resources, reorganizing those in some cases, yet moving toward accomplishing new objectives. At the same time, there is deep concern expressed about maintaining ground that has been struggled over and gained in the past. The transition revealed here emphasizes the need for some form of strategic planning at the University level, a topic to be addressed in the next and final section of the report.

FINAL THOUGHTS

The four substantive sections of this report can be considered elements of an incomplete picture of the future. There are comments on regional change; statements on policy and plans by chief administrators; summaries of programs,
faculties, and facility needs, each at various stages in the planning process in
the nine colleges. Associated with these are future-related statements about the
University’s administration, goals, library facilities, graduate program,
research, student services, faculty, and special activities. But while all these
things offer insight into the University’s plans for the future, they do not
present a precise or comprehensive future plan, made with all the diverse ele-
ments considered together.

While the University Administration engages in detailed planning in the
development of the State-required 5-year plan, which is updated annually, there
is no centralized coordinating or planning activity that addresses educational
concepts; programs to be emphasized or de-emphasized; trends in enrollments;
expansion and contraction of programs; and attempts to fit that information into
an overall plan for the University. The absence of that planning function, which
the Committee feels should be continuous, makes the task of describing the Uni-
versity in terms of the next decade difficult.

The problems to be faced by the University, as seen by the Committee, are
substantially different from those of previous decades. In our view, the rules
and customs by which the University operated in the past when gaining resources
have changed and as yet are unsettled. We do not imply that past efforts to
expand programs, upgrade facilities, and accommodate growth were in any way sim-
ple or easy. But to a great extent the University then considered state support
as an adequate source of funding. That is no longer the case. At the same time,
the University’s fundamental mission and its key activities were almost com-
pletely dedicated to the provision of service to its primary constituency. As
the University searches and finds new sources of support, it will gain a new con-
stituency to serve.

Along with the new, more difficult, funding environment and the search for
new sources of support has come an increase in the pace of change in the University's immediate region. These forces combine to present a difficult environment for planning, but nonetheless underline the need for re-examining the University's mission and how activities and resources can be better coordinated to accomplish the future mission.

It is the strong opinion of the Committee that the University is now in a transition period. Early in this period of transition, probably within the next two years, the planning function mentioned earlier should be organized and made operational. That office should gather data on the projections for programs, faculty, and facilities as enumerated in the College Self-Study Reports. This data should be refined and augmented with current information provided by college administrators and faculty. With that refined data, conflicting goals can be identified along with projections that are clearly unrealistic in terms of their full impact on the University. A comprehensive list of needed resources can be identified and the full interaction of those resources within the University projected.

With that reporting capability established and providing regularly updated information, the University administration may then identify future centers of excellence and the priorities associated with them. Even if imprecise, these ideas can and should be communicated to the faculty. With a clearer understanding of the goals of the University, steps could then be taken to add specifics with these generalities. These should be developed by college administrators and faculty.

Based on our review of the materials summarized in the earlier sections of this report, it is our opinion that many details for drawing together a University planning function exist and are maintained in various departments and offices of the University. For example, information that is now lodged in the
University Scheduling Office, the Office of Business and Finance, and the Master
Planners Office, when combined with concepts provided by key members of the fac-
ulty and administration, could provide the needed ingredients for a first step
toward clarifying and planning to meet specific constraints and opportunities
Clemson will face in the next decade. With these important dimensions identi-

...ied, and with a functioning planning activity in place, the University should be
in a position to:

- Assess its basic mission in terms of the future,
- Identify new sources and amounts of financial support geared to the future
  mission of the University,
- Manage the competing demands for resources that arise from a dynamic fully
  utilized campus,
- Tailor programs and activities to undergird identified centers of excel-
  lence,
- Accommodate the emerging urban-industrial complex now developing in the
  University's immediate region, and
- Achieve for itself an enhanced academic reputation that will benefit all
  academic areas of the University.

The Committee concludes its report by noting that it does not judge the Uni-
versity's future to be bleak by any means. Indeed, upon considering the activi-
ties reviewed here we cannot help being optimistic about the next decade. At the
same time, we must admit that our optimism is not based on the expectation that
the ways of the past which provided so much support to the University are secure.
Indeed, our optimism is based on the conviction that the University can through
careful planning and by its own merit attract resources needed to bring new
dimensions of educational excellence to the State and region.
Dear Senator,

At the August meeting, the President's draft of a long range planning committee was distributed to all of you and was later referred to the Welfare Committee. In the meantime, the information from the 1981 Self-Study Report, which was distributed with your agenda and minutes, was also reviewed by the Welfare Committee. A subcommittee of the Welfare Committee--Dick Hamby, Larry Hudson and John Romeiser--drafted the attached document which contains elements of all three of the versions--ours, the Provost's, and the President's--as well as relevant excerpts from the Self Study Report. Please review this carefully and bring it, as well as the draft distributed by President Atchley, to the meeting on September 20th so that we can take appropriate action.

Holley Ulbrich

HHU:max
University Long Range Planning Committee

I. Statement of purpose

The purpose of the University Long Range Planning Committee is to help assure that strategic planning at Clemson University will be based on an accurate, ongoing assessment of where the institution is with respect to its current and future mission, goals and objectives. The need for such a committee is expressed in the Clemson University Self-Study Report, Volume II, August 1981, submitted to the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools:

"While the University Administration engages in detailed planning in the development of the State-required 5-year plan, which is updated annually, there is no centralized coordinating or planning activity that addresses educational concepts; trends in enrollment, expansion and contraction of programs; and attempts to fit that information into an overall plan for the University. The absence of that planning function, which the Committee feels should be continuous, makes the task of describing the University in terms of the next decade difficult." (p. 401)

The University Self-Study Committee believed that the organization and implementation of such a planning system would enable the University to "...achieve an enhanced academic reputation that will benefit all academic areas..." and "...attract resources needed to bring new dimensions of educational excellence to the State and region" (p.403).

II. Functions of the Committee

The Long Range Planning Committee is an advisory committee to the Provost and through the Provost to the President. The committee shall have the following functions:

1. Collect, refine, and integrate data necessary to:
   a. Assess the progress being made toward the stated goals and objectives of the academic programs of the University.
   b. Identify obstacles to progress, conflicting goals, and unrealistic projections in light of new conditions and their full impact on the University;
   c. Enumerate needs and make recommendations about long-range problems in managing competing demands for resources that arise from a dynamic, fully-utilized campus;

2. Submit an annual report to the Provost for use in institutional long-range planning.

3. Upon request of the Provost or the President, make studies and recommendations on matters of a contingency nature (e.g., a reduction in force plan for the faculty) to ensure that the appropriate advice, counsel and participation are considered in the procedures established to meet such contingencies.

In order to fulfill its functions, the University Long-Range Planning Committee could utilize several sources of information. The starting point would be the most recent
Institutional Self-Study Report. Other sources could include planning documents and information gathered and maintained in various academic units and departments. The Self Study Committee also suggested that information could be obtained from such administrative units as the University Scheduling Office, the Office of Business and Finance, and the Master Planner's Office. The Committee may request of the Provost of such information as it deems relevant to its duties, indicating the relevance of its requests.

III. Composition of the Committee

1. Two deans or associate deans selected by the Council of Academic Deans.
2. Two department heads from colleges other than those represented in (1), chosen by the Association of Department Heads.
3. Four faculty members from colleges other than those represented in (1) or (2), chosen by the Faculty Senate. At least one of those faculty members shall be a faculty senator.
4. Two faculty members in non-administrative positions in the two remaining colleges selected by the Provost.
5. A student representative selected by the Student Senate.
6. A representative of the classified staff.

IV. Selection Guidelines

1. For the purpose of this committee, the library shall be considered a college, its director a dean.
2. The selections in the first four groups shall take place in the order given; Council of Deans first, then department heads, then the senate, and finally the Provost. No group shall make a choice until the prior group has selected its representatives, to ensure representation of all colleges and also to allow for consideration of making the group broadly representative in the selections by the Senate and the Provost.
3. In the event a vacancy occurs, a replacement shall be selected by the appropriate selecting body with the same college represented.
4. The committee shall elect a chairperson and a secretary from among its membership.
5. The student representative shall have a one year term. Other members shall be elected for two year terms and shall be eligible for re-election. Initially, one individual from each group 1, 2, and 4 and two from group 3 shall be given one year terms, drawn by lot, so that one half of the membership rotates off each year.
Senate Survey on Committee/Commission Experience

This survey is a part of the Senate's participation in the review of committees, commissions, and councils currently in progress. Please fill out this form and return it to Holley Ulbrich, Economics, 212 Sirrine by September 30th.

Name ________________________________ 

1. Please answer these questions for all of the university committees you have served on in the last two years.
   Name of committee/commission/council ________________________ _
   Did it meet? __________ How often per year? ________________
   Was the mandate of the committee clear? Too broad? Too limited?
   Did it overlap or duplicate the role of other committees or bodies? If so, in what way(s) and which other committee(s)?

   Is it in the right place in the structure, i.e., does it report to the appropriate commission/council/person?

   Does it function satisfactorily?

   Is the membership appropriate? Too large/small? Disproportionate representation for particular groups? (consider deans, dept heads, administrators, faculty, students)? Is senate representation appropriate/adequate?

   Is the chair or are a significant number of members of the committee (or both) there in an ex-officio capacity? Do you feel that this is appropriate?

   What other recommendations might you have for this committee or commission to make it function more satisfactorily?

   Please take one of these for each committee, if necessary.

   2. These questions should only be answered once!
   Are there areas of concern not addressed by the existing committee structure? If so, what?

   How do you think they should be addressed?

   Do you have any other views you would like to express on the commission/council structure—should it be expanded, contracted, restructured, redefined, or should representation be changed in some way?

   Do you as a Senator and faculty member feel that you have to go to too many meetings relative to what they accomplish?
PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR RICHARD W. RILEY

COMMEMORATING

the induction of Thomas Green Clemson (1807-1888) into the South Carolina Hall of Science and Technology in recognition of exceptional service to his adopted State of South Carolina and to the nation through achievements as a research chemist, by leadership in helping to create the Morrill Act which led to the Land Grant College movement, and through beneficence as the founder of Clemson University.

WHEREAS, the South Carolina Hall of Science and Technology has been founded to increase public awareness of these disciplines in the improvement of the quality of life, and to honor native and adopted South Carolinians for their achievements in science and technology; and

WHEREAS, Thomas Green Clemson, native of Philadelphia, prepared for a career in chemistry and mining, first, by acquiring an education in the arts and sciences at the University of Paris and, second, by special training at the Ecole des Mines Royales; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Clemson achieved notable successes as a research chemist, as an applied scientist in the areas of mining and farming, as United States Superintendent of Agricultural Affairs (progenitor of the Cabinet Post in Agriculture), and as United States Charge' d'affaires to the Kingdom of Belgium; and
WHEREAS, Mr. Clemson married the daughter of John C. Calhoun, acquired extensive farming properties in South Carolina, became an advocate for educational reforms in training for a career in agriculture, exhibited leadership in the establishment of the Land Grant College movement, promulgated the fundamental educational model conceived from early studies in France and a life-time of practical experience, and willed his land, books, paintings, and wisdom to the State of South Carolina for the creation of Clemson Agricultural College -- presently Clemson University.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Richard W. Riley, Governor of the State of South Carolina, do hereby proclaim September 23, 1983, as the day for our citizens of South Carolina to join with me in thoughtful recognition and genuine appreciation of the achievements of THOMAS GREEN CLEMSON and the manifold subsequent achievements in SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY that he made possible through the UNIVERSITY that he founded and willed to our State.

Richard W. Riley
At the September 2 meeting of the Board, four actions were taken. All four recommendations have subsequently been approved by President Atchley.

After a presentation by Mr. John Allen on the design and functions of the proposed Visitor's Center, the Board recommended that the cassette walking tour of the central campus be implemented without the aid of directional sidewalk markers. If later deemed necessary appropriate permanent markers can be designed and installed.

The Planning Board approved in principle the relocation of the Hanover House. It further recommended that the Colonial Dames be asked to provide assistance in planning the relocation and that the relocation improve the House's historical relevance and authenticity.

The Board also discussed the disposition of the old Sheep Barn located adjacent to the Hanover House. The Board recommended that the barn be measured and recorded with the aid of the State Archivist and that the physical plant determine the feasibility of renovating or relocating the structure.

Finally, the Board reviewed a request from the City of Clemson to acquire eleven acres of University property along highway U.S. 76 north of the U.S. Army Reserve Center extending to S.C. 93. The Planning Board recommended that the requested land be maintained by the University. This recommendation was based on several considerations: (1) the University will have need for this land if it is decided to expand the campus; (2) the University projects some specific uses for this land even though exact sites have not yet been determined, and (3) this property is an entrance to the University campus.

Respectfully submitted,

David J. Senn, Vice-President
PRESIDENT'S REPORT  
September 1983

1. A concern was raised about the reclassification of the secretarial staff. I brought this up at the Cabinet and Mr. Ray Thompson, Director of Personnel, came to the next cabinet meeting and gave a thorough explanation. This is a long-term reduction in the unwieldy number of state classifications. It widens the spread between classifications in terms of pay grade. The original scheme would have "downgraded" 200 classified staff at Clemson; after modification, only 2 were actually downgraded. The remaining concerns center around the Secretary I and Clerk Typist positions. I urged that Personnel representatives meet with the people in those positions and explain what has happened.

2. The revisions in the Faculty Manual have gone to the Board of Trustees, which will have met by the time of the Senate meeting. Provost Maxwell added to our recommendations the appointment of an extension representative to the search committees for the President and Provost as an administrative recommendation. This is the first time that a change of this sort has come about in this particular fashion, although it may be understandable in the light of the Senate's refusal to act on those recommendations.

3. Attached are pages 400-403 from Volume 2 of the last Self Study. They are of some interest in the light of the continuing debate over long range planning. Please bring the President's proposal also. Welfare will not have a recommendation at this time.

4. We will be welcoming new senator Dale Linvill at this meeting, who has replaced Doyce Graham. A committee assignment has not yet been made. Jose Caban, who replaced Mike Vatalaro, will also take his place on the Scholastic Policies committee.

5. The Council of Deans voted to initiate a $15 graduate application fee beginning in the fall of 1984. This was originally prompted by the mass of foreign applications from students who apply at a large number of schools, but it will apply to all applicants, domestic and foreign. Most other universities in the region charge such a fee.

6. A question was raised at the Council of Deans in connection with a pending grievance case about the status of office hours. There is no mention of office hours in the Faculty Manual. I would like to ask the Policy Committee to address this question.

7. The Athletic Council approved a policy governing the issuance of sideline passes to control the number of people in that area. They must have passes and records must be maintained of those to whom they were issued. The passes will be issued by the Athletic Director and/or the Director of Athletic Programs.

8. You are reminded that the road show, "We're Proud to Say..." will have two on-campus previews in the next few weeks which are open to anyone interested. Watch the Newsletter for details.
9. The Alumni Fund appeal this year will emphasize recruiting scholarships—that is, scholarships to attract outstanding students. Dr. Maxwell has called to my attention the little-known Faculty/Staff Scholarship Fund. You may designate your contributions to that fund if you desire. This is an opportunity for faculty and staff to contribute to upgrading the quality of our student body, particularly at the upper end. The Alumni Fund supports many other worthwhile activities of great benefit to faculty, staff and students, but academic scholarships for gifted and talented students is at the moment a very, pressing need.

10. Dr. Doris Helms would like some senate dialogue on the evaluation forms of faculty by students, and has a lot of interesting information to share. The original intent was to use them for faculty development, not merely as part of the evaluation process. The Graduate Commission is supposed to be developing a parallel form for use in graduate courses. The TREC committee may need to change its composition or get some "hired help" (perhaps a faculty member with released time) to do an ongoing program of distribution, refinement, compilation, interpretation, and dissemination of results. I shared the report of the Scholastic Policies Committee this spring with Dr. Helms and suggested that she meet with that committee this fall to discuss the process further.

11. The Advisory Committee has completed its hearing on the one GPI case, but the Grievance Board is swamped. If you get complaints from constituents about the delays, please tell them to be patient. Senator Hudson is processing them as quickly as schedules permit. In late October, there will be discussions with the Grievance Board, the grievance counsellors, the Provost, the University Legal Counsel, Policy Chairman Dwight Camper, Vice President Senn and myself about possible changes in the GPII procedure.

12. There have been complaints from bike riders, including but not limited to your president, about moving the barriers to deny bicycle access. I raised the issue at the Cabinet. It has been referred to the Traffic and Parking Committee.

13. I have scheduled a meeting of the Executive Committee plus Clarence Hood and Steve Melsheimer to begin work on our response to the Ad Hoc Committee on Committees, Commissions and Councils. We will be asking for your input shortly.

14. The Council of Deans considered and approved a policy on the development of computer software which parallels the patent policy. Employees of the computer center are not included. Software development using University resources would result in shared royalties. Software developed on your own time and your own computer would, of course, remain your personal property.

15. I'm sure there are errors of omission in this document but I will try to recall any other developments worth sharing between now and the 20th. See you in the Senate Chambers, 3:30 September 20th.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Holley Ulbrich
    President, Faculty Senate

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

SUBJECT: Long Range Planning Committee

July 8, 1983

At the May 24th meeting I agreed that it would be useful to have a committee that would do two things:

1. Examine those portions of the Southern Association Self-Study that relate to academic programs and assess our present circumstances in light of the Self-Study.

2. Devise for the University a plan for faculty reductions in force, should such reductions become necessary, such a plan to ensure faculty participation in the development of the procedural guidelines for any such reductions.

I find the latest draft to be much broader than what I agreed to at the May 24th meeting. Specifically:

a) I did not agree that the "...central role in continuing review of academic programs in light of the mission of the University. . .".

b) I did not agree that the committee would review "...the accreditation reviews of those colleges which are reviewed by outside accrediting agencies, and the Academic Planning Committee. . .". I can see, however, that these reviews might be helpful in carrying out #1, above, and I would be happy to furnish the Committee these reviews if needed for this purpose.
c) I did not agree that this committee would review "... any proposed new programs, institutes, or other academic entities or any consolidation or elimination of programs. ..."

My opinion in this respect is that it is proper and fitting that the committee would assess what has been done re' programs, institutes, etc. in light of the Self-Study and it is certainly proper that there be faculty consultation in the elimination of programs (and this could be provided for in #2, above) but the committee is not to be a part of the process by which proposed programs, institutes, etc., are approved.

d) I don't think that I agreed that this committee would devise a plan for reductions in classified staff should such reductions become necessary. I believe that this would have to be discussed with other Vice Presidents.

e) I did not agree that the committee would deal with all the things indicated in the final paragraph (the programmatic "... implications of proposed enrollment limitations, the relationship of new institutes or endowed chairs to existing or planned programs, the implications of program development, expansion or reduction for physical plant needs, etc.")

Again, I realize that in assessing where we are to what is in the Self-Study that the committee might have to look into many things but it is not to be a step in the approval process for things that are proposed and it is not to have an independent charge to look into things that do not stem directly from the Self-Study or are not necessary for #2, above.

I suggest that the committee be set up to do #1 and #2 as indicated above. If it proves useful we can broaden its scope later.

WDM/ep

cc: President Bill L. Atchley
Dr. David Senn
Dr. David McGregor
The University Long Range Planning Committee is an advisory committee to the Provost and through this officer to the President of the University. Its central role is continuing review of academic programs in the light of the mission of the University and the periodic Self Study reports. This committee will review and evaluate findings and recommendations of the last Self-Study, the Southern Association accreditation team, the accreditation reviews of those colleges which are reviewed by outside accrediting agencies, and the Academic Planning Committee, and suggest directions consistent with those findings. It will also review any proposed new programs, institutes, or other academic entities or any consolidation or elimination of programs in the light of the Self Study and the accreditation review. Based on these studies as well as its own findings, this committee may make recommendations to the Provost and the President for initiation, expansion or enhancement, reduction and/or termination of programs; or it may make general recommendations on needs for support services, facilities and staffing in such programs over the long term.

Inextricably intertwined with significant academic program expansion or reduction is staffing. Of particular concern to the faculty, and to Deans and Department Heads as well, is the prospect of having to manage broadly based staff reductions during a time of financial exigency. In anticipating the possibility of long term stringent resource constraints, and the programmatic implications of such a situation, one function of this committee shall be to develop procedural guidelines for reduction in the size of faculty and staff should such action become necessary. The specific goal of these guidelines shall be to safeguard the integrity of the peer review process and to minimize the detrimental impact of any such reduction in force on the morale of the faculty and staff and the programs and mission of the University.

This committee will not deal with immediate budgetary questions unless specifically asked to do so by the President or the Provost. Explicitly, it is not a budget committee and will not be expected to participate in or review budget cuts, budget allocations, or the process by which individual salaries, or increments thereto, are determined. Issues not strictly programmatic in nature, however, may be considered by the committee insofar as they are pertinent to ongoing review of program and mission, e.g. the program implications of proposed enrollment limitations, the relationship of new institutes or endowed chairs to existing or planned programs, the implications of program development, expansion or reduction for physical plant needs, etc. Its recommendations may be forwarded to the President's Council or to relevant University commissions and councils when appropriate, at the discretion of the Provost and/or the President.

Operating Procedures
The committee is advisory to the Provost and the President. The chairman will work closely with the Provost in establishing the agenda; both must approve the placing of an item or issue on the agenda. The chairman will schedule meetings as needed and will furnish copies of the minutes of these meetings to the Provost and the President. The Provost will supply this body with such budgetary, financial and personnel information as he deems appropriate and pertinent to the matters at hand.

Composition

1. Two deans or associate deans, selected by the Council of Academic Deans.
2. Two department heads, chosen from colleges other than those represented in (1), by the Association of Department Heads.
3. Four faculty members, chosen from colleges other than those represented in (1) or (2), by the Faculty Senate. At least one of those faculty members shall be a faculty senator.
4. Two faculty members in non-administrative positions, selected from the remaining two colleges by the Provost.
5. A student representative selected by the Student Senate.
6. A representative of the classified staff.

Selection Guidelines

1. For the purpose of this committee, the library shall be considered a college, its director a dean.
2. The selection shall take place in the order given; Council of Deans first, then department heads, then the senate, and finally the Provost. No group shall make a choice until the prior group has selected its representatives, to ensure representation of all colleges and also to allow for consideration of making the group broadly representative in the selections by the Senate and the Provost.
3. In the event a vacancy arises on the committee, the replacement shall be selected for the balance of the unexpired term by the appropriate selecting body, with the same college represented.
4. The committee shall elect a chairperson and a secretary from among its membership.
5. Except for the student representative, who shall have a one year term, members shall be elected for two year terms and shall be eligible for re-election. Initially, one individual from each group 1, 2, and 4 and two from group 3 shall be given one year terms, drawn by lot, so that one half of the membership rotates off each year. Terms shall run from August 15 to August 15.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

August 23, 1983

I. Call to Order:

President Ulbrich called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. She introduced Bill Hare as Fred Morgan's replacement from the College of Sciences. He will serve on the Scholastic Policy Committee.

II. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the July 12 meeting were approved with a clarification added to the Policy Committee Report.

III. Presentation by President Atchley:

After a fancy introduction by President Ulbrich, President Atchley began his remarks by commenting on the changes in the proposal for the new Athletic Council. He noted that the University is planning to review all councils, commissions, and committees on campus in order to improve the governance structure in terms of representation and effectiveness. He noted that "we must evaluate the charges of the various governance bodies." In this context the Athletic Council has been modified and faculty representation expanded from six to nine members in addition to the current and past Faculty Senate Presidents. He explained that the nomination of two faculty members from each college (three from Agricultural Sciences) should be made by September 10. He will select five faculty members to fill current vacancies by September 15.

He stated that the Chair of the Athletic Council will continue to serve as the ACC and NCAA representative in order to provide more effective coordination between Clemson and these bodies. That person holds the Chair position at the pleasure of the President of the University. He suggested that the Council appoint an ad hoc committee to examine academic matters pertaining to athletes enrolled at Clemson. Another change affecting the Athletic Council deals with the elimination of perquisites for Council members. In the future the President's Office, not the Athletic Department, will determine all perquisites for council members. He reaffirmed that academics remains the number one priority of the University. The changes in the composition and selection process of this advisory body should have a positive influence. He noted that the University plans to submit a report to the ACC outlining the corrective actions taken in the athletic program.

President Atchley reported that Clemson will soon begin a national search for a Vice President for Resources Development. The search had been postponed previously because of the economic recession's negative effect on contributions and gift-giving. The office will coordinate all academic fund raising programs, capital campaigns, help the University build a proposed endowment of about $40 million, and plan long-term private support objectives. It is possible that college level resource development
persons could eventually be provided.

President Atchley spoke about the statewide program entitled "We Are Proud to Say," which will make presentations on nine Tuesday nights at different locations throughout the state during October and November. The purpose of the program is "to showcase Clemson people and others" and emphasize the educational mission of the University.

He also stated that he wanted to see the development of an academic "booster" club approach to increase private support for academics at Clemson and to honor donors.

Senator Baron asked several questions about summer school salaries. He noted that the summer school salary for teaching one course is approximately 60% of what the individual earns when teaching the same course during the regular semester. It was his understanding that summer school receipts were used to fund research grants. Furthermore, Baron stated that persons teaching in the 9-week program were paid more than persons teaching during the 6-week summer session. Dr. Atchley noted that the summer school program is self-sufficient; no state funds pay summer salaries. He stated that he was open to suggestions regarding the salary matter.

Senator Overcamp raised a question regarding the possible re-appointment of the same faculty members to the Athletic Council for consecutive terms. President Atchley responded that any members of the Athletic Council whose terms expire will have to go back through the collegiate nominations process to have their names put back in the pool of nominees again.

In response to an anticipated question about the Long Range Planning Committee, President Atchley distributed a proposal entitled, "Purpose and Functions of a Long Range Planning Committee" See Attachment A. It was agreed by President Atchley that the Committee should have a future perspective in perhaps, five year increments. This concept of a Five Year Plan is also supported by Senator Waddell, President of the Board of Trustees. The Five Year Plan should go further than the standards needed for accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Several senators agreed that the LRPC was never meant to be a Senate Committee and was not meant to have an adversarial relationship with the administration. Senator Baron noted that the "Self Study should be future-oriented."

Senator Taylor inquired about the relative importance of faculty research as compared to teaching. He noted that it appears that teaching is verbally defined as a primary responsibility and priority of faculty, but the criteria for evaluating faculty rests almost entirely on research. President Atchley responded by noting that teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty, but that the importance of research varies by department.

Senator Coston asked about the time-table for groundbreaking for the Thurmond Center. Dr. Atchley commented that preparations for construction could begin within one year. At the present time different financial arrangements regarding "lease-back" and tax benefits for donors are being examined. The entire project will cost approximately
$25 million; Clemson University must raise at least $10 million.

IV. Election:

A motion was passed to suspend the Rules in order to elect a new secretary of the Senate. The nominees were Senators Bishop and Hill. Senator Bishop was elected.

V. Committee Reports:

A. Scholastic Policy: No report.

B. Policy: President Ulbrich noted that Senator Graham resigned from the Senate, and that Senator Camper was the new chairman. Senator Rudowski, on short notice, carefully read the committee report. The committee met on August 17 and addressed the following topics: (1) Vice President for Resources Development. The committee favors the selection of a person trained in professional fund raising. (2) Representation of extension personnel on the selection committees for top administrators at the university. The contention of extension personnel is that they should have a voice in the selection of any person who has administrative and policy control over them. (3) Faculty evaluation. The Policy Committee favors the retention of a numerical rating system on annual faculty evaluations. It does not favor the most recently proposed new form. The committee also favors a 5-6 point scale (not 3 categories as proposed) for classifications of performance. See Attachment B.

C. Research: No report.

D. Welfare: Senator McGregor reported that Ron Herrin, Director of Payroll and Employee Benefits Programs, informed the Welfare Committee of changes in Blue Cross-Blue Shield policies and coverage. Herrin also responded to a Senate request that the tax-deferred annuities offered at Clemson be updated in terms of their rank. He noted that insurance information is always available to faculty and staff at the insurance office. See Attachment C.

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

Senator Hill stated that the Ad Hoc Committee on Developmental Studies would meet the first week in September. Suggestions to this committee should be submitted at a very early date. He passed out a memorandum (Attachment I) on the request by the Athletic Dept. for selection of staff to teach certain courses.

F. University Committees/Commissions/Councils:

Senator Senn reported that the University Planning Board had met four times to discuss projects which included the new chemistry building, a new west campus parking lot, the Sirrine Hall parking lot and the dual light system for highway 93. Details of his report are in Attachment D. The charge of the University Planning Board is also included in this attachment. Senator McGregor asked if the Planning Board had discussed action to be taken on the advertisement put out
by the Cedarwood development that shows a path through the Ornamental Gardens as an access to the University. Senator Senn says if the problem arises fences may be erected. The proposed east campus convenience store, its location and supervision were discussed. Sen. McGregor stated that it would be supervised by the bookstore and its location was undecided. The possibility of a novelty store in the stadium area was also discussed.

Senator Overcamp reported that the Research Advisory would meet on Sept. 9.

V. President’s Report:

President Ulbrich expanded on some of the items discussed in Attachment E.

VI. Old Business:

President Ulbrich stated that the Advisory Committee of the senate had discussed the changes in the Athletic Council and referred to the description of these changes in Attachment F. Pres. Ulbrich requested input from the Senate on a response to these changes. The discussion that followed brought out both negative and positive aspects of the changes. The senators were advised to to make wise choices in electing representatives to the Athletic Council so that actions by the Council would be reported back to the Senate and faculty. A poll was taken to see how many colleges had completed the election for members. Science was the only one that had not taken action. Opinions were expressed that a fair opportunity should be given to see the results of the changes and the influence of these changes on the athletic program.

VII. New Business:

President Ulbrich initiated discussion on the memo from Provost Maxwell (Attachment G) on the appointment of extension representatives to the screening committees of University Administrators. This matter had been assigned to the Welfare Committee. In the discussion Sen. Melsheimer pointed out that the present policy on selection of college deans and directors does not preclude the selection of a county extension agent to serve on the screening committee should the majority of the extension service faculty choose them. Senator Hudson pointed out that the county agents are non-classified staff that are often directed to meet with their constituency concerning University matters but have no voice in the selection of the person who gives these directives. Feelings were expressed concerning giving to a relatively small group the same number of representatives on the screening committee for a president as the large groups, such as faculty and students. The statement was made that they were represented already thorough the College of Agriculture Sciences and that the Provost could appoint an extension agent to a screening committee. Statements were made by some that this was not an area of faculty business, but others pointed out that Faculty Senate already represented a wide range of individuals. A motion was made by Senator Taylor to modify the section G:VI:29 to include only the director of the Cooperative Extension Service. The motion was seconded and passed. Senator Hudson stated that whereas the extension staff had
this privilege already they would find that they would be more comfortable with this in the faculty manual. A second motion by Sen. Taylor that non-faculty and non-students not be listed in the Faculty Manuel as members of the screening committees for academic administrators other than the Dean of Agriculture was seconded. The senate was advised that this matter should not be delayed and must be faced but again others pointed out that the faculty and students have a very small representation on these committees and that there is a means for extension staff to be appointed to these committees. This motion passed.

A recommendation was made that President Ulbrich refer the matter of Extension representatives on the search committee for President and Provost to the President’s Council.

The draft passed out at the Faculty Senate meeting by President Atchley outlining the purpose and functions of the Long Range Planning Committee (Attachment A) was discussed briefly. A motion was made and passed to table this and to assign the study of this draft to a committee for further study.

A request was made by Pres. Ulbrich for the senators to study the faculty evaluation form so that it can be considered during the next Senate session.

Senator Melsheimer presented the Faculty Manual revisions. He stated that in the editing process no substantive changes had been made. A motion was made, seconded and passed to accept the changes.

A motion to amend the description of the Library faculty was made by Sen. Harris. The motion was seconded and passed (see Attachment B). Sen. Melshiemer made a motion that the sections of the manual that deal with the Planning Board and with professorships and chairs be updated. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

The senate went into executive session at 5:55 p.m. and returned at 6:21 p.m.

VIII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher M. Sieverdes
Interim Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Respectfully submitted,

Muriel Bishop
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments
Purpose and Functions
Long-Range Planning Committee

The Long-Range Planning Committee is an advisory committee to the Provost and through the Provost to the President. The purpose of the Committee is to help assure that strategic planning at Clemson University will be based on an accurate, ongoing assessment of where the institution is with respect to its current goals and objectives as stipulated in the most recent Institutional Self-Study. In other words, the Committee will review and assess the progress of the University in terms of the most recent Institutional Self-Study Report, which is required periodically by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

The Committee will review the recommendations and projections of the Self-Study Report on a year-to-year basis to answer such questions as:

--What objectives have been accomplished this year?
--What progress is being made on goals and objectives that have not been achieved?
--If progress is not being made on goals and objectives as stipulated in the Self-Study, what are the obstacles?
--Has the University stayed within its mission statement as stipulated in the Self-Study?
--In light of new conditions, should statements of goals and objectives or the mission statement of the University be modified or updated?

In short, the Committee will take a look at all activities of the University each year to determine if we have done what we said we would do, and if not, attempt to determine and spell out why not.

The aim of the Committee should be to provide commentary and recommendations that can be readily consolidated into yearly updates on the Self-Study Report. This will accomplish three things:

(1) It will, in essence, provide the outline and most of the data and narrative required for the University's five-year updates on the Self-Study, which is also required by SACS. It will, of course, also provide excellent advance work for the next scheduled Institutional Self-Study.

(2) It will help ensure that the Self-Study Report itself becomes a more effective long-range planning document for the University, as opposed to being a document that represents primarily a once-a-decade institutional exercise that customarily ends up as an occasional reference volume.

(3) It will make institutional long-range planning and strategic forecasts at Clemson much more effective by giving the University administration solid, up-to-date assessments of where the University is now, vis-a-vis where it should be.
In addition to the primary responsibilities outlined above, the Committee also may be requested by the President or the Provost to make studies and recommendations on matters of a contingency nature (e.g., a reduction in force plan for faculty) to ensure that appropriate faculty advice, counsel, and participation are considered in the procedures established to meet such contingencies.
POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT - AUGUST 23, 1983

The Policy Committee met August 17, 1983 with Dr. N. D. Camper acting chairman. The following items were discussed.

1. **Vice President for Development**

   Dr. Clarence Hood met with the Committee and discussed the proposed position of Vice President for Development. The discussion centered on duties and responsibilities of the position. It was agreed that there is a need for coordination of fund raising efforts at all levels within the University. It is hoped that the position would attract an individual trained in professional fund raising.

2. **Representation of Extension Personnel on Selection Committee**

   This item had been discussed in the June and July meetings of this Committee. However, it has not been in the hands of the Committee "for some time." In general the Committee does not object to including representatives from the Cooperative Extension Service on the Screening Committee for the selection of the president of the University, and on selection committees: a. for an assistant dean, associate dean or director within a college (specifically the associate dean and director of the Cooperative Extension Service); b. for the dean of the college of Agricultural Sciences; and c. for the provost. Furthermore it is not our desire to delay Faculty Manual Revisions. Our original feeling was that the request did not originate from a faculty group. The Committee further felt that similar requests from other groups (e.g., classified staff) will appear in the future.

3. **Faculty Evaluation**

   The revised Faculty Evaluation Form proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee chaired by Dr. John Fulton was discussed in the July and August meetings of this Committee. In general the Committee does not approve of the proposed new Evaluation Form. Specifically the following points were raised:

   a. The numeric rating system was eliminated for the most recent evaluation period. Some Committee members felt that this may have been a step backward in view of how evaluations were processed this year. The use of the current evaluation form, with the numerical values included, allows the department or unit head to more adequately evaluate the different strengths of individual faculty members. The Committee strongly feels that the use of three categories (Below Expectations, Meeting Expectations and Exceeding Expectations) was totally unacceptable. An evaluation scheme should have 5 to 6 categories and the present system seems to be satisfactory. An expanded scale allows for a more meaningful evaluation. The Committee recommends that the mean, median and range of performance scores within a department or unit be disclosed to that faculty.
Further, there should be a direct relationship between a performance score and the distribution of effort (e.g., percentage of time for teaching, research, etc.)

b. The proposed Form 1, Goals Statement, received mixed response. In some departments this process is in effect. Some Committee members questioned the need for a Goals Statement, but there was general agreement that a statement of plans would be appropriate, especially as they relate to the distribution of effort. The Committee suggests that submission of a Goals Statement be at the discretion of the faculty member or in keeping with departmental policy.

c. The nature and format of professional activities reporting (Activities Reporting Form, or Resume) should be left to each department. The Committee agrees that a current faculty profile should be maintained in each department or unit office.

d. The Committee believes the present Faculty Evaluation Forms and Procedures should be further tested before launching a new form.
Faculty Senate
Welfare Committee Report
August 23, 1983

The Committee met on August 16.

Ron Herrin, Director of Payroll and Employee Benefit Programs briefly reviewed recent Blue Cross-Blue Shield changes and Tax-Deferred Annuities, and then responded at some length to questions from the group.

Changes in coverage by Blue Cross-Blue Shield include hospital preadmission outpatient testing, an outpatient surgery schedule, and provision for 2nd and 3rd opinions before surgery. These changes have been covered in the State Personnel Division newsletter that all employees receive.

Herrin also explained that Blue Cross-Blue Shield pays the lower of customary or prevailing for a given procedure -- customary being a specific doctors standard fee for a given procedure for the previous year, and prevailing being the average of doctors in a general area for a given procedure. John Bennett's question from last year regarding a listing of fees charged by individual doctors was discussed. Herrin did not feel this was practical because of the hundreds of doctors, thousands of "procedures," and constantly changing charges, but he will look into having in his office a copy of Blue Cross-Blue Shield's Prevailing Rate schedule, so that employees could look up the insured rate for a procedure. The insurance office can currently obtain this information by telephone for an individual if the operation can be adequately defined and does not change during the actual surgery. If you feel anything is out of line on a Blue Cross-Blue Shield settlement, the insurance office will be glad to check it out.

Herrin explained further that our's is a self-insured state employees plan through State Personnel Division and Blue Cross-Blue Shield administers the program under contract. They were the low bidder when the contract to administer was renewed in 1982. The State Personnel Division Insurance Unit has an advisory committee of 30 state employees.

Regarding Tax-Deferred Annuities, a question had been raised in the Senate about an update of the Tax-Deferred Annuities survey and ranking. Herrin has the current information available in his office, but does not plan to publish and distribute it to all employees. The ranking that was done in the last summary several years ago may have been a disservice because any ranking must make a number of assumptions which may not be valid for a given faculty member. Over forty companies presently are approved for Clemson, of which only about 15 have more than five members. The university presently requires about 10 potential members before they will approve a company for payroll deduction because of the expense involved. Any company will be approved if it is licensed to do business in the state and signs up ten members -- the insurance office does not attempt to "screen" companies. One of the more valuable statistics that the insurance office has available is the experience figure on actual ten-year payoff on an investment of $100/month, but even this statistic is subject to different interpretations based on individual circumstances and investment goals. Herrin suggests that anyone considering starting or changing a tax-deferred annuity please come by the insurance office and talk it over.
Herrin was asked about periodically reissuing "new-faculty" insurance pockets to "old" faculty. Consensus was that this might be wasteful, but that it would be useful to periodically remind faculty that the most current insurance and annuity information is always available in the insurance office. College and departmental meetings are encouraged. A series of video-tape programs has been considered. A "short course" on retirement planning also is under consideration.

The question of Summer School pay for 9-month faculty was discussed briefly, and will be explored in more depth at our next meeting.

The perennial Long Range Planning proposal, now in its nth Sirrine-Sikes loop, was discussed. The Welfare Committee recommends that we go back to the version last approved by the full Senate and stop trying to accommodate a stonewall.

Larry Hudson discussed returns from the 12-month faculty questionnaire on annual leave. Most respondents favored an intermediate leave step between the present 18 days for the first 19 years and 30 days thereafter. Welfare Committee members from the three units most affected, Agricultural Sciences, Forest and Recreation Resources, and Library will follow up with their respective Deans or Directors and recommend means of getting a specific proposal before the Administration.
The University Planning Board has met four times since I last reported to the Senate.

On June 9 the focus of discussion was the new chemistry building. The Board recommended that both the site and the architectural plans for the new building be approved. Bids will be taken later this year.

On June 20 the Board considered the development of a new west campus parking lot. The request was made because fill dirt was needed for the stadium construction and because the stadium contractor had offered to grade the site. The Board tabled the proposal and recommended "that study begin immediately on a more responsive proposal for the area that would meet all user needs." At the same meeting the Board endorsed a proposal to install a dual light system in front of Sikes Hall on a trial basis during the 1983-84 academic year. Other studies of this pedestrian problem will continue throughout the year.

At its July meeting, the Board reviewed parking lot design guidelines with particular attention directed toward the expansion of the Sirrine Hall parking lot.

The August meeting continued the discussion of the Sirrine Hall parking lot. The Board recommended the expansion of the lot to 280 spaces with one tree for every 20 spaces. This is a variance from the Master Plan Design Guidelines which specify one tree for every 10 spaces. The Board also recommended that site improvements be made at Lee and Lowry Halls as modified by the Landscape and Site Development Comm. The Board considered a request for directional sidewalk markers for self-guided walking tours of the campus. Implementation of this request will be delayed until a better understanding of the Visitor's Center and tour plans are acquired and other alternatives are investigated. Finally, the concept of an east campus convenience store was approved in principle.

Respectfully submitted,

David J. Senn, Vice-President
The University Planning Board is charged with ensuring the Master Plan is being used to effectively guide the orderly and cohesive development of the campus. The Board reviews any change which would significantly alter the Master Plan or the physical environment and recommends action to be taken by the President. The Board consists of the Campus Master Planner (ex officio); the Vice President/President elect of the Faculty Senate; the President of Student Government, the Chairman of the Board of Trustee's Planning Committee; the Directors of Alumni Relations, Athletics, and the Physical Plant; the Vice President for Business and Finance; the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies; the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs; the Associate Director of the S. C. Agricultural Experiment Station; and the Alumni Professor from the College of Architecture.
PRESIDENT'S REPORT
September 1983

1. A concern was raised about the reclassification of the secretarial staff. I brought this up at the Cabinet and Mr. Ray Thompson, Director of Personnel, came to the next cabinet meeting and gave a thorough explanation. This is a long-term reduction in the unwieldy number of state classifications. It widens the spread between classifications in terms of pay grade. The original scheme would have "downgraded" 200 classified staff at Clemson; after modification, only 2 were actually downgraded. The remaining concerns center around the Secretary I and Clerk Typist positions. I urged that Personnel representatives meet with the people in those positions and explain what has happened.

2. The revisions in the Faculty Manual have gone to the Board of Trustees, which will have met by the time of the Senate meeting. Provost Maxwell added to our recommendations the appointment of an extension representative to the search committees for the President and Provost as an administrative recommendation. This is the first time that a change of this sort has come about in this particular fashion, although it may be understandable in the light of the Senate's refusal to act on those recommendations.

3. Attached are pages 400-403 from Volume 2 of the last Self Study. They are of some interest in the light of the continuing debate over long range planning. Please bring the President's proposal also. Welfare will not have a recommendation at this time.

4. We will be welcoming new senator Dale Linvill at this meeting, who has replaced Doyce Graham. A committee assignment has not yet been made. Jose Caban, who replaced Mike Vatalaro, will also take his place on the Scholastic Policies committee.

5. The Council of Deans voted to initiate a $15 graduate application fee beginning in the fall of 1984. This was originally prompted by the mass of foreign applications from students who apply at a large number of schools, but it will apply to all applicants, domestic and foreign. Most other universities in the region charge such a fee.

6. A question was raised at the Council of Deans in connection with a pending grievance case about the status of office hours. There is no mention of office hours in the Faculty Manual. I would like to ask the Policy Committee to address this question.

7. The Athletic Council approved a policy governing the issuance of sideline passes to control the number of people in that area. They must have passes and records must be maintained of those to whom they were issued. The passes will be issued by the Athletic Director and/or the Director of Athletic Programs.

8. You are reminded that the road show, "We're Proud to Say..." will have two on-campus previews in the next few weeks which are open to anyone interested. Watch the Newsletter for details.
9. The Alumni Fund appeal this year will emphasize recruiting scholarships—that is, scholarships to attract outstanding students. Dr. Maxwell has called to my attention the little-known Faculty/Staff Scholarship Fund. You may designate your contributions to that fund if you desire. This is an opportunity for faculty and staff to contribute to upgrading the quality of our student body, particularly at the upper end. The Alumni Fund supports many other worthwhile activities of great benefit to faculty, staff and students, but academic scholarships for gifted and talented students is at the moment a very pressing need.

10. Dr. Doris Helms would like some senate dialogue on the evaluation forms of faculty by students, and has a lot of interesting information to share. The original intent was to use them for faculty development, not merely as part of the evaluation process. The Graduate Commission is supposed to be developing a parallel form for use in graduate courses. The TREC committee may need to change its composition or get some "hired help" (perhaps a faculty member with released time) to do an ongoing program of distribution, refinement, compilation, interpretation, and dissemination of results. I shared the report of the Scholastic Policies Committee this spring with Dr. Helms and suggested that she meet with that committee this fall to discuss the process further.

11. The Advisory Committee has completed its hearing on the one GPI case, but the Grievance Board is swamped. If you get complaints from constituents about the delays, please tell them to be patient. Senator Hudson is processing them as quickly as schedules permit. In late October, there will be discussions with the Grievance Board, the grievance counsellors, the Provost, the University Legal Counsel, Policy Chairman Dwight Camper, Vice President Senn and myself about possible changes in the GPII procedure.

12. There have been complaints from bike riders, including but not limited to your president, about moving the barriers to deny bicycle access. I raised the issue at the Cabinet. It has been referred to the Traffic and Parking Committee.

13. I have scheduled a meeting of the Executive Committee plus Clarence Hood and Steve Melsheimer to begin work on our response to the Ad Hoc Committee on Committees, Commissions and Councils. We will be asking for your input shortly.

14. The Council of Deans considered and approved a policy on the development of computer software which parallels the patent policy. Employees of the computer center are not included. Software development using University resources would result in shared royalties. Software developed on your own time and your own computer would, of course, remain your personal property.

15. I'm sure there are errors of omission in this document but I will try to recall any other developments worth sharing between now and the 20th. See you in the Senate Chambers, 3:30 September 20th.
• Elimination of the overly restrictive policies of the state personnel and purchasing offices;
  • Elimination of confusion now existing about indirect costs;
  • Equitable salary levels and salary increases for research productive faculty;
  • Lower teaching loads for research faculty;
  • Minimized committee and administrative demands on the time of research faculty; and
  • The return of a larger portion of indirect costs to the departments originating the research.

Summary

This section on statements from other University Self-Study Committee reports contains numerous specific recommendations to be considered when filling in the details of a future picture of the University. Cutting across the three functions -- teaching, research, and public service -- the content summarized here provides strong evidence that when viewed as an entity the University is grappling with limited resources, reorganizing those in some cases, yet moving toward accomplishing new objectives. At the same time, there is deep concern expressed about maintaining ground that has been struggled over and gained in the past. The transition revealed here emphasizes the need for some form of strategic planning at the University level, a topic to be addressed in the next and final section of the report.

FINAL THOUGHTS

The four substantive sections of this report can be considered elements of an incomplete picture of the future. There are comments on regional change; statements on policy and plans by chief administrators; summaries of programs,
faculty, and facility needs, each at various stages in the planning process in the nine colleges. Associated with these are future-related statements about the University's administration, goals, library facilities, graduate program, research, student services, faculty, and special activities. But while all these things offer insight into the University's plans for the future, they do not present a precise or comprehensive future plan, made with all the diverse elements considered together.

While the University Administration engages in detailed planning in the development of the State-required 5-year plan, which is updated annually, there is no centralized coordinating or planning activity that addresses educational concepts; programs to be emphasized or de-emphasized; trends in enrollments; expansion and contraction of programs; and attempts to fit that information into an overall plan for the University. The absence of that planning function, which the Committee feels should be continuous, makes the task of describing the University in terms of the next decade difficult.

The problems to be faced by the University, as seen by the Committee, are substantially different from those of previous decades. In our view, the rules and customs by which the University operated in the past when gaining resources have changed and as yet are unsettled. We do not imply that past efforts to expand programs, upgrade facilities, and accommodate growth were in any way simple or easy. But to a great extent the University then considered state support as an adequate source of funding. That is no longer the case. At the same time, the University's fundamental mission and its key activities were almost completely dedicated to the provision of service to its primary constituency. As the University searches and finds new sources of support, it will gain a new constituency to serve.

Along with the new, more difficult, funding environment and the search for
new sources of support has come an increase in the pace of change in the University's immediate region. These forces combine to present a difficult environment for planning, but nonetheless underline the need for re-examining the University's mission and how activities and resources can be better coordinated to accomplish the future mission.

It is the strong opinion of the Committee that the University is now in a transition period. Early in this period of transition, probably within the next two years, the planning function mentioned earlier should be organized and made operational. That office should gather data on the projections for programs, faculty, and facilities as enumerated in the College Self-Study Reports. This data should be refined and augmented with current information provided by college administrators and faculty. With that refined data, conflicting goals can be identified along with projections that are clearly unrealistic in terms of their full impact on the University. A comprehensive list of needed resources can be identified and the full interaction of those resources within the University projected.

With that reporting capability established and providing regularly updated information, the University administration may then identify future centers of excellence and the priorities associated with them. Even if imprecise, these ideas can and should be communicated to the faculty. With a clearer understanding of the goals of the University, steps could then be taken to add specifics with these generalities. These should be developed by college administrators and faculty.

Based on our review of the materials summarized in the earlier sections of this report, it is our opinion that many details for drawing together a University planning function exist and are maintained in various departments and offices of the University. For example, information that is now lodged in the
University Scheduling Office, the Office of Business and Finance, and the Master Planners Office, when combined with concepts provided by key members of the faculty and administration, could provide the needed ingredients for a first step toward clarifying and planning to meet specific constraints and opportunities Clemson will face in the next decade. With these important dimensions identified, and with a functioning planning activity in place, the University should be in a position to:

- Assess its basic mission in terms of the future,
- Identify new sources and amounts of financial support geared to the future mission of the University,
- Manage the competing demands for resources that arise from a dynamic fully utilized campus,
- Tailor programs and activities to undergird identified centers of excellence,
- Accommodate the emerging urban-industrial complex now developing in the University's immediate region, and
- Achieve for itself an enhanced academic reputation that will benefit all academic areas of the University.

The Committee concludes its report by noting that it does not judge the University's future to be bleak by any means. Indeed, upon considering the activities reviewed here we cannot help being optimistic about the next decade. At the same time, we must admit that our optimism is not based on the expectation that the ways of the past which provided so much support to the University are secure. Indeed, our optimism is based on the conviction that the University can through careful planning and by its own merit attract resources needed to bring new dimensions of educational excellence to the State and region.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Athletic Council  
Dr. B. J. Skelton, Chairman

FROM: Bill L. Atchley

SUBJECT: Clemson University Athletic Council 1983-84

The Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees on June 15, 1983, endorsed with slight modifications the administration's proposal for reorganizing the Athletic Council. The full Board of Trustees accepted the committee's endorsement on July 22, 1983.

A copy of the statement outlining the purpose and function of the Athletic Council and its composition is attached, along with a list of ex-officio members for 1983-84 and four faculty representatives still serving active terms. The Athletic Council will continue to function as presently constituted until I complete the filling of vacancies, by September 15.

By this memorandum I hereby officially charge the Athletic Council with the responsibilities set forth in the attached document. This memorandum also officially implements other changes indicated in that document.

The changes involved are significant. Briefly, they:

(1) now provide a specific, clearly stated charge to the Council. Previously, the official charge to the Council read simply as follows: "This body recommends policy concerning intercollegiate athletics to the Vice President for Student Affairs." The new charge now makes the Council a body accountable for helping ensure the University's compliance with NCAA, ACC, and University rules and regulations governing intercollegiate athletics.

(2) increase faculty representation on the Council, both in terms of numbers and method of selection. We have increased the number of faculty representatives from six to nine. I will fill vacancies by September 15, 1983, (there are currently five) from a pool of qualified nominees to be selected in an appropriate manner by the faculty of each of the collegiate
units, including the library. All future vacancies will be filled by this procedure. Previously, there was no such nomination process directly involving the collegiate units. In the interest of maintaining continuity, I am asking Dr. Hugh Webb, whose term officially expired June 30, to continue serving on the Council as secretary until September 15, at which time he may be eligible for reappointment through the newly established collegiate process.

(3) give the Council a clear role in providing oversight to athletic operations at the University. The Council now has the important responsibility of recommending policy on intercollegiate athletics to my office through the Vice President for Student Affairs and to advise me on any matters I may refer to it for consideration.

We have followed a long, careful process in developing the new charge and other changes concerning the Athletic Council. These changes and the document attached are in every sense a joint effort of the administration and the Trustees. That effort has made use of valuable input from all groups represented on the Council. The Student Affairs Committee has been particularly conscientious and insightful in the deliberations that led to the statement of this new role for the Athletic Council.

I am confident that the changes outlined will help provide many safeguards for the oversight of our athletic program. I am confident these steps will help ensure better compliance with all appropriate rules and regulations. I am also confident that this new conception of the role of the Athletic Council -- which represents all areas and major support groups of the University -- in its own way states the philosophic approach to intercollegiate athletics that will characterize this University's programs in the future. As I have said on many occasions, we can never guarantee perfection, but we can guarantee the right and the best intent.

I look forward to working with you as we continue to develop what I consider to be potentially the finest, best balanced athletic program in America.

BLA/ew
Enclosures (2)

xc: Cabinet
Student Affairs Committee, Board of Trustees
Senator James Waddell, Chairman, Board of Trustees
Other Trustees
Ex officio, nonvoting members of Athletic Council
### COMPOSITION OF 1983-84 ATHLETIC COUNCIL AS OF 8-3-83

#### (a) Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. F. Geldard</td>
<td>June 30, 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. A. Vaughn</td>
<td>June 30, 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Carolyn Briscoe</td>
<td>June 30, 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. C. Harshman</td>
<td>June 30, 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(five vacancies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (b) Ex-officio Members

- Dean of Admissions and Registration
  - B. J. Skelton — Faculty Representative to ACC and NCAA
- President of the Faculty Senate
  - Holly H. Ulbrich
- Immediate Past President of the Faculty Senate
  - Clarence Hood, Jr.
- Chairman of the Scholarship and Awards Committee
  - Corrine Sawyer
- President of the Alumni Association
  - Leonard C. Butler
- Immediate Past President of the Alumni Association
  - I. L. Donkle, Jr.
- President of IPTAY
  - Bill M. Reaves
- Immediate Past President of IPTAY
  - John H. Timmerman
- Chairman of the Graduate School Association
  - John A. Murden
- President of the Student Body
  - David Stalnaker
- President of the Student Senate
  - Oran P. Smith
- President of the Block "C" Club
  - Ian D. Kayser

All twenty-one members of the Council shall have the right to vote. Clemson University's Vice Presidents, Athletic Director, Associate and Assistant Athletic Directors will serve as ex-officio non voting members of the Council. The secretary of the Council shall be elected annually by the Council from among its faculty members.
ATHLETIC COUNCIL

The Athletic Council of Clemson University functions to exercise "institutional responsibility and control of intercollegiate athletics" and to insure accountability of the Athletic Department to the University as required by the constitution of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and the Atlantic Coast Conference, and Clemson University.

The Athletic Council is charged with recommending policy on intercollegiate athletics to the President of the University through the Vice President for Student Affairs. The Athletic Council shall keep the students, faculty, staff, alumni, and IPTAY informed about the athletic policy and changes in it.

The Athletic Council shall serve as an accountability entity, and thus, is charged with ensuring that Clemson University is in compliance with the rules and regulations of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the Atlantic Coast Conference, or any other such body in which the University holds membership. To help ensure that objective, all communications between Clemson University and both the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Atlantic Coast Conference will be with the full knowledge of the chairman of the Athletic Council, who will receive copies of all official correspondence.

The Athletic Council shall serve in an advisory capacity to the president of the University on any matters referred to it.

The Athletic Council will in no way relieve the president of the University of full responsibility for the conduct of the executive functions of the University administration.

MEMBERSHIP

The Athletic Council will be composed of 21 voting members.

- 9 faculty members appointed by the president of the University for staggered three year terms. Faculty members may be reappointed for subsequent terms.

- the University's ACC/NCAA representative, who shall be appointed by and will serve at the pleasure of the president of the University. This person will chair the Athletic Council and be responsible for dissemination of the athletic rules and policy changes within both the ACC and NCAA, as well as other responsibilities required by the ACC/NCAA.

- the president and immediate past president of the Alumni Association.
- the president and immediate past president of IPTAY.
- the president and immediate past president of the Faculty Senate, provided the latter is in the employ of Clemson University
- the Chairman of the Scholarship and Awards Committee
- the president of the student body
- the president of the Student Senate
- the president of the Graduate Student Association
- the president of the Block C Club

Clemson University's Vice Presidents, Athletic Director, Associate and Assistant Athletic Directors will serve as ex officio, non voting members of the Council.

The secretary of the Council shall be elected annually by the Council from among its faculty members.
Memorandum

TO: Members of the Athletic Council
   Dr. B.J. Skelton, Chairman

FROM: Bill L. Atchley

SUBJECT: Status of Council Members

To avoid any appearance of undue favoritism, and to ensure the integrity and credibility of the Athletic Council as it assumes its new role, I am today instituting the following administrative policy:

In general, no one who serves on the Athletic Council will receive or accept any perquisites or other special considerations from the Athletic Department, including but not limited to season or special ticket allocations, parking privileges, special seating or any other like benefits, direct or indirect. This restriction does not, however, preclude a member of the Athletic Council from participating in normal and customary social events sponsored by the Athletic Department.

Exceptions to general policy pertaining to such matters as preferential seating in the purchase of season tickets, complimentary season tickets for the Council's NCAA/ACC representative, tickets to away games, invitations to sit in box or special seats or to serve as official hosts for guests of the University will be handled through the President's Office on an ad hoc basis.

Nothing in this policy shall preclude a member of the Athletic Council from enjoying the regular benefits that derive from his or her personally paid IPTAY membership.

Bill

xc: Cabinet
   Student Affairs Committee, Board of Trustees
   Other Members of the Board of Trustees
   Ex officio nonvoting members, Athletic Council
August 11, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Holley H. Ulbrich  
President, Faculty Senate

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

SUBJECT: Revisions to the Faculty Manual relating to Cooperative Extension Personnel

For some time the relevant committee of the Faculty Senate has had under consideration the request of the Extension Senate that Extension be represented in the selection of the President, Provost, Dean of Agricultural Sciences, and Director of Extension. Since this is the case, I see no compelling reason why the committee cannot conclude its deliberations on these matters and report to the Faculty Senate at its next meeting. By doing so at this time, any revisions in the Faculty Manual can be included among those that may be transmitted to the Educational Policy Committee of the Board at its next meeting.

In order to ensure participation of Extension personnel in the selection of the officers indicated above, I suggest the following revisions:

1. p. VI:29, first paragraph

   Add: "and Extension personnel" after "Faculty" in the second line.
   Change: "President" to "Presidents" in the third line.
   Add: "and Extension Senate" after "Senate" in the third line.

2. p. VI:29, fourth paragraph

   Add (after "administrator"): "In the case of the Director of the Cooperative Extension Service the majority of the members of the committee will be selected by the Extension Senate."
3. p. VI:30, second paragraph

Add (after "University"): "In the case of the Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences the President of the Extension Senate will be a member of the search committee."

4. p. VI:30, fourth paragraph

Add (after "at least"): "one representative from the Extension Service,......."

The desire of the Extension Service personnel to be a part of the selection process of their Director, Dean, Provost, and President is at least as pressing a matter as any other that occasions a desire to revise the Faculty Manual.

WDM/t

cc: President Bill L. Atchley
Mr. Emory V. Jones
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. W. D. Maxwell
    Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Daniel B. Smith
    Extension Agricultural Economist

SUBJECT: Proposed Changes in Faculty Manual in Selection of Search Committee for Associate Dean and Director of Cooperative Extension Service

Our ad hoc committee of the Extension Senate would like to propose another revision to the Faculty Manual in addition to the ones I sent to you on November 24, 1982. The proposed revision is as follows: part 6 - section G; that the second sentence in the last paragraph on page 29 be revised as follows: a majority of the members of the committee shall be chosen by the faculty of that college or equivalent administrative unit; the minority may be appointed by the Dean of the college or an equivalent administrator (for the associate dean and director of Cooperative Extension Service, a majority of the members of the committee shall be chosen by the county extension agents and specialists). The underlined portion of this sentence represents the revision that we are proposing.

mrg

copy to Ms. Linda Russell
    Mr. Rowland Alston
    Mr. Emory Jones
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. W. D. Maxwell
    Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Daniel B. Smith
    Professor of Agricultural Economics

SUBJECT: Representation of County Extension Staff in the Selection Process of Certain University Administrators

The Extension Senate appreciated your meeting with us in September to discuss policy and welfare issues that are important to Extension employees and the Extension program. I was asked by the Extension Senate to chair an ad hoc committee for the purpose of investigating the possibility of county extension representation in the selection process of the President of the University, Provost, and Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences. It is my understanding that the Faculty Senate is making some proposed revisions in the Faculty Manual which will be submitted to the Board of Trustees in their January meeting. If this deadline is met, the next opportunity for revisions in the Faculty Manual may be in 1984. Our committee wanted to get our proposals to you in order that they might be considered along with the revisions being proposed by the Faculty Senate.

Currently, there is no provision in the Faculty Manual that specifies county extension staff representation in the search process for the administrative positions that impact directly on county extension workers. The county extension program has high visibility for Clemson University. In addition, county extension agents are frequently asked by university administrators to contact legislators and other Clemson University supporters regarding funding and policy issues that are critical to the total University. In the past, the agents have responded very positively to these requests and the results have been fruitful for Clemson University. The agents have expressed through the Policy Committee of the Extension Senate that they are the only professional employees of the University who do not have representation in the selection process for certain university administrators who are responsible for the county extension portion of the public service program. Presently, there are about 230 county extension agents. The agents have expressed the feeling that they can serve the Extension Service and the University more fully if given the opportunity to have input into the selection process for certain administrative positions.
Our committee would like to recommend the following revisions in the Faculty Manual that would permit county extension agent representation in the selection process:

Proposed Revision - Part VI - Section G: that the first sentence in the first paragraph on page 29 be changed as follows: In the selection of the President of the University, the Board of Trustees recognizes the interests of the university faculty by providing for the appointment of the President of the Faculty Senate, one senior faculty member (selected for this purpose by the full professor), one county extension agent (elected by county extension agents) to the screening committee. It is also proposed that the county extension agents have similar representation on the selection committee as proposed for the screening committee.

Proposed revision - Part VI - page 30, second paragraph. For the selection of the Dean of a college or the Director of libraries, a committee shall be formed which includes at least one student, at least one department head (or equivalent from within the college), and a county extension agent (for Dean of College of Agricultural Sciences only) and either an off-campus representative of an appropriate profession or a dean from another college within the University.

Proposed revision - Part VI - page 30, fourth paragraph. For the selection of the Provost, the President after consultation with the advisory committee of the Faculty Senate, shall appoint a committee which includes at least one graduate student, one undergraduate student, and one county extension agent.

I recognize that revisions to the Faculty Manual are not easily made. The Extension Senate would be very appreciative of your recommending these proposed revisions to the Faculty Manual through the appropriate channels. I will be happy to discuss any of the proposed changes with you.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of these proposals.

mrg

copy to Dr. Clarence Hood - Faculty Senate President
Mrs. Sylvia Strange - Extension Senate President
Faculty Senators - College of Agriculture
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 by providing for the appointment of the President of the Faculty Senate and one senior faculty member (elected for this purpose by the full professors) to the Screening Committee. A county extension agent (elected by the county agents) is also appointed to this 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 is chosen by the county agents and specialists); the minority may be appointed by the dean of the college of 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.

VI:29
For the selection of an academic administrator of an off-campus program, the committee shall represent both the off-campus program and the appropriate on-campus academic areas. The majority of the representatives to this committee shall be chosen by the affected faculty; 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 the dean of a college of the Director of Libraries, a committee shall be formed which includes at least one student, at least one department head (or equivalent) from within the college, and either an off-campus representative of an appropriate profession or a dean from another college within the University. For the Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences, the committee also includes a county extension agent. The majority of the representatives to the committee shall be chosen by the faculty from within the affected administrative unit; the minority may be appointed by the Provost. The Provost shall make the appointment from the list submitted by the committee, subject to the approval of the President of the University.

For the selection of a Vice-Provost, the Director of University Research, or an academic dean, other than a college dean, or other academic administrators not specified elsewhere who report directly, or indirectly, to the Provost, the Provost, after consultation with the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate, shall appoint a committee which includes at least one student. The Provost shall make the appointment to the position from the list submitted by the committee, subject to the approval of the President of the University.

For the selection of the Provost, the President, after consultation with the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate, shall appoint a committee which includes at least one graduate student, one undergraduate student and a county extension agent. The President shall appoint the Provost from the list submitted by the committee.

The selection and appointment of all academic administrators shall be accomplished in conformity with applicable University Affirmative Action policies and procedures (see II.H). In particular, in the selection of each search-and-screening committee, Black and female representatives shall be included whenever feasible.

Where feasible, student representatives shall be nominated by student clubs or other assemblies associated with the unit in question; where unfeasible or impractical, student representatives shall be nominated by the President of the Student Senate and/or the President of the Graduate Associate. As its discretion, each committee shall be empowered to add, as non-voting members, individuals who are neither faculty nor students.

This University policy on the selection of academic administrators was adopted by the Board of Trustees in July, 1981. It modifies
MEMORANDUM

August 23, 1983

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Maureen Harris, Senator from the Library

SUBJECT: Suggested revision of paragraph 3 of II:6 as revised by the Faculty Manual Committee

In the paragraph below, ( ) indicates an insertion and ////// indicates a deletion.

Library Faculty. The library faculty ranks of General Librarian, Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, and Librarian correspond to the ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment, (Tenure), and Promotion of Library Faculty specify qualifications for these ranks. Other than these rank qualifications, provisions of this Manual which pertain to faculty also apply to librarians at the corresponding library faculty ranks. (Other provisions of this Manual which refer to specific faculty ranks apply to the corresponding library faculty ranks.) In full regard, the Director of Libraries carries out the functions prescribed for the Dean of the Colleges.
MEMORANDUM

To: Holley Ulbrich, President
Faculty Senate

From: R.W. Hill and M.C. Palmer, for the Ad Hoc Committee on Developmental Studies

Subject: Intervention of the Athletic Department in Selecting Faculty to Teach Particular Courses in English and Math

In the spring of 1983, Vice Provost Reel conveyed to both the English and the Mathematics Departments a request from the Athletic Department that certain faculty who had taught English 100 and Math 100 be allowed to "follow" the 100 students into the next level courses: English 101 and Math 104 or 105. Both the Mathematics Department and the English Department responded with denials of the request and with some sense of outrage at what appeared to be unethical intervention in the selection of faculty.

Professor Fulton, Head of the Math Department, requested and, we understand, received a written request for the staffing of these courses; the matter was discussed and rejected by the Executive Committee of the Math Department and the Math Sciences Council. The request was handled entirely verbally but to the same conclusion in the English Department by Professor Koon.

Since that time, the developmental studies programs of the Math Department have devolved to the Learning Resources programs of the College of Education (see Dean James E. Matthews' memorandum of June 21, 1983), at least in part. The English Department has insisted that its programs remain within its four walls, so to speak, and has arranged with the Athletic Department to reinforce the Writing Lab programs to include tutoring sessions. Present policy of the English Department now precludes independent tutoring (for pay) by Graduate Assistants or Faculty except as it is directly under the supervision of the Writing Lab Director.

It should be clearly understood that only the clear-headed and forceful action of the department heads and faculty in the Math and English Departments shut off the intervention of the Athletic Department in the selection of faculty for particular courses. It should also be understood that the Athletic Department is now cooperating fully with the operations of the Writing Lab rather than running their own independent tutoring program in English. All is/may be well (for the moment).
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

July 12, 1983

I. Call to Order:

President Ulbrich called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the June 7 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Director of the Strom Thurmond Center

Horace Fleming addressed the Faculty Senate with regard to the status of The Strom Thurmond Center for Excellence in Government and Public Service. Harry Durham and Dean Robert Waller provided additional information.

Harry Durham stated that funds are being raised by the Founders of The Strom Thurmond Center, Inc. There are currently ten (10) founders within South Carolina and seven (7) out-of-state. Among the founders are John Connally (Chairman), Bob Hope, and Ted Turner. The present goal is $10.9 million. Thus far pledges have totalled $2.65 million of which $1.0 million will hopefully be in hand by the end of the year. This initial fund raising has been in progress for nine months and will continue for two more years.

Horace Fleming discussed the following programs of the Institute: (1) The Thurmond Seminars in Government and Politics to bring school teachers and other professionals to Clemson in the summer for intensive courses in government and politics, (2) The High School Achievement Program to bring promising high school sophomores and juniors to Clemson each summer for orientation to college life and careers in public service (to be begun in two years at the earliest), (3) The Thurmond Scholars Program to award yearly to four entering freshmen four-year scholarships, (4) The Institute Lecture Series to bring leading public figures to address primarily substantive, timely topics, (5) The Adjunct Professorship Program to attract individuals of significant influence to Clemson for teaching, research, or writing (this program currently being redesigned), (6) The Governmental Research Program to provide for basic and applied research in state government.

The Institute is to be "action-oriented" with an emphasis on bringing people together for multidisciplinary research, both basic and applied. Thus far the Institute has co-sponsored with the College of Agriculture the Farm and Food Policy Symposium and organized the Nuclear Freeze Roundtable, as well as several other public programs.

In response to questions, Dr. Fleming made several points. He stated that the Institute will seek serious high quality work with no ideological biases and will have no involvement in political activities or campaigns.
The director of the Institute will report to the Provost and may have an advisory board consisting of university personnel some of which will be faculty.

Dr. Fleming expressed a feeling of success and optimism about the Institute and Center and asked for the faculty’s support, sincere criticism, and patience in its development.

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Scholastic Policy:

Senator Bauer reported that the committee met with Stan Smith and B. J. Skelton on June 14 (see Attachment A). He stated that the committee reviewed the report from the UCLA Senate regarding the academic progress of students (athletes and non-athletes) in their degree programs. The committee did not take any formal action on the proposal.

Senator Baron stated that the Senate should not discuss issues concerning athletics and suggested a resolution to that effect. His opinion was based on the lack of action on the Senate resolution to restructure the Athletic Council. Senator Taylor recommended that the Senate wait until the Athletic Council matter is settled. Senator Melsheimer stated that a proposal for restructuring the Council will be presented to the Board of Trustees on July 22. No action was taken.

B. Policy:

Senator Graham reported that the committee is continuing its work on the Faculty Evaluation Form and is starting to consider some concerns raised by the Extension Senate, specifically extension representation in the search for a Vice-President for Development.

C. Research:

Senator Overcamp reported that the committee discussed the Provost’s draft of a policy on conflict of interest. Their report was presented as new business.

D. Welfare: No report.

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

Senator Hill (Ad Hoc Committee on Developmental Studies) confirmed his report that the Athletic Department had requested the English Department to have certain individuals teach certain sections of required freshman English courses. The individuals requested had previously taught remedial English courses in which some of the students were athletes. Senator Burkett presented a report with regard to developmental studies in Education. His report and pertinent information is in Attachment B. The Senate will further consider the matter when a report on the math sciences course is received.
Senator Bauer (Ad Hoc Ticket Priority Subcommittee of the Welfare Committee), in an attempt to clarify statements made at the previous meeting of the Senate, stated that no one on the subcommittee had spoken directly with anyone associated with IPTAY on unified giving and ticket priorities as of yet. It was suggested that Joe Turner, Bill McLellan, and Bobby Robinson be invited to a future Senate meeting to discuss athletics at Clemson.

F. University Committees/Commissions/Councils: No reports.

V. President's Report:

President Ulbrich expanded on some of the items discussed in Attachment C. She stated that from four to six GPII's are in process and one GPI.

With regard to the Thurmond Center, the Institute Adjunct Professor Professor Program will be retitled; one title being considered is the Institute Distinguished Fellows Program.

A question as to whether or not Senator Senn's substitute at a meeting of the Planning Board could vote on an issue before the board was resolved. In general any senator substituting for another on any committee, commission, board or council has the right to vote for the Senate.

Several faculty members have expressed concerns about the Vice-President for Development, particularly the role of this office and its relationship to present fund-raising groups. The matter was referred to the Policy Committee.

At the next meeting of the President's Council, it is expected that President Atchley will establish an ad hoc committee to review the present structure of committees, commissions and councils. The Senate will have an opportunity to participate in this review.

A question about the review of off-campus extension personnel by on-campus department heads whom they rarely see was referred to the Policy Committee.

President Ulbrich reported that two pedestrian-activated stoplights are to be installed at the crosswalks in front of Sikes Hall. A pedestrian overpass and the teeing of the intersection in front of Sikes are still under consideration.

Representatives of TIAA-CREF have expressed a desire to get more options available to teachers in the South Carolina state retirement plan.

VI. Old Business:

President Ulbrich reported on the actions being taken with regard to the SCSEA in response to FS-83-4-3 (Attachment D). She plans to invite Larry Ellis, the Executive Director of SCSEA, to speak to the Senate and other interested groups about SCSEA in the late fall.

President Ulbrich highlighted President Atchley's response to FS-83-6-1
President Ulbrich reported that the General Education Requirements have been approved by President Atchley. The final version is closer to the version submitted by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee than the version of the Council of Deans. (See Attachment E)

President Ulbrich noted that more detailed information concerning the proposed prerequisites to be required of applicants to baccalaureate degree programs, senior colleges and universities (Attachment G) was submitted as part of the President’s Report (Attachment C).

The subject of the Long Range Planning Committee was brought before the Senate with mention of the Provost’s concerns about the functions of the Committee (Attachment H). Senator Sieverdes suggested that the Senate go on record as favoring the most recent draft which it had passed. Senator Overcamp pointed out that the very narrow scope of the committee in the Provost’s draft did not allow the committee to really do any long range planning. Others objected to confining the committee to two narrow and rather unappealing tasks.

Senator Baron moved that "President Ulbrich is to draft a memorandum to the Provost expressing the Faculty Senate’s sentiment that the Provost’s draft of the function of the Long Range Planning Committee is unsatisfactory and that the Senate stands by its most recent proposal." The motion was seconded.

Senator Hill asked if it were reasonable to accept the Provost’s version, to have the committee form, and to expand the scope of the committee at some later time. Sentiment was expressed that such future expansion of its role would not be a reasonable assumption to make.

The motion passed unanimously.

VII. New Business:

A. Conflict of Interests

Senator Overcamp discussed the Research Committee’s report (Attachment I) on the Provost’s draft policy on conflict of interests. He stated that there two main issues: (1) a conflict of interests policy is important for ethics and guidelines but present policies are adequate as long as they are enforced by deans and department heads, (2) the Provost’s policy is at variance with some aspects of current policy as given in the Faculty Manual and, if a rewrite is in order, established procedures for revising the Faculty Manual should be followed.

Speaking for the committee Senator Overcamp stated that the draft policy is not needed. He further moved acceptance of the report by the Senate. Senator Graham stated that the Policy Committee is in agreement with the report. The report was accepted unanimously.
B. Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, etc.

Senator Graham moved adoption of the proposed wording changes for the Faculty Manual with regard to renewal of appointments, tenure, and promotion (Attachment J). The suggested changes were approved unanimously.

C. Summer School Salaries

Senator Baron stated that (1) some summer school income had been used to finance research grants and (2) faculty received more pay for the 9-week summer session than for the same number of credit hours in a regular summer session. He stated that our summer school program must be self-supporting, but that there may be some inequities in light of the above. The matter was referred to the Welfare Committee.

D. Alumni Professorships and the Alumni Master Teacher

Several senators expressed an interest on the part of their constituents with regard to the criteria and procedures for selection of alumni professors and the Alumni Master Teacher. President Ulbrich said that she would look into the matter and report at the next meeting.

VIII. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Frederick W. Morgan
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments

Minutes
Scholastic Policies
June 14, 1983

Present: Bauer, Palmer, Privette, Stan Smith, B. J. Skelton

1. Commenting on the report from the UCLA Senate, Skelton expressed feelings that eliminating the freshman eligible rule made little difference if they were still allowed to practice.

2. The CHE prerequisites were discussed. Several questions and concerns were raised, e.g. there is an insufficient number of foreign language teachers to teach two years in high school. Skelton said his feelings were that the requirements ought to be those for graduation from high school rather than for admission to college.

3. It was agreed that the committee would meet with Dick Mattox in the early fall to discuss admission policies and procedures.

4. It was pointed out there are different admission requirements for colleges due to differences in numbers of applications.

5. Stan Smith pointed out there will be a speaker at the fall advisor workshop who will discuss the legal liability of advisors.

6. Some issues of the registration process were briefly discussed.

7. The committee will plan to meet with Stan Smith this fall to discuss registration procedures and also the impact of the new academic regulations.
September 12, 1983

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Senators Burkett and Hamby

SUBJECT: Developmental Studies in Education

The following are some facts about the Developmental Studies program administered in the College of Education:

1. The courses are developmental, not remedial. They are not meant for non-readers.

2. Very few education majors enroll in the courses. Most students are in technical majors and are taking the courses to improve their study skills and reading in social science and humanities areas.

3. The courses are one-hour electives which are taken mainly by freshmen. The courses are Ed 101--Reading Improvement, Ed 102--Efficient Reading, and Ed 103--Study Techniques.

4. The courses are open to any student in the university. Attempts to inform students of these courses are made in the following ways: (a)Articles in The Tiger; (b)Pamphlets which are circulated around campus; (c)Personal letters sent to each department asking for referrals with follow-up letters; (d)Presentation at freshmen orientation; (e)Contact with individual professors to get vocabulary to be used in teaching the courses.

5. Typical enrollment by athletes for a typical semester is as follows:
   - Ed 101--Reading Improvement: 99 students, 16 athletes(16%)
   - Ed 102--Efficient Reading: 13 students, 9 athletes(69%)
   - Ed 103--Study Techniques: 93 students, 17 athletes(18%)

6. These courses are taught each semester by the same instructor who was hired for this purpose. There is no way for professors or anyone else to negotiate about who will teach them.

7. A doctoral student at USC recently did a study which showed that students who completed these courses had significantly higher standardized reading test scores than a control group composed of students who applied for the courses but whose schedules prohibited them from enrolling.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Holley Ulbrich, President
    Faculty Senate
FROM: Dean James E. Matthews
SUBJECT: Developmental Education Courses

June 21, 1983

It has come to my attention that some questions were raised by one or more members of the Faculty Senate concerning the developmental education courses offered in the College of Education. In talking with one of our senators, I understand that some materials are being prepared by them and personnel who teach in the developmental education area for distribution to the Senate so that a better understanding of the nature of the program will be possible.

There is one point, however, that I want to clarify at this time. The courses (Ed 101, 102, and 103) are open to all students in the University who feel they might profit from such courses. Statements indicating that enrollment is restricted to athletes are untrue. We try very hard to inform all incoming students of the availability of the courses. During each summer orientation session, a representative of the College meets with all freshmen and describes the program and its possible benefits.

While the Athletic Department has provided financial assistance to the program, it is neither designed for nor restricted to athletes. Since we do not classify our students as athletes or non-athletes, we do not have precise enrollment figures differentiating the two groups. In talking with personnel who teach these courses, however, they estimate that about 80 to 85% of the students enrolled are not athletes.

Any assistance you can give in dispelling the myth that these courses are for athletes only will be appreciated. We welcome any students who can profit from the experience.

JEM/jf

xc: Dr. J. V. Hamby
    Dr. B. V. Burkett
    Dr. C. W. Gray
    Dr. E. J. Kozma
ATTACHMENT C

PRESIDENT'S REPORT
July 1983

1. A number of grievances are in process. Thus far all of them have fallen under GPE. The Grievance Board has been working hard to get these cases underway and heard.

2. Doyle Graham, Dave Senn and I talked to Horace Fleming about the Thurmond Institute Adjunct Professor issue and have worked out a mutually acceptable solution. We are trying to set up a meeting with me, Horace, President Atchley and Provost Maxwell to resolve the issue before the Senate meets. Horace will be our guest at that meeting to talk about the Strom Thurmond Institute, its programs, fund raising and philosophy.

3. The Planning Board affirmed by a vote of 5-1 with one abstention the site of the new chemistry building directly behind Sirrine. Correction of pedestrian hazards on Highway 93 is proceeding slowly. David Senn will have more details.

4. The General Education Requirements as signed by President Atchley are attached. Please note that this version is much closer to that approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee than that approved by the Council of Deans.

5. The Commission on Faculty Affairs met on June 29th. A number of issues were addressed, including the conflict of interest document (I will have a draft of our comments at the Senate meeting), the faculty evaluation form (comments passed on to Senator Graham for Policy), recreation policy (access to Fike for dependance and other issues), a proposal from the Fringe Benefits Committee for a Health Wellness Committee (approved by President's Council), addition of the Registrar to the Mariscal's Committee and addition of the chairperson of the Faculty Development Committee to the Commission on Faculty Affairs. (Those two recommendations will also go to the President's Council.) Concerns about the advising process raised by Dr. Fishemel and echoed by several others on the Commission appear to lie primarily under the jurisdiction of the Undergraduate Commission. Dr. Fishemel has asked to draft a memo summarizing the concerns expressed and forward it to Senator Beller for consideration by the Scholastic Policies Committee.

6. A revision of the proposed long range planning committee was sent to President Maxwell on June 22nd. I hope to have a report for you at this meeting.

7. The prerequisites which you endorsed at the last Senate meeting have also been approved by the Medical University of South Carolina, South Carolina State, The Citadel, the College of Charleston and Lander. The Provost indicated that they do, indeed, apply to out-of-state and foreign students, but not to transfer students; students who do not meet these prerequisites may go to a two-year college or PEO school and then transfer. All
out 52 high schools in the state are equipped to meet these
prerequisites. Clemson has no specific high school course
prerequisites for admission at present. The Provost feels that
this will strengthen the hand of high school guidance counselors
in insisting that students take more substantive courses. The
list was drawn up in consultation with the state Department of
Education. They take effect with the entering class of 1986,
which is this fall's eighth graders. In response to a question
raised about the relationship between the prerequisites and high
school graduation requirements, the Provost provided me with the
attached document putting the two sets of requirements side by
side.

8. Attached is a letter from Jim Matthews, Dean of the College of
Education, on the matter raised at the last meeting about
developmental education requirements.

9. The Council of Deans met June 20th and considered several
matters. One was what catalog a student is under: the language is
still being clarified, but in general a student will have a choice
of the one under which he enrolled or any subsequently issued
during his/her tenure at Clemson. Transfer students enter under
the catalog in effect at the time of transfer. There was also
some discussion of the proposed conflict of interest statement. I
indicated that the Senate expected to have a reply at this
meeting, so please consider carefully the attached document from
the Research Committee. At the request of one of the deans, it
was also referred to the Commission on Faculty Affairs.

10. I will be meeting (at their request) with representatives from
FIPA-CASP and will have a report for you at the meeting.

11. I also have a meeting scheduled with President Atchley before
the Senate meets to discuss a variety of issues, but particularly
the Vice President for Development, unified giving, and recreation
dollars.

12. I will be on vacation July 14-21 and also August 7-14. If you
need Senate assistance during either of those periods, please call
Lee Cain or Fred Morgan. The next Senate meeting is scheduled
for August 20th. Have a good rest of the summer!
MEMORANDUM TO:  Dr. Bill L. Archley  
FROM:  Harry Durham  
SUBJECT:  News About the South Carolina State Employees Association  

June 9, 1983  

On May 31, I met with Dr. Holley Ulbrich, Dr. Davis McGregor, Dr. Dwight Camper, Mr. Ray Thompson, Ms. Pat Collins, and Mr. Jack McKenzie concerning Faculty Senate Resolution FS-83-4-3, dissemination of information about the South Carolina State Employees Association to Clemson University personnel.

We had open and friendly discussion about various ways to inform Clemson University personnel about the activities of the South Carolina State Employees Association. We agreed upon the following actions:

(a) Jack McKenzie, Publications and Graphics, will request to be placed on the association's mailing list so he can gather appropriate information for occasional inclusion in the Newsletter.

(b) Ray Thompson and Pat Collins, Personnel, will include informational material about the association in new faculty/staff packets.

(c) Dwight Camper, Plant Pathology and Physiology and SCEA board member, will coordinate with Dr. Ulbrich for a time this fall when Larry Ellis, Executive Director of SCEA, or some other staff member, could meet with the Faculty Senate and other campus groups to discuss SCEA activities.

xc: Dr. Holley Ulbrich  
    Dr. Dwight Camper  
    Dr. Davis McGregor  
    Ms. Pat Collins  
    Mr. Ray Thompson  
    Mr. Jack McKenzie
June 9, 1983

Dear President Atchley,

Enclosed is Faculty Senate Resolution FS 6-83-1, which was passed unanimously by the Senate at its meeting of June 7th. While the subject matter is less than earth-shaking in nature, I believe that it represents a general frustration of faculty and students alike in the mechanics of scheduled academic activities on Saturdays. I do not know who has the "power of the keys" at the University, but if we could alleviate this relatively simple problem, I think that a number of individuals would be most appreciative.

In addition to the resolution, a number of the senators expressed concern and frustration over the increasing use of weekend scheduling—Saturday examinations during the regular semesters and Saturday classes during summer sessions as well as the scheduling of some Saturday commencements (August) and Sunday Honors and Awards Day. We appreciate the problems of scheduling, but would like to address those concerns to the appropriate committee, administrator, or office. We appreciate any assistance you could provide us in this matter.

Sincerely,

Holley Ulbrich
President, Faculty Senate

HHU:trs
xc: Merrill Palmer, Larry Bauer
June 17, 1983

Professor Holly Ulbrich
President, Faculty Senate
Clemson University
212 Sirrine Hall
Clemson, S. C. 29631

Dear Holly:

Thank you for your letter of June 9, 1983 concerning the opening and closing of the buildings on Saturdays. It is customary during the summer for the Security Officers to be notified about buildings that should be open. Since the Faculty Senate resolution suggests that there have been some problems, I have asked Dr. Reel to remind the Security Officers shortly before each of the remaining Saturdays that the buildings need to be opened.

You also raised questions concerning the use of Saturdays throughout the year. Of course, you are probably aware that the basic academic calendar was laid out through a joint committee of Commission on Undergraduate and the Commission on Graduate Studies which included faculty, students and members of the Admissions and Registration Staff, who are most responsible for the implementation of the academic schedule and who know the most about the amount of time needed between sessions to prepare for the next session. That Committee's proposal was brought before the President's Council. It was adopted by the Council and has been in place only this year. Already we are seeing positive results, however, from it. For example, the attendance at the Honors and Awards Day Ceremony in your college alone was so great that your Dean was going to have to move the ceremony into a larger building. The overflow was caused by happy parents who are able to come to the University at a time that their sons and daughters are being honored. Other colleges experienced the same problems. The establishment of the annual calendar, in accordance with the principles established, is the work of the Scheduling Committee, which is chaired by the University Scheduling Officer and includes the Vice Provosts and college representatives. It reports to the Provost.

Use of Saturdays for examinations has been part of examination schedules at Clemson for a number of years. This use is most important if we are to minimize the number of conflicts in examinations and give the students a reasonable spread of times in which they take their examinations. So far as the summer use of Saturdays is concerned, that also has been part of summer programming for a number of years and is necessary if the summer school is going to have the same amount of class time as classes do in the long semesters. None of us desires the summer school to be something less than or not as good as the winter, and we are determined to offer all of our academic work in the best possible manner, time frame, and surroundings.
June 17, 1983

The carrying out of the scheduling insofar as the guidelines that were laid down by the joint Committee are concerned, these are handled by the University Scheduling Committee of which David Fleming is Chairperson and on which are the Vice Provosts for Undergraduate and Graduate Studies and a representative from each of the colleges.

I know that sometimes the oversight of getting a building open and sometimes the frustration of a Saturday class is at the moment on a faculty member's mind, but I do know that most faculty are highly concerned for the well-being of our students and for their academic progress. Thus, we recognize that as professionals our work is twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week.

I hope this helps you in your concerns.

Yours sincerely,

Bill L. Atchley
President

BLA:rbb
GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENT
(as passed by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, April 22, 1983 and with clarification by Council of Deans, May 16, 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 Math Science.

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 agricultural economics), geography, history, political science, psychology, or sociology (including rural sociology).

38 hours

Vice Provost
Undergraduate Studies

Chairman
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Provost
President
## Proposed Prerequisites to be Required of Applicants To Baccalaureate Degree Programs, Public Senior Colleges and Universities, Effective Fall, 1988*

### Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Science</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Social Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>2L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Ed or ROTC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Approved by the Commission on Higher Education, April 7, 1983.*
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Holley Ulbrich
    President, Faculty Senate

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

SUBJECT: Long Range Planning Committee

At the May 24th meeting I agreed that it would be useful to have a committee that would do two things:

1. Examine those portions of the Southern Association Self-Study that relate to academic programs and assess our present circumstances in light of the Self-Study.

2. Devise for the University a plan for faculty reductions in force, should such reductions become necessary, such a plan to ensure faculty participation in the development of the procedural guidelines for any such reductions.

I find the latest draft to be much broader than what I agreed to at the May 24th meeting. Specifically:

a) I did not agree that the "...central role in continuing review of academic programs in light of the mission of the University." 

b) I did not agree that the committee would review "...the accreditation reviews of those colleges which are reviewed by outside accrediting agencies, and the Academic Planning Committee." I can see, however, that these reviews might be helpful in carrying out #1, above, and I would be happy to furnish the Committee these reviews if needed for this purpose.
c) I did not agree that this committee would review "... any proposed new programs, institutes, or other academic entities or any consolidation or elimination of programs..."

My opinion in this respect is that it is proper and fitting that the committee would assess what has been done re' programs, institutes, etc. in light of the Self-Study and it is certainly proper that there be faculty consultation in the elimination of programs (and this could be provided for in #2, above) but the committee is not to be a part of the process by which proposed programs, institutes, etc., are approved.

d) I don’t think that I agreed that this committee would devise a plan for reductions in classified staff should such reductions become necessary. I believe that this would have to be discussed with other Vice Presidents.

e) I did not agree that the committee would deal with all the things indicated in the final paragraph (the programmatic "... implications of proposed enrollment limitations, the relationship of new institutes or endowed chairs to existing or planned programs, the implications of program development, expansion or reduction for physical plant needs, etc.")

Again, I realize that in assessing where we are to what is in the Self-Study that the committee might have to look into many things but it is not to be a step in the approval process for things that are proposed and it is not to have an independent charge to look into things that do not stem directly from the Self-Study or are not necessary for #2, above.

I suggest that the committee be set up to do #1 and #2 as indicated above. If it proves useful we can broaden its scope later.

WDM/ep

cc: President Bill L. Atchley
     Dr. David Senn
     Dr. David McGregor
The University Long Range Planning Committee is an advisory committee to the Provost and through this officer to the President of the University. Its central role is continuing review of academic programs in the light of the mission of the University and the periodic Self Study reports. This committee will review and evaluate findings and recommendations of the last Self-Study, the Southern Association accreditation team, the accreditation reviews of those colleges which are reviewed by outside accrediting agencies, and the Academic Planning Committee, and suggest directions consistent with those findings. It will also review any proposed new programs, institutes, or other academic entities or any consolidation or elimination of programs in the light of the Self Study and the accreditation review. Based on these studies as well as its own findings, this committee may make recommendations to the Provost and the President for initiation, expansion or enhancement, reduction and/or termination of programs; or it may make general recommendations on needs for support services, facilities and staffing in such programs over the long term.

Inextricably intertwined with significant academic program expansion or reduction is staffing. Of particular concern to the faculty, and to Deans and Department Heads as well, is the prospect of having to manage broadly based staff reductions during a time of financial exigency. In anticipating the possibility of long term stringent resource constraints, and the programmatic implications of such a situation, one function of this committee shall be to develop procedural guidelines for reduction in the size of faculty and staff should such action become necessary. The specific goal of these guidelines shall be to safeguard the integrity of the peer review process and to minimize the detrimental impact of any such reduction in force on the morale of the faculty and staff and the programs and mission of the University.

This committee will not deal with immediate budgetary questions unless specifically asked to do so by the President or the Provost. Explicitly, it is not a budget committee and will not be expected to participate in or review budget cuts, budget allocations, or the process by which individual salaries, or increments thereto, are determined. Issues not strictly programmatic in nature, however, may be considered by the committee insofar as they are pertinent to ongoing review of program and mission, e.g. the program implications of proposed enrollment limitations, the relationship of new institutes or endowed chairs to existing or planned programs, the implications of program development, expansion or reduction for physical plant needs, etc. Its recommendations may be forwarded to the President's Council or to relevant University commissions and councils when appropriate, at the discretion of the Provost and/or the President.

Operating Procedures
The committee is advisory to the Provost and the President. The chairman will work closely with the Provost in establishing the agenda; both must approve the placing of an item or issue on the agenda. The chairman will schedule meetings as needed and will furnish copies of the minutes of these meetings to the Provost and the President. The Provost will supply this body with such budgetary, financial and personnel information as he deems appropriate and pertinent to the matters at hand.

Composition

1. Two deans or associate deans, selected by the Council of Academic Deans.
2. Two department heads, chosen from colleges other than those represented in (1), by the Association of Department Heads.
3. Four faculty members, chosen from colleges other than those represented in (1) or (2), by the Faculty Senate. At least one of those faculty members shall be a faculty senator.
4. Two faculty members in non-administrative positions, selected from the remaining two colleges by the Provost.
5. A student representative selected by the Student Senate.
6. A representative of the classified staff.

Selection Guidelines

1. For the purpose of this committee, the library shall be considered a college, its director a dean.
2. The selection shall take place in the order given; Council of Deans first, then department heads, then the senate, and finally the Provost. No group shall make a choice until the prior group has selected its representatives, to ensure representation of all colleges and also to allow for consideration of making the group broadly representative in the selections by the Senate and the Provost.
3. In the event a vacancy arises on the committee, the replacement shall be selected for the balance of the unexpired term by the appropriate selecting body, with the same college represented.
4. The committee shall elect a chairperson and a secretary from among its membership.
5. Except for the student representative, who shall have a one year term, members shall be elected for two year terms and shall be eligible for re-election. Initially, one individual from each group 1, 2, and 4 and two from group 3 shall be given one year terms, drawn by lot, so that one half of the membership rotates off each year. Terms shall run from August 15 to August 15.
Report of the Research Committee
on
Proposed Conflict of Interest Policy

The Administration has proposed new conflict of interest rules for all University employees which are appended to this report. Although these rules are meant to be applied to all employees, which include administrators, athletic coaches, classified employees and faculty, this report will primarily address the impact of the proposed policy on faculty.

The faculty are governed by the conflict of interest policy in the Faculty Manual (III-12). The Manual cites three additional documents:

2. Conflict of Interest Statutes (18USC 202-209).

The first is a general conflict of interest policy for state employees and officials. The latter two documents deal primarily with federally-funded research and consultations.

Although the stated intention of the proposed rules is to complement the provisions of the Faculty Manual relating to consulting and outside employment, the proposed rules are a significant extension of the present policy. If given broad interpretation, the proposed rules abrogate the provisions of the Faculty Manual on outside employment which could lead to the University's inability to retain existing faculty, to recruit new faculty or to improve faculty morale.

Our comments on the individual rules are as follows:

(a) and (b)

These proposed rules are meant to prevent conflict of interest in the purchasing of supplies, services and materials. This is adequately covered under the present Faculty Manual provisions (III:13) and the Rules of Conduct. The proposed rules extend the potential of conflict of interest from those firms in which the faculty have "significant financial interest" to merely "financial interest". Because of the complexity of our economic system, the lack of de minimis limits, such as those currently listed in the Rules of Conduct, may seriously impair the business of the University.
This proposed rule is directed at preventing an individual employee from providing consulting services that reasonably could have been provided by that employee through the University. This rule, broadly interpreted, could negate the current consulting policy. The current policy, which states "The University ... encourages consulting activities, provided that they present no conflict of interest and result in no diminution of the quantity and quality of professional services rendered to the University ....," appears to be sufficient to avoid conflict of interest if this policy is enforced by department heads and deans.

This proposed rule is intended to prevent an individual from "using his or her association with the University" for personal financial gain. In general, this area is covered under the present policy. Often it is difficult to separate the technical knowledge and the professional association of a faculty member. For example, some consulting activities, such as the review of academic programs at other universities, are a result of the faculty member's position as well as his or her technical knowledge. A broad interpretation of this rule could rescind portions of the consulting policy.

This proposed rule is designed to prevent conflict of interest by accepting gifts, fees, employment or anything else of value from a firm that is a supplier to the University. Two potential problems exist with this rule. Since the rule lacks de minimis limits, such as those in the Rules of Conduct, the acceptance of token gifts would be a conflict of interest. Secondly, this rule may be interpreted to prohibit some consulting and summer employment which is professionally beneficial to the faculty member as well as to the University. The present consulting policy, which requires the approval of the department head and dean, and the conflict of interest policy should be sufficient to prevent abuses.

This proposed rule prevents the use of University facilities, equipment and personnel for personal gain. The current policy prohibits the use of facilities and equipment for outside activities, and it carefully states the exceptions for consulting activities which have been allowed for the mutual benefit of the University and the faculty member. Any proposal to abandon this policy is in conflict with the Faculty Manual. In addition, this rule prohibits the use of University personnel for personal gain. Although there can be no question on the use of University personnel in their normal duty hours while being paid for University work, the total prohibition prevents legitimate joint consulting or outside activities. This appears to go well beyond conflict of interest needs.
This proposed rule prohibits the use of annual leave to circumvent the other proposed rules. For nine month faculty, it is stated that this includes the interval between Spring and Fall semesters. Clearly, two such intervals exist. The first is from May 17 to August 14. The second is the so-called "Christmas break." The Faculty Manual sets limits on outside employment in the August 15 - May 16 contract period (IV:12). Any extension of these limitations into the summer for faculty not employed by the University is an attempt to limit the activities of faculty when they are not under salary. Such an extension would be in direct conflict with the Faculty Manual that states that approval for consulting is not required for the period in which the faculty member is not employed by the University (III:14).

In summary, the proposed conflict of interest rules both interpret and extend the present policy of the Faculty Manual. Examples of the extensions are: deletion of de minimus limits on financial interests and gifts, weakening of the consulting policy such that a significant fraction of consulting could be ruled in conflict of interest, termination of any exceptions to the use of University facilities and equipment currently allowed, extension of consulting and other rules to unsalaried faculty during summer months and prohibition of any joint consulting or outside activities.

Since the proposed rules go far beyond interpretation of existing policy in the Faculty Manual, which was developed through the mutual agreement of the Faculty Senate and the University Administration, their implementation will require formal changes in the Manual. If they are meant only to be interpretation, they should be redrafted to avoid conflict with present policy.
Conflict of Interests

University personnel must follow a code of behavior that safeguards them and the University against the appearance as well as the reality of conflicts of interests. Actions such as those indicated below and all others that constitute conflicts of interest, potential conflicts of interests and the appearance of conflicts of interests will be avoided by persons who have the welfare of the University and their own welfare in mind.

In accordance with this principle, no University employee shall:

a) purchase, on behalf of the University, any materials, supplies or services from a firm or entity in which that employee has a financial interest;

b) influence any other employee in the selection of a vendor of materials, supplies or services so as to result in selection of a firm or entity in which the person bringing the influence to bear has a financial interest;

c) provide, or offer to provide, as an individual or through a firm, corporation, or entity other than the University, services for compensation that are the same or similar to those provided by that employee in the course of his or her employment with the University and which reasonably could have been provided by that employee as such through the University;

d) use his or her association with the University to further any commercial or other venture in which he or she has a financial interest;

e) accept a fee, gratuity, employment or anything else of value from an individual, firm or entity that supplies services or materials to the University if the University employee is in a position to select, or influence the selection of, the vendors who provide these services or materials to the University;
Conflict of Interests
Page Two

f) utilize the equipment, facilities or personnel of the University for personal gain;

the

g) utilize annual leave (or/interval between Spring and Fall semesters, if a nine-months employee) to circumvent the above provisions.

These rules are intended to complement the provisions of the Faculty Manual relating to consulting and outside employment and the relevant policy statements and procedures of the individual colleges. Any questions not resolved by these rules should be directed to the dean of the appropriate college.
July 12, 1983

Report from Policy Committee

Subject: Change in Faculty Manual II.J. - Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion, page II:14

The present wording requires a review of the complete file by the Provost in cases of reappointment during the probationary period as well as requests for tenure and promotion.

The volume of material submitted to the Provost in tremendous and much of it concerns reappointments recommended by the peer evaluation committee, department head, and the dean.

The major consequence is that there is insufficient time for the Provost to consider tenure, promotion, and reappointment in instances in which recommendations differ. The purpose of the change, therefore, is to stop the review of reappointments at the dean's level if the faculty member is not in his penultimate year and if all three recommendations (peer committee, department head, and dean) are positive.

The Suggested Change

A. At present the third paragraph of II.J. (p. II:14) reads as follows:

"The dean of the college shall review the recommendations by the departmental committee and the department head and shall forward the complete file to the Provost, along with a separate recommendation. A committee or committees may be established within the college to assist the dean in such reviews."

B. Proposed wording is:

"The dean of the college shall review the recommendations by the departmental committee and the department head and shall forward the complete file on all requests for tenure and promotion to the Provost, along with a separate recommendation. The dean of the college shall also forward the complete file on these requests for reappointment concerning which there are one or more negative recommendations from the departmental committee, the department head, or the dean. A committee or committees may be established within the college to assist dean in such reviews.

The Policy Committee recommends that the Senate go on record as being in favor of the change as detailed above."
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

June 7, 1983

1. Call to Order:

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

II. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the May 3 meeting were approved as distributed except for minor editorial changes.

III. Jim Strom, Director of Development:

Jim Strom addressed the Faculty Senate with regard to the present and future directions of the Office of Development. His office is one of the three fund-raising organizations on campus, the others being IPTAY and the Alumni Association. Though they have distinct goals, a considerable amount of interaction and cooperation exists between the Alumni Association and the Office of Development. IPTAY, of course, chooses to be completely separate.

The Development Office is responsible for securing funds for academic development with the primary focus being corporations, foundations and professional associations. Solicitations generally deal with annual gifts. State appropriations are used to pay for employee salaries and other expenses. This year the office raised around $3 million of which $1 million went for equipment. Three goals for the future are (1) to decentralize fund-raising to put directors of development at the college level, (2) to give better recognition to donors, and (3) to develop a program for researching prospects.

Jim Strom is also the Executive Director of the Clemson University Foundation. This organization deals with endowments for investment. Currently the endowment is $10.2 million with 80% being restricted funds. The return on the other $2 million in unrestricted funds pays that part of the salaries for some employees of the Development Office which is related to Foundation work.

The fund drive for building the Thurmond Institute and the Center the Performing Arts is a separate solicitation; however, the monies received are being handled by the Development Office. The source of money for programs for these two facilities is not yet decided.

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Scholastic Policy:

Senator Bauer reported that he and President Ulbrich met with Marvin Carmichael, the Director of Student Financial Aid. He stated that
Carmichael seeks faculty input with regard to ways to enhance his office's mission.

At its most recent meeting the committee discussed the problem of locked classroom buildings at times when classes are to be held. In this discussion it was noted that there are eight (8) days on weekends when faculty members have official commitments. Senator Senn expressed concern about Saturday classes during summer school and scheduling in general. President Ulbrich referred such matters to the Policy Committee.

The committee plans to consider the "plus/minus" grading system, student evaluation of teachers and the liability of student advisers. They also plan to meet with Dean Skelton to discuss admissions policies as well as the football eligibility requirements suggested in a missive to President Ulbrich from the Faculty Senate at UCLA.

B. Policy:

Senator Graham reported that the committee's overriding concern is the proposed new form for faculty evaluation by department heads. The committee is seeking comments on this matter. President Ulbrich stated that a copy of the ad hoc committee's report and comments from the Organization of Academic Department Heads, Dean Waller, and Professor Fulton would be distributed to all senators. The Policy Committee's report will hopefully be completed by August.

C. Research:

Senator Overcamp reported that collegial policies on indirect costs are a problem in only one college. He plans to get together with the senators in that college to work out the problems.

The next high priority item for the committee is the Provost's draft of a policy on conflict of interest. Copies of the draft are to be sent to all senators.

D. Welfare:

Senator McGregor elaborated on the report which he so thoughtfully submitted typed. (See Attachment A.)

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

A suggestion was made by Senator Baron that a letter be sent to the Open Forum concerning funds made available by the Athletic Department for the Learning Resources Lab in the College of Education while a cut was made in funds provided by the Athletic Department to the English Department for remedial courses. It was suggested that the funding cut was related to the lack of cooperation on the part of English in not letting individuals requested by Athletics teach certain courses. It was noted that Mathematical Sciences had received similar off-the-record requests from the Athletic Department. Questions were also raised by several senators concerning the availability of the Learning Resources Lab to non-
athletes. President Ulbrich asked Senators Burkett and Hamby to keep the Senate apprised of the use of the Learning Resources Lab, and Senators Palmer and Hill to report on the allegations concerning the English and Mathematical Sciences departments.

F. University Committees/Commissions/Councils:

Senator Senn reported that the University Planning Board has been quite active lately. Among the topics discussed at their most recent meeting was the safety problem with Highway 93. While some members stated that there was no problem and that nothing should be done, the recommendation was to take more time to consider the proper course of action. President Atchley has, however, committed to having some measures taken by August. The board thinks that a pedestrian overpass should be constructed (though much research has yet to be done as to what type of structure is best) and that the "teeing" of the intersection in front of Sikes is not a viable solution to the problem at this time. In the mean time they suggest (1) shoulder level lights, (2) hummers, (3) security personnel and (4) crosswalks made more visible.

The board approved basketball courts at the Clemson House and the location and design of the new chemistry building. One college has protested the design and location of the new chemistry building and President Ulbrich stated that she wants any suggestions concerning this matter. She plans to attend the next meeting of the Planning Board as a substitute for Senator Senn, at which time there will be further discussion on the chemistry building.

V. President's Report:

President Ulbrich expanded on some of the items discussed in Attachment B. She stated that the Long Range Planning Committee will hopefully be active by the fall. It was announced that the Faculty Manual Committee is seeking corrections for the manual and plans to get the next updates out by fall.

President Ulbrich stated that the reason that so few academicians join the SCSEA is the sliding scale fee for dues. With so few professors as members, higher education has no inside lobby to meet their special interests.

The proposed changes in the composition of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Committee will be presented to the President's Council with modifications. It will be recommended that two faculty members be elected by the Senate and two faculty members be appointed.

From the previously mentioned contact with Marvin Carmichael, it was learned that there is a move toward scholarships for recruiting and recognizing outstanding students, slightly away from the current emphasis on scholarships based on need. The change reflects a greater availability of other resources -- loans, grants, and work-study -- for needy students.

At a special meeting of the Athletic Council, a 5-4 vote kept wrestling as
a varsity sport even though the coach has left. Senator Baron asked about the changes in the Athletic Council recommended by the Senate that President Atchley said he would try to implement. President Ulbrich responded that President Atchley plans to present this to the Board of Trustees once all new board members and newly elected board officers are ready for action.

Among Senate details announced were (1) Jose Caban is to replace Mike Vatalaro who is going on sabbatical and Mark Hudson is to be the new alternate for Architecture, (2) the Open Forum is to be considered as an ad hoc committee for the near future, (3) resolutions are to be submitted to the secretary at least 12 calendar days before the next meeting, (4) Senator Senn wants suggestions with regard to procedural by-laws for the Senate.

VI. Old Business:

None.

VII. New Business:

Senator Bauer brought forth the Commission on Higher Education prerequisites for applicants to baccalaureate degree programs at public senior colleges and universities (Attachment C). It was mentioned that at the request of the Provost the CHE approved a change to having two (2) units of a foreign language. A motion to endorse the prerequisites was made and seconded.

In the ensuing discussion many questions went unanswered. Among these were: (1) Can all high schools offer such a program? (not sure, but they have until 1988 to get such a program), (2) Will we have varsity sports?, (3) Why physical education or ROTC?, (4) What about transfer and foreign students?

From questions that were answered several clarifications were made. The requirements would be binding for all students enrolling in baccalaureate degree programs at all senior colleges and universities in the state of South Carolina. These prerequisites entail more science and foreign language than current high school graduation requirements.

The motion passed 15-7.

In other business Senator Palmer moved adoption of resolution FS-83-6-1 (Attachment D). The motion passed unanimously.
VIII. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m. with the news of Chris Sieverdes being the father of a 9.5 pound baby boy.

Respectfully submitted,

Frederick W. Morgan
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments

Senators Absent (Substitute Present):
Welter, J. (Carter, G.)
Nocks, B. (Hudson, M.)
Behery, H.
Sheriff, J.
Burnett, W. (Conover, R.)
Dixon, M. (Melsheimer, S.)
McCullough, L. (Wainscott, S.)
Rudowski, V.
Taylor, R.
Manson, D.
Stutzenberger, F.
Welfare Committee Report
June 6, 1983

The Committee met on May 31.

1. A meeting called by Harry Durham to discuss Senate Resolution FS-83-4-3 was reviewed. Specific steps for providing information on South Carolina State Employees Association were agreed to at that meeting. A general informational meeting will be planned for the fall. The concerns in the Senate resolution seem on the way to successful resolution.

2. Status of the Long Range Planning Committee proposal was discussed. The Committee consensus was to use the Provost's suggestions for the responsibilities of the LRPC (self studies and personnel reductions planning and followup) and to proceed with establishing a broad-based LRPC. Welfare Committee makes no specific recommendations for editorial revision of the documents.

3. A questionnaire on annual leave policy has been distributed to 12-months faculty. Library faculty was inadvertently omitted, but this has been corrected. Returns to date have been excellent. Summary of returns is complicated by a wide range of suggestions.

4. A series of mini-courses on topics of interest to the faculty is being planned for the fall or spring semester. Anyone with program suggestions, or interested in working with Bill Baron on this, please contact him.

5. Proposals on health-wellness services or events are being held in abeyance while the Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee of the Commission on Faculty Affairs looks into the matter. The Welfare Committee will cooperate on any emerging proposal. We do have an offer for assistance in funding and constructing a jogging, exercise-station trail, and will follow up on this.
PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. The Grievance Counsellors have been appointed by the Advisory Committee and are available. They are Clarence Hood, Steve Melsheimer, and John Huffman. Encourage any faculty members with grievances to make use of their services.

2. The Advisory/Executive Committee met with the President and the Provost on May 24th to discuss long range planning. The meeting was helpful and wide-ranging. I think that we may have worked out some of the wrinkles in the Long Range Planning Committee.

3. I met with the newly established Faculty Manual Committee on May 26th. Steve Melsheimer is chairman. We drew for staggered terms for the Senate's nominees. Steve Melsheimer drew three years, John Idol two, and John Hamby one. The other members are Henry Vogel (elected by the Council of Deans), Doyce Graham (ex-officio), and Tolly Taylor from the Provost's Office (nonvoting). They hope to have the backlog of approved changes and editorial corrections ready for the September Board meeting.

4. The Council of Deans in its last two meetings took several actions of concern to the Senate:
   a) Tabled the proposed form for faculty evaluation by administrators pending a review by the Association of Department Heads and the Senate. I have forwarded the relevant correspondence to the new chairman of the Association of Department Heads, Alan Schaffer. (I also asked him to look at long range planning, particularly the Senate proposal, and to consider where the department heads fit in to the committee/commission structure.)
   b) Passed, after much debate and several modifications, the attached general education requirements. They now go to the President and implementation is expected for Fall 1984.

5. Davis McGregor, Dwight Camper, and I will be meeting with Harry Durham and several of his staff before the Senate meets and will have a report at that time on the resolution concerning publicizing SCSEA activities. The PR staff is reviewing their guidelines with respect to a number of organizations in terms of what should be covered in the newsletter.

6. A question has arisen with respect to the appointment of Adjunct Professors at the Strom Thurmond Institute without departmental affiliation. Dave Senn, Doyce Graham and I have a meeting scheduled with Horace Fleming on June 9th to discuss this. I have also invited Horace to come to the Senate, perhaps in July, to discuss the activities and plans of the institute.

7. There was some confusion about terms of college representatives on the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. They were being elected for one year terms. The Faculty Manual is unclear, but the constitution of the President's Council makes it clear that they are staggered one year terms. This
will be corrected beginning with this year's elections.

8. The President's Council did not meet this month. When it meets, I expect that the modification of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Committee will proceed in line with the Senate resolution. I have also discussed a review of the committee and commission structure with the President and I expect it will be initiated at that time.

9. Larry Bauer and I had a meeting scheduled with Marvin Carmichael to discuss financial aid and scholarship policy. We will have a report for you at the June 7 meeting.

10. I received a proposal from UCLA concerning freshman participation in varsity athletics. It was shared with the Advisory Committee and referred to Scholastic Policies. I also forwarded a copy to B.J. Skelton and he plans to send written comments.

11. The University Counsel, Ben Anderson, would like to have some discussions on problems of interpretation in Grievance Procedure II. We need to consider a procedure for review at the June 7th meeting.

12. A staff association of some kind is in the early stages of development. I will keep you posted.

13. The Advisory Committee decided not to send everyone both draft and final minutes. Henceforth you will receive one (draft) set of minutes; corrections will be noted in the next set. This should save on volume in filing and mailing.

14. The Senate President now has a 10-hour a week work-study student for the fall and spring semesters. This should be a big help with the copying, mailing, and filing. I hope that this is a permanent assignment.

15. Dean Waller has replaced Dean Amacher on the Commission on Faculty Affairs. Now that the problems with staggered terms on that Commission have been resolved, I hope to convene that Commission in June and begin work on several matters.
Report from
Scholastic Policies Committee

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on Tuesday, May 10, and discussed the attached prerequisites for applicants to public colleges and universities proposed by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. The committee recommends that the Senate go on record as being in favor of this concept and that Clemson University should adopt these prerequisites. The committee does feel that these should be considered minimal with the possibility the University or Colleges within the University might want to amend these requirements.
Prerequisites to be Required
Of Applicants to Baccalaureate Degree Programs,
Public Senior Colleges and Universities,
Effective Fall, 1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4: At least 2 having strong grammar and composition components, at least 1 in English literature and at least 1 in American literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3: Including at least Algebra I and II. A fourth unit, including geometry, is strongly recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Science</td>
<td>2: At least 1 unit each of 2 laboratory sciences chosen from biology, chemistry or physics. A third unit of a laboratory science is strongly recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Social Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>1: A second unit of the same language is strongly recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1: One unit of advanced mathematics or computer science or a combination of these; or one unit of world history or of international relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Ed or ROTC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FEK
4/7/83
Faculty Senate Resolution FS-83-6-1

WHEREAS final examinations and summer school classes routinely meet on Saturdays, and

WHEREAS it is difficult for students to attend classes in buildings that are locked, and

WHEREAS the practice of propping doors open with chairs, trash cans, or other convenient objects is contrary to fire codes and results in significant energy losses,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests the President of Clemson University to arrange to have doors to classroom buildings unlocked prior to classes and secured following classes on those Saturdays for which regular classes or examinations are scheduled.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

May 3, 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 April 12 were approved as distributed. Editorial corrections suggested by Senators Sieverdes and Senn were made at the close of the meeting.

III. Election of Representatives

The individuals chosen by the Faculty Senate to represent the faculty on various boards, commissions, and committees were elected. Senators Palmer and Nocks counted the ballots. The results are shown on Attachment A.

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Scholastic Policy:

Senator Bauer reported that the committee had not met as yet. He discussed briefly a number of topics which the committee will consider. These topics were the plus/minus grading system, continuing enrollment policy implementation, problems with Saturday exams, teacher evaluation and peer evaluation, excused absences, students advising, and registration. The committee’s most important issue will be admission policies.

Senator Bauer stated that Clemson University has until July 1 to decide whether or not to accept the prerequisites recommended by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. See Attachment B.

B. Policy:

Senator Graham reported that the committee had not met as yet. He discussed briefly the following items which the committee will investigate: faculty evaluation forms, questions regarding internal audits, and what constitutes a complete file for a faculty member up for tenure, promotion, etc.

C. Research:

Senator Overcamp reported that the committee had not met as yet. Several old topics which the committee will discuss are support for publications not covered by a grant or contract, lack of high-level secretarial support for technical typing, and the consulting, patent, and copyright policies. Two new topics to be discussed are policies for the return of indirect costs from grants or contracts and working with the Development Office for equipment/travel funds.
Senator Stutzenberger stated that there are some questions to be answered about matching funds for equipment. President Ulbrich said that previous policies are inoperative as of now but that she would keep the Senate informed on this matter.

Senator Baron suggested leaving the consulting, patent, and copyright policies as they stand.

D. Welfare:

Senator McGregor reported that the committee met with President Ulbrich and Senator Senn to discuss the work of this committee. Some topics carried over for consideration are the Long Range Planning Committee, annual leave policy for 12-month employees, a unified giving program, the S.C. State Employees' Association, and a health maintenance program. New items are early retirement incentives, possible part-time work after retirement, a faculty club building, mini-courses for faculty on topics like insurance, investments, health, etc. From his discussion it appears that a high priority item will be the establishment of a Faculty Day.

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

No reports.

F. University Committees/Commissions/Councils:

Senator Overcamp (Research Advisory Committee of the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research) reported the committee met on April 28 and discussed the following: (1) a draft "Proposed Research Policy Document" to be made available to the faculty and administration for comments; comments are requested prior to August 1, 1983; the report will be finalized in the fall, (2) formulation of a research procedures document, (3) the faculty interest in the Faculty Publications booklet which is being prepared for July, 1979 - June, 1981 at the expense of $10,000.

Senator Bauer (Recreation Committee) reported that the committee discussed family hours at Fike during the summer and voted to amend the existing policy with an expanded number of hours.

President Ulbrich (Commission on Undergraduate Studies) reported that the report on "satisfactory progress for a student" has been sent to a committee for deliberation. The withdrawal policy, FS 83-4-2, will be considered in the fall. Senator Privette inquired about the general education requirements. President Ulbrich stated that these are "caught in a loop" and that she would keep the Senate informed about their status.
V. President's Report:

President Ulbrich expanded on some of the items discussed in Attachment C. She stated that the Open Forum needs a non-senate faculty member to be appointed by the Provost and asked senators to advertise the existence of the Open Forum and encourage their constituents to submit letters for publication.

President Ulbrich stated that President Atchley wants to continue good communication with the Faculty Senate and is anxious for the Provost and himself to meet with Senate Advisory Committee. She said that the President is unsure as to what to recommend with regard to the widening of Highway 93. The options are to have Hwy. 93 widened to four lanes with a median, left turn lanes at Newman Road and S. Palmetto Blvd., bicycle paths, and sidewalks or to leave it as is. If the highway is not widened to five lanes between Newman Road and S. Palmetto Blvd., then highway funds would not be available for the proposed bicycle lanes and sidewalks, so that those would also be terminated at Newman Road.

President Ulbrich reported that pedestrian activated lights have been approved for the two crosswalks in front of Sikes and that making the intersection in front of Sikes into a "T" is a possibility.

President Ulbrich called for volunteers for faculty orientation. She stated that Senators Camper and McGregor and herself are to meet with the Commission on Public Programs to discuss the SCSEA resolution, FS 83-4-3.

V. Old Business:

President Ulbrich opened the floor to discussion on the Long Range Planning Committee that the Faculty Senate has suggested be created. Senators Manson, Privette, and Sieverdes stated that their respective deans are basically in favor of its creation.

Senator Hudson moved that the Senate affirm it stand on the on the present description of the committee. After the motion was seconded, Senator Baron stated that the Vice-Provost and Associate Deans should not be considered for membership. Senator Manson moved that Part III.1. should read:

Two deans selected by the Council of Academic Deans.

The motion was seconded. After some discussion the amendment was voted down 12 - 14.

Senator Taylor moved that the above-mentioned section read:

Two deans or associate deans selected by the Council of Academic Deans.

The amendment was seconded and passed unanimously. The original motion in support of the Long Range Planning Committee as described passed unanimously.

President Ulbrich opened the floor for discussion on the wording of the
operating procedures of the Long Range Planning Committee. The current wording was accepted unanimously.

VII. New Business:

President Ulbrich opened the floor to discussion on Attachment D with regard to the composition of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Committee. Senator Sieverdes moved that we favor the composition to be changed to have one faculty member appointed by the Provost and two faculty members selected by the Senate to have one year terms. The motion passed unanimously.

Senator Taylor asked for senators to submit to him a list of all books recently published that are authored by Clemson faculty members.

VII. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Frederick W. Morgan
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments

Senators Absent (Substitute Present):
Coston, D. (Carter, G.)
Behery, H.
Hamby, J. (Pate, H.)
Burnett, W.
McCollough, L.
Bishop, M.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>Muriel Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Graduate Studies and Research</td>
<td>Joe Dickey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>Bill Baron, John Welter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Student Affairs</td>
<td>Muriel Bishop (1 yr. term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pam Kline (1 yr. term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Sieverdes (1 yr. term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Public Programs</td>
<td>Robert Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Board</td>
<td>Larry Hudson, Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merrill Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hassan Behery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Rudowski, Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arlene Privette, Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Awards Committee</td>
<td>Bob Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer School Committee</td>
<td>David Swanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Program Committee</td>
<td>Robert Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depositories Committee</td>
<td>Maureen Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Education Committee</td>
<td>Verner Burkett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts Committee</td>
<td>Michael Vatalaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Doyce Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape and Site Development Committee</td>
<td>D. C. Coston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Fire Prevention Committee</td>
<td>Buddy Dillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Parking Committee</td>
<td>John Gowdy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped Students Committee</td>
<td>Verner Burkett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Forum Committee</td>
<td>Fred Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and Drug Abuse Committee</td>
<td>Dwight Camper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Brown (1 yr. term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Sieverdes (1 yr. term)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greek Affairs Committee

Financial Aid, Student Employment and Placement Committee

Recreation Advisory Committee

University Union Board

Patent Committee

Faculty Manual Committee

Wesley Burnett (1 yr. term)
Chris Sieverdes (2 yr. term)

Bill Baron (2 yr. term)

Joe Dickey (3 yr. term)

Dwight Camper (1 yr. term)

Clarence Hood (1 yr. term)

John Hamby (1 yr. term)
Steve Melsheimer (3 yr. term)
John Idol (2 yr. term)

Unexpired Terms

Housing Committee

Financial Aid, etc.

Recreation Advisory Committee

Security and Lighting Committee

D. P. Miller (expires 1985)

Ed Olive (expires 1984)

Mable Wynn (expires 1984)
Larry Bauer (expires 1985)

Beth Reuland (expires 1985)
Report from
Scholastic Policies Committee

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on Tuesday, May 10, and discussed the attached prerequisites for applicants to public colleges and universities proposed by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. The committee recommends that the Senate go on record as being in favor of this concept and that Clemson University should adopt these prerequisites. The committee does feel that these should be considered minimal with the possibility the University or Colleges within the University might want to amend these requirements.
Prerequisites to be Required
Of Applicants to Baccalaureate Degree Programs,
Public Senior Colleges and Universities,
Effective Fall, 1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>At least 2 having strong grammar and composition components, at least 1 in English literature and at least 1 in American literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Including at least Algebra I and II. A fourth unit, including geometry, is strongly recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>At least 1 unit each of 2 laboratory sciences chosen from biology, chemistry or physics. A third unit of a laboratory science is strongly recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Social Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A second unit of the same language is strongly recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>One unit of advanced mathematics or computer science or a combination of these; or one unit of world history or of international relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Ed or ROTC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. I am writing this report after only ten days as your President, so bear with me as I get the hang of things. The first ten days have been marked by a flood of phone calls, memos in both directions, and meetings, as I try to get the Senate organized and touch base with all the people that I need to work with in the next twelve months.

2. I met with Boo Cheney and Jack McKenzie of the PR staff to discuss, among other matters, the Open Forum. They are anxious to get it off the ground. We need some good letters for the initial issue. Encourage your faculty and staff to write.

3. John Fulton, who chaired the ad hoc committee of the Commission on Faculty Affairs which was looking at the faculty evaluation form, has written a summary report to accompany the recommended new forms, which I distributed at the Council of Deans on April 18th. They plan to get comments back in July. I am referring it also to the Policy Committee for their comments and suggestions, and the Association of Department Heads is looking at it.

4. Also at the Council of Deans, the Provost made available the suggested list of high school courses to be taken prior to admission to South Carolina state colleges and universities. This list was proposed by the Commission on Higher Education. Some of you have probably already seen the list. I would like to have the Scholastic Policies look at it and make comments. The Provost also made a partially facetious but also partially serious request that the Policy Committee come up with an interpretation of what constitutes a "complete file" for a candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion. He is apparently getting truckloads of files and would like to reduce it to a manageable volume.

5. The Undergraduate Commission will be taking a close look at the definition of satisfactory progress in our March resolution, to iron out some wrinkles and complications. They will also be looking at our recommended withdrawal and reinstatement policy when they convene again in the fall.

6. I met with the President on April 22nd and discussed a wide range of pending matters. He is most interested in continuing the dialogues initiated last year between him and the Provost and the advisory/executive committee of the Senate, so I will try to set a meeting for late May or early June. Long range planning is a possible topic. I would welcome suggestions of other topics. We usually go with a single topic agenda. We also discussed the Highway 93 situation. I will be attending a meeting on that the day before the Senate meets and will report to you at the meeting. Finally, we discussed some possible avenues of communication on matters of faculty concern with the Board of Trustees. We will be pursuing that later in the summer. He also reiterated his sincere appreciation for our concern and support over the last few months.

7. Long range planning is still in the works. I distributed a copy of our original proposal to the Academic Deans at the Council of Deans meeting. Please try to discuss this proposal with your
dean. As soon as new officers take over, I will also try to initiate discussions with the Association of Department Heads. Welfare Committee will be meeting before the Senate meets so we may have some additional input at that time.

8. Secretary Fred Morgan is preparing a "Senate notebook" with more or less permanent materials—roster, calendar, committee assignments, simplified parliamentary procedure, representatives on University Committees and Councils, etc. He hopes to have it ready before the June meeting. If you have any suggestions on what would be useful to you in the notebook, pass them on to Fred.

9. I was a little slow in getting the procedure down pat for forwarding resolutions, and we only had three weeks between meetings, so I have not heard from either the Grievance Counselor resolution or the SCSEA resolution at this writing. I will let you know if I hear anything in the interim.

10. I know that many of you are involved in helping with election of college representatives to University Committees and Commissions. This is supposed to be completed by May 1st. If I can be of any help in sorting out membership of the Commission on Faculty Affairs or committees under it, please call on me. Chris Thurston of the Office of University Research can help with the Graduate Commission and committees under it as well as the Patent Committee. Vice Provost Reel has his commission and its numerous committees exceptionally well organized and has already notified colleges of elections.

11. The Senate telephone line was transferred promptly (April 13th!). You can reach me at 2456.

13. We will be electing our representatives to University Commissions and committees at the beginning of the May 3rd meeting. The Advisory Committee made nominations based on your preference sheets and recommendations, with due consideration to spreading the responsibilities among senators and among college units. I have attached an excerpt from the constitution of the President's Council concerning the relation of the Faculty Senate to such Commissions. Please keep in mind our right of referral as you serve on these committees and commissions.
Section 3. **Referral** - The Commissions shall seek the position of the Faculty Senate and Student Government on matters of general faculty and student concern prior to formulation of policy proposals. Any member of a Commission who believes there is a need for clarification on the position of the Faculty Senate or believes there is general faculty concern, may request referral to the Faculty Senate, whereupon, when seconded and approved by majority vote, Commission action shall be deferred until the Faculty Senate reports or 60 days have elapsed after the matter has been referred to the Faculty Senate. Such action may occur only once on a given matter.
THE COMMISSION ON STUDENT AFFAIRS

Item: The Commission on Student Affairs unanimously approved a recommendation by the Chairman of the Executive Board on Student Services that the composition of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Committee be changed as follows:

A. Drop one of the two faculty appointments made by the Faculty Senate President.
B. Add one student appointment to be made by the Student Body President.
C. Make all student and faculty appointments for one year.

The changes will balance faculty (3), staff (3), and student (3) representation on this committee.

If approved, the composition will be:

New: The Committee shall consist of three Student Affairs staff members nominated by the Vice President for Student Affairs; two faculty members nominated by the Vice President for Student Affairs; one faculty member nominated by the President of the Faculty Senate; two undergraduate students, one nominated by the Student Senate and one nominated by the Panhellenic Council/Interfraternity Council. The Coordinator of Alcohol and Drug Education (Associate Dean of Student Life) shall serve as an ex-officio member. Unless otherwise specified, members will serve one year terms. The chairperson shall be elected by the committee each year and approved by the Vice President for Student Affairs.

Old: The Committee shall consist of three Student Affairs staff members nominated by the Vice President for Student Affairs; two faculty members nominated by the Vice President for Student Affairs; two faculty members nominated by the President of the Faculty Senate to serve two year overlapping terms; two undergraduate students, one nominated by the Student Senate to serve a two year term, and one nominated by the Panhellenic Council/Interfraternity Council. The Coordinator of Alcohol and Drug Education (Associate Dean of Student Life) shall serve as an ex-officio member. Unless otherwise specified, members will serve one year terms. The chairperson shall be elected by the committee each year and approved by the Vice President for Student Affairs.