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MINUTES
of the
FACULTY SENATE
of
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

June 1987 through Dec. 1987
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
June 9, 1987

I. CALL TO ORDER
President Mullins called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes of April 28, 1987 were approved as corrected.

III. SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY
President Mullins introduced Dr. Gary Ransdell, Vice-President for Institutional Advancement. Dr. Ransdell comes to Clemson from SMU, where he served as Director of Alumni Relations and Executive Director of the Alumni Association. President Mullins noted that one of the items Dr. Ransdell would probably be discussing, is the funding of a Performing Arts Center, which has been included in the Five Year Permanent Improvement Plan for fiscal year 1989. Mullins expressed his support for this project by welcoming Dr. Ransdell with a personal gift to open the account for that project. Mullins noted that the new Freedom of Information Act does not permit him to remain anonymous, so he announced that his gift would contribute approximately 0.005% of the total goal for the Performing Arts Center.

Dr. Ransdell thanked President Mullins and reported that there is already $100,000 from the Camp family in that account. The same family has made a $1,000,000 revokable bequest for the Performing Arts Center. Vice-President Larson has also planned for partial funding through an add-on student fee.
Hopefully, construction will begin within the next year or so. The date should be established within the next six months. In any case, the plan is to have the Center not be totally contingent on either private donations or state funds. The Performing Arts Center is expected to cost in the area of $12,000,000. This is one of two or three planned "brick and mortar" projects in a special campaign. The campaign is expected to raise 25% of the total needed for these projects.

Ransdell briefly described the organizational changes, which he has planned and is implementing, in the Institutional Advancement Division (see Attachment A). Previously, there were three units in this division: Institutional Development, Alumni Relations, and University Relations. Within these areas there was some duplication of effort and many people were involved in administrative activities. The reorganization adds a new area, called Advancement Services. This addition will permit the development staff to be free from many administrative tasks and to concentrate on raising funds. It will also provide for more thorough donor research. The reorganization did create new positions, however these were created from restructuring current positions rather than the addition of exempt personnel.

The division of Institutional Advancement employs 107 people. This total includes Vice-President Ransdell, 4 Associate Vice-Presidents, and 22 Directors or managers. Sixty-nine exempt and non-exempt staff are in the area of University Relations. There are seven professional staff in the Development Office and four in the Alumni Office. Two new positions have been created in the Development Office, the Director of Major Gifts, and the Campaign Manager. These positions are currently being
filled and are being funded from the capital campaign budget, not state funds, although Ransdell plans that they will become state lines within five years. There are also three new secretarial positions within this division.

The Development Office function is to raise new funds and bring in old ones. The Alumni Office does programming and relations among the University constituency. University Relations does image enhancement and carries out functions related to external relations of the University in the community, region and nation.

Ransdell reviewed current plans for the Capital Campaign, which is the private dollar side of the Second Century Program. The Campaign is expected to raise about $62,500,000 in new money. Recent history at Clemson has revealed the beginnings of several campaigns but there is little evidence of completed funding. The Strom Thurmond Campaign is nearly complete; however building will not start until the pledges are paid.

A campaign case is in the beginning stage of development although the initial breakdown is only a rough estimate prior to obtaining further input. The breakdown of the campaign will include about $14,000,000 in institutional endowment, $14,000,000 in student scholarships, $7,000,000 for ongoing programs (Thurmond Institute, Calhoun Mansion, etc.), $8,000,000 as an endowment for equipment and the remainder for the "brick and mortar" projects. The Loyalty Fund will be included in the Capital Campaign for five years. Ransdell noted the importance of raising about 60% of the goal prior to public announcement of the campaign. Failure
to do this advance fund raising, and lack of clear definite priorities are the major reasons that campaigns do not reach the goal. The plan is to function in an "enhanced major gifts mode" for the next year or so and then announce a Capital Campaign. It is not important to conduct a Capital Campaign in conjunction with a centennial celebration. It is important to have advance preparation, clear goals, and knowledge of sources of money before starting a campaign. The centennial celebration will provide an excellent opportunity to develop interest in Clemson and enthusiasm for supporting the University.

Senator Daniels asked whether research indicates that it is better to conduct several major campaigns simultaneously, or to concentrate on one campaign. Ransdell said that, for Clemson University, which is not yet fully organized in a decentralized mode, it is important to have one campaign in which all have agreed on priorities.

President Mullins asked if there is a target date for establishment of the priorities. Ransdell replied that he expects the priorities to be determined by the end of the summer. The current timetable includes moving into a leadership gifts drive during the fall.

During the past months there has also been considerable effort directed toward development of standards for various levels of giving. Many of these standards have been significantly raised from the previous levels.

Agreement has been reached regarding a spending policy. This policy addresses what will be spent and what part of an endowment will be
invested to continue provision of long range income. The Deans will be communicating with their faculty about this issue as each College assumes responsibility for the portion of endowment income that will be spent.

Three years ago the Development Office formed major gift clubs which enabled enhancement of programs. However these clubs did not emphasize annual giving. Thus, the clubs are not set up to ensure stable annual income. They must be revised to include annual incentives. The clubs brought in about $15,000,000. However, of that amount, $5,000,000 was deferred money, $5,000,000 was "recaptured" (previously given) money, half of the remainder reflected one-time gifts to the Strom Thurmond project, thus, really only about $2,500,000 was new money. This emphasizes the need for new policies on donations, especially deferred gifts. Ransdell said paying on a $25,000 Life Insurance policy, which won't pay off for 25 or 30 years, does not reflect the same kind of sacrifice as giving a large sum of money annually. It is getting recognition without much sacrifice. The annual giving credited for this kind of arrangement should be the amount of the premium and the new cash value of the policy. Unfortunately, the groups most likely to be affected by changes of this type are faculty and staff.

Senator Hedden asked about development of funds through CURF. Ransdell said that CURF will deal with grants and contracts, money which comes primarily from corporations and foundations for contracted purposes, rather than from individuals. This money is not really a gift. CURF will serve as a repository for funds for which the donor receives a service in return. Clemson University Foundation is the recipient of private gifts.
President Mullins asked how the current policy of organizational matching gifts to IPTAY being placed into a scholarship fund would be affected. The answer amplified on the policy of many organizational matching funds which prevent use of these funds by the athletic department. Ransdell said that when the gift is restricted the match can go somewhere else.

Senator Daniels asked about funding for the Professorship Teaching Awards. Ransdell said this was a case of approval before there was funding. Under the changes being made, the Foundation will make grants to various University divisions in a manner similar to obtaining grants from outside Foundations. The entire amount available will be budgeted at the beginning of the year. The Foundation will receive requests from David Maxwell who will make the decisions about where that money will be allocated. The goal is to make the decision making at the point of the expertise and also to make the entire process more open.

Senator Nowaczyk asked how much money would be needed to complete the Strom Thurmond project. Ransdell reported that the project would cost about $6,000,000. Most of that amount, about $4,000,000, is currently in the bank. Most of the remainder has been pledged and is being paid. However, construction will begin as the entire funding is assured. Ransdell added that the auditorium will be included in the building, primarily due to the personal efforts of Senator Thurmond.

President Mullins thanked Dr. Ransdell for speaking to the Senate and expressed his wish that such communication can continue in the future.
IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Policy. Senator Bryan reported that one meeting has been held and that there is a motion resulting from that meeting which will be introduced under Old Business. The Policy Committee has begun consideration of the report of the ad hoc committee on Governance.

B. Research. Senator Birrenkott offered the report (Attachment B). He added that the latest draft of the CURF policies and procedures is being circulated. The Committee will meet and review this draft before June 22, 1987.

C. Scholastic Policies. Senator Hedden read the report (Attachment C).

D. Faculty Welfare. Senator Daniels reported that the priority items for this committee during the academic year 1987-88 would include: Fringe benefits, retirement (especially early retirement), international students and faculty, salaries, sexual harassment, evaluation of promotion, tenure, and appointment renewal policies, and departmental distribution to faculty of teacher ratings. He added that it seemed that a number of people were vitally concerned with the issue of Coke vs. Pepsi.

E. Commissions and Committees.

The joint Clemson-Clemson University Committee. Senator Nowaczyk reported that the issues to be considered included traffic and parking, bicycle paths, recreational use of facilities, and privatization. The committee will discuss the possibility that private firms could provide certain services better than the State.

Senator Derr reported for the University Traffic and Parking Committee. The administration did not accept the recommendation that employees be allowed to register unlimited numbers of motor
vehicles. An administrative policy that only 2 vehicles can be registered will be in effect this fall. This will not change the policy that an employee can have only one of these cars on campus at any given time.

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT.

President Mullins called attention to several items in his report and update (Attachment D). There have been changes in the Five Year Permanent Improvements Plan (Item 1). The Message Center and Day Care Center have been deleted (page 5). The Continuing Education Center has been added. This item is listed at $8,000,000 but will actually cost approximately $13,000,000. The difference is accounted for in the $5,000,000 already available for this project. The Day Care Center is included as a footnote, as it is dependent on ascertaining funding. Mullins noted the importance of the Johnstone renovations which are planned to occur over the next 12 years.

In addition to the discussion of Athletic Council participation in hiring of coaches (Item 2), Mullins called attention to the recent statements by Sheehan regarding use of Athletic Funds for academic purposes. The implications of these statements are unclear but deserve further consideration.

Faculty should be aware of the impact of "bottom line budgeting" (Item 9). Whether this process affects faculty employment recommendations needs to be monitored. If there is a relationship then it is probable that the number of grievances filed will increase.
Attention is also called to the change in the internal grant process (Item 10). This change may or may not result in greater fairness and economy.

Senator Nowaczyk asked for further comment regarding the Athletic Council discussions relating to hiring of coaches. Mullins replied that the Athletic Director essentially hires the person with the approval of Vice-President Lomax and President Lennon. There is no further input into this process. It seems that Mr. Robinson keeps a current list of choices for each coaching position and can replace any resignee within hours. Senator Baron asked why the Council approved this process. Mullins said that it seemed the Council had accepted the lengthy argument, presented by Robinson, of his need for flexibility.

V. OLD BUSINESS.

Senator Bryan moved adoption of the resolution relating to the number and rank of grievance counselors (Attachment E). Seconded. Senator Daniels questioned the selection process of grievance counselors. Mullins clarified that the Faculty Manual specifies that they are named by the Advisory Committee of Senate.

Senator Baron questioned the presence of a quorum.

After making a count, President Mullins verified the continued presence of a quorum.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. The resolution 87-6-1 passed.
VI. NEW BUSINESS.

Senator Nowaczyk reported that President Lennon will be firing the shotgun in the Third Annual Downhill Run for charity.

Senator Birrenkott requested that the Policy Committee expeditiously examine the question of adding additional members to the Grievance Board. The number of grievances seems to be increased, resulting in greater workload for the members of the Grievance board, and in turn, lengthening the time required for resolution of the problems. Agreement existed that this is an important item for the Policy Committee to examine.

VII. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

MaryAnn B. Reichenbach, Secretary


MAR/tlt
ATTACHMENT B.

FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
June, 1987

The committee met on May 20 at 9 am in room 108 Long Hall. Special guests at this meeting included Drs. N. D. Camper, H. Skipper, E. Kline, D. Klupfel, P. Burrows, Dean B. Box (Forestry and Recreation Resources), Dr. O. J. Dickerson (Plant Pathology/Physiology Department Head), and Dr. J. Mullins (President, Faculty Senate). This was the first of several meetings that this group will be holding around the state to let people know about an industrial-CU initiative in biotechnology. The laboratory and field experimentation involves two colleges, Sciences and Agricultural Sciences, although faculty from other disciplines are working on engineering and social issues associated with this and similar projects.

I believe that the faculty senators present were cautiously optimistic about this research initiative. We have concerns about this technology and any environmental release of genetically engineered microorganisms but realize that we are not experts in this area and that fear of any unknown may be playing a large role in our acceptance of the technology. We were also briefed on the various groups which must review and approve these projects from the on-campus Institutional Biosafety Committee to the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington.

The Faculty Senate Research Committee has received the latest draft of the proposed Policies and Procedures Manual for the Clemson University Research Foundation (CURF). A group of faculty members have been working with the Office of University Research (OUR) and Al McCracken (Budgets and Planning) to answer objections raised in a previous open meeting of the Faculty Senate Research Committee. The inclusion of a faculty advisory committee to CURF with elected faculty from all colleges and the library is one of the major issues we have raised and pressed for from the administration. This summer or early in the fall semester we will hold another open meeting in hopes of getting more faculty input into how CURF will operate and benefit the faculty.

If anyone has any items for consideration by the Faculty Senate Research Committee please feel free to forward them to me or any of the members listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Chair
Glenn Birrenkott Jr.

FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE 1987-88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael J. Drews</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>286 Sirrine Hall</td>
<td>-5955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William P. DuBose III</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>101 Long Hall</td>
<td>-5042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph L. Hammond</td>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>102 Riggs Hall</td>
<td>-5908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward B. Pivorum</td>
<td>Biological Sc</td>
<td>348 Long Hall</td>
<td>-3592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Ryan</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>0-317 Martin</td>
<td>-3818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis G. Tesolowski</td>
<td>Industrial Ed</td>
<td>G-01 Tillman</td>
<td>-3656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn P. Birrenkott</td>
<td>Poultry Sci</td>
<td>134 P&amp;AS Bldg</td>
<td>-4019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This year has been an exciting and busy one for the committee and for researchers at CU. The committee began the year under the leadership of Dr. E. P. Stillwell. Senator Stillwell resigned as chairman because of pressing research and teaching commitments. At that time Dr. Birrenkott assumed the role of chairman of the Faculty Senate Research Committee.

The following issues were explored and either resolved, remitted to another committee or commission, or a decision reached that it was not a problem:

1. The 800/600 level requirement for students pursuing a Masters degree
2. The strategic defense initiative & whether we needed a special statement in the Faculty Manual on what types of research could or should CU be engaged in
3. The Clemson Land Use Planning Board
4. Return of overhead monies
5. Input into the Cooper Library's Five Year Plan

The following items were discussed and are on the agenda for continued input by 1987-88 Faculty Senate Research Committee:

1. The Clemson University Research Foundation (CURF) Bylaws
   Policies and Procedures Manual
2. The Emerging Technologies Development and Marketing Center
3. The research environment at CU

The deliberations of the committee were made considerably easier this year by the excellent cooperation of the personnel in the Office of University Research (OUR), Budgets and Planning and the Graduate School. Several of our meetings were open to the OUR Faculty Advisory Committee and other faculty members identified by the Advisory/Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. These well-attended meetings showed the administration the depth of faculty concern over research issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Glenn Birrenkott Jr.
Chair

FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE 1986-87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Office Location</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael J. Drews</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>286 Sirrine Hall</td>
<td>-5955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Haselton</td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>238 Brackett</td>
<td>-5015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Hedden</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>256 Lehotsky</td>
<td>-4832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Lyson</td>
<td>Ag Econ</td>
<td>219 Barre Hall</td>
<td>-3374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Moran</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>205 Strode</td>
<td>-2655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Snelsire</td>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>209 Riggs</td>
<td>-5915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis G. Tesolowski</td>
<td>Industrial Ed</td>
<td>G-01 Tillman</td>
<td>-3656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. P. Stillwell</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>103 Kinard</td>
<td>-5320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn P. Birrenkott</td>
<td>Poultry Sci</td>
<td>134 P&amp;AS Bldg</td>
<td>-4019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE SCHOLASTIC POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

June 9, 1987

The Scholastic Policy committee met on June 4th. The main item of business was a discussion of potential items for the committee's consideration during the upcoming senate year. High priority will be given to resolving the issue of common exam scheduling. Other items of potential interest were discussed including advising and academic exceptions, but no decisions on a final agenda were made. The discussion of priority items will continue at the next committee meeting.

Members present: Alice Derr; J. C. McConnell; Leo Gaddis; Roy Hedden; Robert Kosinski.
1. I have included a revised draft copy of the Five-Year Permanent Improvements Plan, Fiscal Years 1988-89 through 1992-93 (Pres. Rpt.#1). This is an important document for you to share with your constituents and make suggestions to your Faculty Senate representatives on the Facilities Planning Committee. The members, in addition to myself, are Ron Nowaczyk and Larry Dyck. Martin Davis is our faculty representative from the College of Architecture. There are several important changes from the previous draft copy. Some of these changes are a result of discussions in the past several meetings of the Facilities Planning Committee. Of particular importance to all faculty is the inclusion of a Performing Arts Center in fiscal year 89. I have not been able to talk with Gary Ransdell about the Performing Arts Center because he has been out of town the past week. I will keep the Senate informed on the details of this at the June meeting. Gary will probably discuss his plans for the PAC at the meeting.

2. At the May meeting of the Athletic Council the Structure of the Athletic Council as presented at the May meeting of the Faculty Senate was approved with minor changes. One amendment to add under Responsibilities and Functions of the Athletic Council the statement, "participation in the screening of applicants for the positions of athletic director and head coaches of all intercollegiate sports", was amended to "participation in the screening of applicants for the position of Director of Athletics". This change produced considerable debate.

3. The matter of sexual harassment continues to be discussed in both the President's Cabinet and in the Council of Academic Deans. The President urges everyone to be particularly sensitive to this problem. The best way to deal with the problem is to be aware of the repercussions and to prevent its occurrence. We also discussed the subject in the Faculty Senate Advisory/Executive committee meeting, and the Welfare Committee may sponsor a seminar at some future date on the subject.

4. I have discussed with Dean Ben Box the possibility of having some of the faculty involved in the current research dealing with biotechnology present to the Senate an overview of the research and the problems dealing with public reaction to the research. As you have observed, there was considerable public reaction to the recent tests in California on organisms used to protect fruit against cold. There is a distinct possibility that Clemson University will be involved in the near future with contract research with an industrial firm which will involve field testing a micro-organism which has been genetically engineered. Ben suggested that his group make a presentation to the Faculty Senate in June, but since we had invited Gary Ransdell, I suggested the July meeting.

5. A number of Coke (the soft drink) lovers have complained about the absence of the soft drink in the vending machines. According to Steve Copeland of the business office this was not intended, but was a result of an attempt to keep soft drink prices at $.50. A few machines of WOMETCO containing Cokes will be placed in large demand areas, but the existing contract will not be renegotiated until next January.

6. I am enclosing an excellent article (Pres. Rpt. #2) on asbestos which appeared in the current issue of American Scientist. We need to be as knowledgeable as possible on this subject.
President's Update

7. An act was passed by the General Assembly and approved 5/13/87 by the Governor to provide for the implementation of early retirement by faculty at public institutions of higher education (Pres. Rpt. #3).

8. The draft copy of the Five-Year Permanent Improvement Plan Fiscal years 1988-89 through 1992-93 dated May 29, 1987, which was distributed to you with today’s agenda has been further revised as follows:

   (1) Message Center and Day Care Center deleted
   (2) Continuing Education Center added to the list on page 5 as Priority 89-1 with an estimated cost of $8,000,000. This does not include the $5,000,000 already available in the form of a Capital Improvement Bond (CIB).
   (3) Other minor cost estimation revisions and project moves to different fund sources.
   (4) A footnote on page 5 states that the Day Care Center, an athletic academic center, and a fraternity row are in the initial stages of conceptualization. These proposals, if financially feasible and acceptable to the University, could be initiated in FY 89 or FY 90.

9. The collegiate deans have been primarily concerned with the impact of the current budget and implementation of the new bottom line budgeting procedure. The new procedure is being implemented differently in each college, and at present it is not clear what effect it will have on faculty. One aspect of the procedure that troubles me, and that I raised with the Deans and David Maxwell, is whether or not the return of lapsed salaries to a college or department would influence the department head or dean in a tenure recommendation.

10. The Council of Deans has approved a plan to provide a committee within each college to rank the proposals submitted for University Research Grants and Provost Research Awards. This arose from a complaint concerning the present efficiency and fairness in the distribution of awards. I am not sure that this will save time, it may be fairer, but this means 9 more committees. I will let our Research Committee review the change as soon as I receive the details.
(R139, H2551)

AN ACT TO AMEND THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, 1976, BY ADDING SECTION 59-103-150 SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EARLY RETIREMENT PLANS BY PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

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

Early retirement plans for public institutions of higher education

SECTION 1. Chapter 103 of Title 59 of the 1976 Code is amended by adding:

"Section 59-103-150. (A) As long as there is no impact on state appropriations and subject to approval by the governing body of the public institution of higher education, the institution may implement an early retirement plan for its faculty to accomplish the following objectives:

(1) reallocate institutional resources;
(2) provide an equitable method to increase the flexibility of the institution to effect cost-saving measures;
(3) foster intellectual renewal;
(4) provide increased opportunities for promotion of a younger faculty;
(5) improve the opportunity to recruit qualified women and minorities.

(B) An early retirement plan may include provisions for institutions to pay:

(1) actuarial costs required by Sections 9-1-1850 and 9-11-60;
(2) health, dental, and life insurance costs;
(3) incentive payments;
(4) the costs of single premium annuity plans to provide supplemental benefits."
Clemson University
Five-Year Permanent Improvements Plan
Fiscal Years 1988-89 through 1992-93

29 May 1987
Introduction

All State agencies are required to submit a Five-Year Permanent Improvements Plan (OPIP) to either the Commission on Higher Education or the Budget and Control Board on 1 July of odd-numbered years. Clemson University develops two plans. One is for Education and General (E&G) projects and the other is for Public Service Activities (PSA).

The five-years plans are the primary mechanism for requesting capital improvement bonds (CIBs) from the State. The plans are reviewed, projects are prioritized and debated, and a bond bill is passed the following June, the even numbered year.

A secondary purpose of the plan is to indicate what projects are planned with funds available from each agency's own sources. These fund sources could include general appropriations, student fees, private donations, operating revenues, institution and revenue bonds, and non-traditional financing mechanisms.

This document provides a brief summary of existing projects and outlines both the PSA and the E&G 5-year plans. The plans are summarized by expected funding source - PSA CIBs, PSA other funds, E&G CIBs, campus funds, revenue producing activities, and other fund sources.

Existing Projects

54 established projects representing an investment of $42,671,737.22 will be carried over into FY 88. 23 additional projects budgeted at $7,450,000 have been proposed for approval in the Annual Permanent Improvements Programs. There are 9 PSA projects with a total budget of $14,681,615. The majority of these are funded by CIBs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Author</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,839,215</td>
<td>PEE DEE Research &amp; Education Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>Pesticide Storage Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229,600</td>
<td>Swine Service Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415,000</td>
<td>Hobcaw Barony Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,140,000</td>
<td>Completion of Lehotsky Basement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>Replacement for Pendleton Rd. Insectary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,400,000</td>
<td>Show and Sale Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,444,815</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The balance of $239,800.00 represents a combination of fund sources including private gifts, camper fees, and appropriated funds.
The 68 E&G projects represent a projected investment of $35,440,122.22. 2 of the projects are supported exclusively by CIBs, 3 by CIBs and campus funds, 23 by campus funds, 33 by revenue producing activities, 4 primarily by private donations, and 3 by a combination of campus funds and revenue producing activities.

A summary of investment by fund source is presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$13,650,535.13</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,343,421.09</td>
<td>Campus Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,100,500.00</td>
<td>Revenue Producing Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,345,666.00</td>
<td>Other Funding Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,440,122.22</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital Improvement Bond projects are the New Chemistry Building, 504 (Handicap) Compliance Modifications, Improvements to the Waste Water Treatment Plant, the Completion of Jordan Hall Basement - Phase 3, and Expansion of the Electrical Distribution System. Other existing major projects and their fund source include the Strom Thurmond Institute Building (other funds-private donations), the College of Engineering clean room (campus funds), the Indoor Tennis Center and the soccer stadium (both primarily private donations), improvements to the campus fire alarm and energy management system (campus funds), renovations to the first floor of the Clemson House and the Security and Retail Building (both revenue generating activities).

Finally, $5,000,000 in CIB's has been approved for the education component of the Continuing Education Center. This project will be initiated in FY 88 once the development approach is finalized. Also, the $4,500,000 Computer Operations Building which is not considered a "state" project will be completed during the upcoming fiscal year.

Public Service Activities

Capital Improvement Bonds

Capital Improvement Bonds provide the majority of funds for public service permanent improvement projects. Exhibit #1 outlines the PSA capital bond request for the next five fiscal years. A total of $17,795,000 is being requested.
The projects are presented in priority order. The animal research facility represents a long-standing critical need as the majority of University animal research facilities are inadequate in size and do not comply with Federal regulations for the use and care of animals.

Other Funding Sources

Other funding sources available to public service activities are minimal. Occasionally, the sale of agricultural products, proceeds from timber sales or camper fees can support permanent improvements. However, these funds are generally utilized for the care and upkeep of existing resources.

An aggressive program is being developed, however, to raise $3,000,000 from corporations and foundations to supplement the bond request for the animal research facility. Also, the sale of excess agricultural lands is being investigated. Should such a sale prove feasible, the proceeds will be utilized to create an urban horticulture station in the Myrtle Beach area. Exhibit 2 indicates a total of $6,000,000 may be realized from other funds.

Education and General

Projected E&G permanent improvement needs over the five years covered by the plan total $255,403,000. A variety of funding sources will be sought to meet these needs. These sources include capital improvement bonds, funds available to the campus either through student fees or institutional bond issues, revenue producing activities, and other sources. The latter may include private donations, federal grants, and non-traditional financing mechanisms.

Each of these funds sources is discussed below.

Capital Improvement Bonds

Exhibit #3 outlines the five year E&G request for capital improvement bonds. The total is $102,700,000, 40% of the total five year capital need.

$16,600,000 is being requested for asbestos abatement in the plan. The total asbestos abatement program is $37,000,000 and will take 12-15 years to implement.
Campus Funds

Funds available to the campus include the Maintenance, Repair and Renovation Fee charged to each student, state appropriations and the capability, within legislative limits, to issue bonds which student fees also support. As a general rule, state appropriations are not utilized for permanent improvements.

Exhibit #4 outlines the projected use of campus funds over the next five years. The "Annual Permanent Improvements Forecast" dated 4 May 1987 discusses the major maintenance and minor renovation categories in more detail and outlines the proposed projects. At this time, the feasibility and the desirability of increasing the legislative limit on institution bonds and charging students an additional fee to construct a performing arts center is being discussed.

Revenue Producing Activities

These activities include housing, athletics, telecommunications and other student services. Parking operations will also be self-supporting by FY 89. These activities can generate funds either through operating revenues or through the issuance of revenue bonds.

Total expenditures in the plan period as shown on Exhibit #5 are estimated to be $41,247,000. The majority of the $17,000,000 for Phases 1 & 2 of the Johnstone Hall renovation will be funded by revenue bonds. This 4-phase project is estimated to cost $30,000,000 and require approximately 12 years to implement.

The funding strategy for the renovation of Harcombe Dining Hall is under investigation. The remaining projects will be supported by operating revenues.

Other Funding Sources

As previously noted, other funding sources can include private donations, federal grants, and non-traditional financing mechanisms. The University is becoming more aggressive in its efforts to attract major gifts and grants and in the investigation of potential real estate developments. The latter are viewed as mechanisms to finance desired campus facilities. As such, they cannot be viewed simply as profit motivated.
Exhibit #6 illustrates potential projects over the plan period that may be funded by other sources. One of the most critical is the proposed Textile Research Institute for which Federal grants are being sought. This facility will provide modern, flexible space for several of the University’s research thrust programs.

In total, $94,000,000 from other funding sources is projected to be expended in the five years covered by the plan. This total represents 40% of the projected total investment in E&G permanent improvements.

**Recommended FY 89 E&G Project Priorities**

The format of the Five-Year Permanent Improvements Plan requires each agency to list their proposed projects in priority order, regardless of funding source. The recommended priority order for FY 89, the first plan year, follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89-1</td>
<td>Brackett Hall Asbestos Abate/Renov.</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-2</td>
<td>Material Sciences/Engrg. Bldg.</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-3</td>
<td>Water Filtration Plant Improvements</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-4</td>
<td>Textile Research Institute, A/E Only</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-5</td>
<td>Renovation of Johnstone Hall-Phase 1</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-6</td>
<td>Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-7</td>
<td>504 (Handicap) Compliance Modif’ns</td>
<td>3,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-8</td>
<td>Major Maintenance-Campus</td>
<td>1,182,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-9</td>
<td>Minor Renovations</td>
<td>485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-10</td>
<td>Major Maintenance-Housing</td>
<td>1,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-11</td>
<td>Parking Improvements</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-12</td>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-13</td>
<td>Day Care Center</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-14</td>
<td>Message Center</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-15</td>
<td>Indoor Practice Facility</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$65,962,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, $8,000,000 in revenue bonds will be issued in FY 89 for the Continuing Education Center. These bonds will supplement the $5,000,000 in Capital Improvement Bonds approved for the Center and which will be released early in the calendar year 1988.

**Summary**

Every University program is, in part, supported by physical facilities. Permanent improvements are necessary not only to maintain the integrity and functionality of existing facilities, but also to provide additional space for existing and emerging research and public service thrusts.
The projects outlined in The PSA and E&G 5-Year plans represent a significant financial commitment. As implied by Exhibit #7, every effort will be made to secure funds from federal, private, foundation and other revenue sources for these improvements. Indeed, capital improvement bond requests represent only 43% of the needed total.

This aggressive funding campaign will ensure Clemson University's position as a nationally prominent institution as it enters its second century.
### Exhibit #1

**Clemson University**  
**Five-Year Permanent Improvements Plan**  
**PSA - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 89</th>
<th>FY 90</th>
<th>FY 91</th>
<th>FY 92</th>
<th>FY 93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Research Compliance Facility&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Research Station</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swine Farrowing Facilities</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Research Support Facilities&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edisto Center Laboratory Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Abattoir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandhill Center Laboratory Bldg.&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry Pathology Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Diet &amp; Food Processing Fac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Pen Poultry Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Digestion/Metabolism Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Develop. Laboratory&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Nutrition/Physiology Research Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Maint./Storage Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,750,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,650,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,100,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,395,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>900,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Scope and cost increase since 8/86. $3,000,000 in private gifts will also be sought.
2. Additional project since 8/86.
### Exhibit #2

**Clemson University**  
Five-Year Permanent Improvements Plan  
**PSA - OTHER FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 89</th>
<th>FY 90</th>
<th>FY 91</th>
<th>FY 92</th>
<th>FY 93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Research Compliance Fac.¹</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Beach Research Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) An additional $5,828,000 in capital improvement bonds is being requested.
### Exhibit #3

Clemson University

**Five-Year Permanent Improvements Plan**

**E/G CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 89</th>
<th>FY 90</th>
<th>FY 91</th>
<th>FY 92</th>
<th>FY 93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asbestos Abatement Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brackett Asbestos Abate./Renovation</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin - Asbestos Abate./Replace Fan Coils Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement - Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Hall - Remove Asbestos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lever Hall - Remove Asbestos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non Asbestos Related Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat'l Sci's/Eng. Research Bldg.</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Filtration Plant Improvements</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504 (Handicapped) Compliance Mod.</td>
<td>3,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Sciences Addition</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Freeman Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Resources Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Barre Basement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Long Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotechnology Research Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate Holtzendorf YMCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$29,200,000</td>
<td>$19,700,000</td>
<td>$15,900,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$22,900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit #4

**Clemson University**

**Five-Year Permanent Improvements Plan**

**CAMPUS FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 89</th>
<th>FY 90</th>
<th>FY 91</th>
<th>FY 92</th>
<th>FY 93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>1,182,000</td>
<td>1,194,000</td>
<td>1,235,000</td>
<td>555,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Renovations</td>
<td>485,000</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$11,667,000</td>
<td>$1,514,000</td>
<td>$1,435,000</td>
<td>$1,440,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Total project $13,000,000. Private gifts will provide the balance.

### Exhibit #5

**Clemson University**

**Five-Year Permanent Improvements Plan**

**REVENUE PRODUCING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 89</th>
<th>FY 90</th>
<th>FY 91</th>
<th>FY 92</th>
<th>FY 93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education Center</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing-Major Maintenance</td>
<td>1,120,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>875,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Johnstone Hall-Phase 1</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Johnstone Hall-Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Center</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Practice Facility</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Improvements/Expansions</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schilletter Hall-Reroof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tele-Com. Sys. Modernize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harcombe Dining Hall-Renovate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Garage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$19,595,000</td>
<td>$880,000</td>
<td>$2,545,000</td>
<td>$14,102,000</td>
<td>$4,125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Total project $13,000,000. Capital Improvement Bonds have been secured for the balance.
## Exhibit #6
**Clemson University**
**Five-Year Permanent Improvements Plan**

### OTHER FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 89</th>
<th>FY 90</th>
<th>FY 91</th>
<th>FY 92</th>
<th>FY 93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>19,000,000</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Research Institute</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Center</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus Student Activity Ctr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakefront Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Campus Recreation Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$13,500,000</td>
<td>$46,500,000</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Developed by private operator on campus property.

### Exhibit #7
**Clemson University**
**Five-Year Permanent Improvements Plan**

### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 89</th>
<th>FY 90</th>
<th>FY 91</th>
<th>FY 92</th>
<th>FY 93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSA Capital Improvement Bonds</td>
<td>$7,750,000</td>
<td>$4,650,000</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
<td>$1,395,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA Other Funds</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$10,750,000</td>
<td>$4,650,000</td>
<td>$6,100,000</td>
<td>$1,395,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/G Capital Improvement Bonds</td>
<td>29,200,000</td>
<td>19,700,000</td>
<td>15,900,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>22,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Funds</td>
<td>11,667,000</td>
<td>1,514,000</td>
<td>1,435,000</td>
<td>1,440,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Producing</td>
<td>19,595,000</td>
<td>880,000</td>
<td>2,545,000</td>
<td>14,102,000</td>
<td>4,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>13,500,000</td>
<td>46,500,000</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>73,962,000</td>
<td>68,594,000</td>
<td>32,880,000</td>
<td>34,542,000</td>
<td>45,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$84,712,000</td>
<td>$73,244,000</td>
<td>$38,980,000</td>
<td>$35,937,000</td>
<td>$46,325,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many news reports have commented on the tragic illness and mortality now afflicting workers who were exposed to high concentrations of airborne asbestos fibers between World War II and the 1960s. Their suffering naturally arouses anxiety for those currently exposed to airborne asbestos in buildings. Owners of buildings that contain asbestos must decide whether to remove it at once, to enclose or encapsulate it, or to leave it alone until renovation or demolition compels its removal. The decision is made with little government guidance, and in a climate of fear often bordering on hysteria. This article outlines the problems posed by asbestos in buildings and presents some formal analysis, including economic analysis, to guide the beleaguered owner or anxious occupants.

Many building products contain, or have contained, asbestos. When it is an ingredient in liquids such as tar or paint, there is little likelihood that asbestos fibers will become airborne. When it is in a hard product such as vinyl-asbestos floor tiles or asbestos-cement board or pipe, significant concentrations of airborne fibers result only from cutting or abrading the material with power tools. But when the asbestos product is friable, or crumbly, fibers may be released if the material is disturbed in any way.

The friable asbestos-containing materials most commonly found in buildings include sprayed or troweled insulation, pipe and boiler insulation, and insulation board. Most of these products were manufactured between the 1920s and the early 1970s. Sprayed materials were used for fireproofing steel beams and for thermal insulation, while troweled insulation was often used as a decorative or acoustic surface. The vast majority of sprayed asbestos was installed between the mid-1950s and 1973.

In 1964, Irving Selikoff published his first study documenting the health problems of workers who installed this insulation in ships and buildings (Selikoff et al. 1964). By 1973 regulations limited the spraying of asbestos insulation, and by the mid-1970s programs to remove friable asbestos-containing materials from buildings began to emerge. The “asbestos in schools rule” promulgated in 1982 by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) required all schools to inspect for asbestos and to report any findings to parents and teachers. Although the rule did not compel any corrective action, panic often gripped those who were suddenly informed that they or their children were in a contaminated school. This caused a growing wave of asbestos abatement programs, followed by a still-growing wave of litigation against manufacturers of the asbestos-containing materials and in some cases against the architect who specified the material and the contractor who installed it. In 1986 Congress passed a law that compels the EPA to promulgate rules specifying the circumstances in which schools must take abatement action. Ontario, reflecting the difference between the Canadian and American cultures, responded to the same forces with asbestos abatement programs and the appointment of the Royal Commission on Asbestos (RCA) to study the problem, but with no litigation to date.

Economics and risk management

It is sometimes argued that prudence demands that all friable asbestos-containing materials be removed at once. Unfortunately, removal and replacement are costly, and the removal workers themselves face risks. As a society we have limited resources to devote to satisfying our wants. We must ask of any asbestos abatement program: Could this money purchase greater risk reductions if spent elsewhere? If the answer is yes, then economic rationality and indeed prudence direct our attention to the most cost-effective programs.

Analyzing the cost effectiveness of a policy determines the cost per life or per life-year (a year of reduction in life expectancy) saved by the policy. This allows us to rank policies according to their risk reduction per dollar. Even cost-effectiveness analysis raises a contentious analytical issue: How should we allow for the delay between the expenditure on a program now and the reduced risk of mortality far in the future?

If benefits are valued in dollar terms, future costs and benefits should be discounted to the present. When we discount a benefit, we acknowledge that something we will probably gain in the future is not as valuable as the same thing gained today. To make a precise calculation, we invert the formula for compound interest: if the annual discount rate is $r$, then a benefit $b$ years in the future is discounted to the present by multiplying it by $1/(1 + r)^t$. Although the formula is standard, the choice of a rate of discount is not, and the problem has spawned a rich but inconclusive literature.

If we do not value lives in dollars, should we discount the lives themselves? Not discounting lives means that spending $1 million now to save a life 30 years from now represents a cost of $1 million per life saved. But 30 years from now, the $1 million, if invested wisely, would be worth several million dollars, implying that the true cost is several million dollars per life.

To discount or not is important, since discounting for 30 years at a 5% annual rate reduces the benefits by 77%. On this issue economists are profoundly divided.

Donald Dewees is a professor of law and of economics at the University of Toronto, where he has taught since 1971. He holds a B.S. degree in electrical engineering from Swarthmore College, an LL.B. from the Harvard Law School, and a Ph.D. in economics from Harvard. Between 1980 and 1984 he served as Director of Research for the Ontario Royal Commission on Asbestos, which dealt with all aspects of asbestos problems. During 1984–85 he was a Gilbert White fellow at Resources for the Future in Washington, where he wrote a report on the economics of dealing with asbestos in buildings, published by RFF in 1986. Address: Department of Economics, University of Toronto, 150 St. George Street, Toronto, Canada M5S 1A1.
Risks posed by asbestos in buildings

The principal causes of premature death among those who have worked with asbestos are asbestosis, lung cancer, and mesothelioma, although other cancers have also been linked to such work. Asbestosis is a chronic restrictive lung disease caused only by exposure to asbestos fibers. Although it has been a major cause of premature mortality among the workers who installed the insulation that concerns us today (Selikoff et al. 1979), current levels of exposure in buildings are sufficiently low that there is no risk that occupants will develop asbestosis. Lung cancer may be caused by many factors, most notably smoking, but exposure to airborne asbestos fibers increases the risk of contracting this usually fatal disease. Mesothelioma, a rare cancer of the surface lining cells of the lung and abdomen, occurs predominantly among those exposed to asbestos and, like lung cancer, is often fatal within a year of diagnosis. Thus the primary health risk posed by airborne asbestos in buildings consists of an increased possibility of contracting lung cancer and mesothelioma.

The current risks to occupants and workers can be estimated using a dose-response model and assumptions about the characteristics of the exposed population. Such models, which predict the incidence of or the mortality from asbestos-related lung cancer and mesothelioma, have been published by the RICA (1984, appendix to chap. 7), the Chronic Hazard Advisory Panel on Asbestos (CHAP 1983), the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA 1983), the EPA (1985a), and others. The models differ in some assumptions and estimated parameters, but all are similar in structure, and their predictions are not seriously different with regard to risks from exposure in buildings. In all the models, the lung cancer risk is an age-dependent background risk multiplied by an amount proportional to the cumulative exposure to asbestos. Since there is for all practical purposes no background rate of mesothelioma, the mesothelioma risk is a function of exposure, and of the time since first exposure raised to the third or fourth power. Most models assume a ten-year latency period between exposure and the first incidence of an asbestos-related disease.

The estimates that these models produce are subject to considerable uncertainty arising from several sources. First, the dose-response coefficients are estimated from historical data regarding workers who experienced exposures orders of magnitude greater than those of building workers and occupants today when safe practices were followed. The models extrapolate from these high exposures to very low exposures, a procedure that is necessarily uncertain. A second source of uncertainty arises from differences in the results of various studies. The dose-response coefficients estimated from the dozen or so cohorts of workers that have been intensively studied vary by two orders of magnitude. In the United States, OSHA and the EPA have assumed that these differences reflect errors in measuring a single dose-response relationship. The American Conference of Governmental and Industrial Hygienists and regulatory agencies in Ontario and the United Kingdom assert that the risks per unit of exposure differ with the three major types of asbestos fibers. The risks are lowest for chrysotile, the most common type; perhaps ten times greater for crocidolite, which is infrequently encountered; and intermediate for amosite, which is sometimes found in sprayed applications and in pipe and boiler insulation. The Ontario RICA goes still further, concluding that even for a single type of fiber, different manufacturing processes can cause different levels of risk for a given exposure. The rationale for these differing toxicities is that the health hazard is related to the dimensions of the fibers, and that the dimensions vary systematically by fiber type and manufacturing process (RICA 1984, pp. 231–73). Still, the RICA presents a single risk assessment for asbestos in buildings, based on dose-response coefficients from the Selikoff cohort. Hughes and Weil (1983) have developed a model that estimates risks separately for chrysotile alone and for “mixed fiber exposure.”

A third controversy concerns the measurement of airborne fiber concentrations. There are few measurements of the working conditions decades ago that caused the current onslaught of disease. The exposure of workers to asbestos is now measured using an optical microscope to count fibers longer than five micrometers trapped on a filter through which air from the workplace has been drawn. This technique is not effective for concentrations less than about 0.1 fiber per cc (f/cc), so measurements outdoors and in buildings such as offices and schools employ a transmission electron microscope (TEM) to analyze the filter. The TEM method is more accurate but also far more costly, and it counts fibers not seen by the optical microscope; so there is a difficulty in determining the optical, equivalent of a TEM measurement.

Some of these uncertainties might be reduced through further study but others are unavoidable. Decisions must be made with available information. What have the measurements and models determined about current risks?

Major studies of the concentration of airborne asbestos fibers in buildings number fewer than a dozen (summarized by the RICA in 1984, chap. 9, and by the EPA in 1985). The RICA concludes that the majority of occupants in buildings with substantial amounts of friable asbestos would be exposed to “fiber levels less than 0.001 f/cc, with a few single readings as high as 0.01 f/cc representing the highest likely exposure” (1984, p. 577). This level of exposure is in dramatic contrast to the 5–15 f/cc to which the workers who installed such insulation were exposed; in fact it is one ten-thousandth as great. Greater exposures might occur where occupants are in the immediate vicinity of work that disturbs friable materials or within range of air circulating from such work, or where significant quantities of the material have fallen onto building surfaces and are being disturbed (p.

Panic often gripped those who were suddenly informed that they or their children were in a contaminated school
We must ask of any asbestos abatement program: Could this money purchase greater risk reductions if spent elsewhere?

I will use an exposure of 0.001 t/cc to represent an above-average amount for building occupants. Since only a small fraction of all buildings have asbestos-containing friable materials, and since individuals move around within buildings and from one building to another, a typical exposure to asbestos in buildings is unlikely to exceed more than ten years. According to the RCA model, a cohort of 1 million persons exposed to airborne concentrations of 0.001 t/cc for ten years starting at age 22 might, when all members of the cohort have died of various causes, experience 15.6 deaths from asbestos-related diseases. Since the incidence of mesothelioma increases with time since first exposure, the models explicitly recognize that children may face higher risks from exposure to asbestos than adults. The risk almost doubles if first exposure occurs at age 7, and is reduced by 40% if first exposure occurs at age 35.

When the RCA weighs these risks against others faced routinely by the general public, it concludes that the current risks from airborne asbestos fibers are not significant. The risk to a building occupant with above-average exposure for ten years is less than one-hundredth the risk of a highway fatality resulting from commuting by car and from the building (1984, p. 585). It is one-third the risk of cancer experienced by residents of a brick house due to natural radiation from the bricks themselves during ten years (Wilson 1979, p. 182). It is one-sixteenth the risk of lung cancer caused by exposure to second-hand cigarette smoke for seven hours per week (Doll and Peto 1985, p. 47).

Although the exposure of building occupants is generally very low, workers who disturb asbestos insulation may be exposed to elevated concentrations of fibers that might in some cases exceed current regulatory limits (Paik et al. 1983; Pinchin 1982, p. 7.17). The possibility of these high levels of exposure led the RCA to conclude that asbestos-containing friable materials may cause significant risks for custodial, maintenance, renovation, removal, and demolition workers. These risks require precautions such as encapsulation, enclosure, or removal of the asbestos if it is damaged or falling on building surfaces or is being disturbed (1983, p. 593). If the material is not removed, a maintenance program should be instituted and continued as long as the asbestos remains in the building.

Some divergences between the policies recommended by the Ontario RCA and by the EPA can be explained by their differing assumptions about the urgency of protecting occupants. The EPA compelled all primary and secondary schools to search for asbestos-containing friable materials. Where such materials were found, the EPA recommended a thorough initial cleaning of all horizontal surfaces, special monthly cleaning thereafter, and inspection at least twice a year. These exhaustive cleaning recommendations apparently reflected a belief that the mere presence of asbestos-containing friable materials posed a serious threat to health.

In contrast, the RCA does not recommend the universal inspection of buildings for asbestos, nor does it recommend an initial cleaning. Instead, it recommends that if any friable material is falling or is to be disturbed, it should be tested for asbestos content. If asbestos is found, damaged material should be repaired or removed, special cleaning procedures should be followed, precautions should be taken if the material is disturbed, and the material should be inspected from time to time. This low-key approach reflects the fact that buildings without special maintenance programs have generally yielded low concentrations of airborne fibers posing insignificant health risks to occupants.

Cost-effectiveness of postponing removal

Regulations in the United States and in Ontario are alike in requiring that all asbestos-containing friable materials be removed prior to the demolition of a building. The question therefore is not whether the material should be removed, but when. A crash program of asbestos removal can cause problems arising out of poor workmanship. Indeed, immediate removal may not reduce already low concentrations of airborne asbestos. Furthermore, it will often be less costly to allow the material to remain in the building until it will be disturbed by major maintenance, renovation, or demolition.

The cost of removal and reinsulation ranges between $4 and $10 per square foot of surface material (Purnam et al. 1984). Moving the occupants can cost as much as $5 per square foot of floor space. Postponing the removal until renovation or demolition saves the cost of moving the occupants. Postponing the removal until demolition saves the cost of reinsulation and requires less care to protect floors, carpets, and fixtures from damage, reducing costs by perhaps one-third. Further savings from postponement include the possibility of improvements in the technology of removal and the time value of money. (If removal at any time would cost $1 million, we need to invest far less than that amount today in order to have $1 million available 30 years from now.) Offsetting these savings is the added cost of precautions needed to safeguard building workers as long as the asbestos-containing material remains. Estimates of the cost of these precautions range from $0.01 to as much as $1 per square foot per year. The more frequently the material will be disturbed or damaged, the greater are these costs, and the smaller the savings from postponing removal.

Cost-effectiveness analysis can be used to evaluate
these various options. One study estimated that a program to remove asbestos-containing friable materials from schools in the United States would cost in the vicinity of $180,000 per cancer case avoided (Putnam et al. 1984). My own calculations for both schools and office buildings assume much lower levels of exposure for occupants and yield costs in the millions of dollars per life saved without discounting, and in the hundreds of millions of dollars if costs and effects are discounted. For example, an analysis of one office building shows that removal at demolition costs $28 million to $60 million per life-year saved, where each premature death involves a loss of about 13 years. Advancing removal to the time of renovation raises the cost to billions of dollars per life-year saved, and removal now fails even to reduce risks below those of removal at renovation. If future effects are not discounted, removal at renovation is the least costly policy, at $730,000 per life-year saved, whereas removal now would cost $5.15 million per life-year saved (Dewees 1986b).

If one accepts that the cost of a policy expressed in dollars per life or life-year saved is relevant to the choice among policies, then it is helpful to have a benchmark against which to compare such figures. We might look to the amount that courts or workers’ compensation programs award for premature death among 30 to 70 year olds, the range within which most asbestos-related deaths might occur. Such awards are quite variable, but reach as high as $250,000 not including punitive damages (Dewees 1986a). Alternatively, we might look to the wage premium that workers are paid for accepting jobs that involve some risk of fatal accidents. The literature on this subject finds an implicit “value of life” ranging from a few hundred thousand to a few million dollars (Viscusi 1983). Finally, we might look at public programs such as those for highway safety or environmental and occupational health, to see how much our governments are prepared to spend to reduce risks of fatality. Here we find amounts ranging from under $100,000 per life for traffic safety and consumer protection to tens or millions of dollars per life in the area of occupational and environmental health.

Although there is no central tendency in this literature, I conclude that as a society and as individuals we behave as if we are willing to spend in the vicinity of $1 million per life to reduce small risks of premature mortality. In contrast, crash programs of asbestos removal seem quite expensive. We could buy much more public health improvement by spending our money on other programs.

Analyzing the cost effectiveness of policies for controlling asbestos quickly teaches one humility. There are many types of buildings. Each has its own characteris-

The risk to a building occupant with above-average exposure is less than one-fiftieth the risk of a highway fatality resulting from commuting by car to and from the building

tics, and no single program will be reasonable for all. In some cases, the poor condition of the material, its susceptibility to damage, or the frequency with which it is disturbed may cause removal at once to be both prudent and economical. In other cases, leaving the material in place until renovation or demolition decades from now will not cause significant health risks, and will impose costs that are a small fraction of the cost of immediate removal. Furthermore, removal shifts risks from building occupants and maintenance workers to removal workers. Yet despite the many variations, one conclusion seems reasonably clear: we should resist squandering our resources on crash programs of asbestos removal to reduce already insignificant risks lest we find ourselves unprepared to cope with more acute risks from other hazards or even from the programs themselves.
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RESOLUTION

Whereas, The Clemson University Faculty Manual provides for a panel of three grievance counselors made up of full professors from different colleges; and

Whereas, These faculty members have in the past been required to contribute excessive time to this worthy cause; therefore,

Resolved, That the Faculty Manual be changed to provide for a panel of up to six (6) grievance counselors of tenured faculty with at least the rank of associate professor with no more than two counselors from the same college.

Resolved, That this panel of counselors should be knowledgeable as to various provisions of the Faculty Manual that are relevant to grievances, and that these counselors be provided with appropriate training and documentary guidance to meet their legal needs of their office.
I. CALL TO ORDER

President Mullins called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

President Mullins introduced Dr. Ellis Kline, Professor of Microbiology, and Dr. Horace Skipper, Professor of Agronomy and Soils. Drs. Kline and Skipper were invited to address the Senate regarding the Agro-Biotech Initiative (see Attachment A).

Dr. Kline began the presentation by asking for expression of concerns about genetic engineering. The major concern expressed related to the possibility of creating malicious organisms. Dr. Kline acknowledged that he and Dr. Skipper had considered that possibility before becoming involved in this project. The major questions which they considered were:

1) Should they do it?
2) Would it be injurious?
3) What benefits would accrue from the project?
4) Is it safe?

Monsanto has developed the organism, Pseudomonas fluorescens, which is a minute, soil-based bacterium. This bacterium occurs in the soil normally, it has no known detrimental effects, and it colonizes root systems. Also normally occurring in the soil is galactocadase, an enzyme which is present in many animals as well. Monsanto has taken this LacZY marker and attached it to the pseudomonas. The purpose of the research is to track
the system under various conditions. The organism can be tracked because it can be easily identified by the LacZY, fluorescens, and by two additional markers.

Dr. Kline noted that recombinant DNA has benefited humans through new means of insulin production, growth hormone production, and other similar products. The long range goal of this research is to inoculate and localize bacterium which produce natural herbicides, thus efficiently producing a natural system.

Dr. Skipper noted that a two volume document has been sent out for review of the planned research through E.P.A. The document is also available on campus should faculty wish to review it. There will be a public hearing on August 26 in Washington, D.C. The interest is in actual field testing. Dr. Skipper reported that President Lennon hails this project as Clemson University's application of biotech in the real world.

The site selected for the testing is five acres of the Edisto Education and Research Center near Blackville. Advantages of this site include soil representative of the Coastal Plains, cooperative and willing faculty and staff, recognition of the site as an information transfer center, availability of water for irrigation, presence of containment terraces and barriers such as fences, crop strips, and bare strips.

Three treatment conditions will be used. Condition A will be controls. Condition B will be plants inoculated with native bacterium. Condition C will be plants inoculated with LacZY. The first plant used will be winter
wheat, planted in 16 rows with 7" centers and a 10 foot buffer zone surrounding the planted area. Only the 8 center rows will be condition C. The Bacterium movement will be tracked both by depth and from row to row. Wheat roots normally descend 6-10", if the organism goes too deeply it will die from anoxia. Sampling will be done daily from day 0 to check the number of organisms per seed. After about 6 to 8 weeks, the bacterium begins to die out.

The following summer low till soy beans will be planted, without inoculation. After harvest of this crop, winter wheat, which has not been inoculated, will again be planted to see if the organism survives.

Senator Birrenkott asked for an explanation of the role of Clemson's IBC.

Dr. Skipper replied that Laboratory testing of the phenotypes is currently being conducted on campus but that it is the field testing which is of concern. Both tests had been subjected to careful examination on campus. If they had not had University approval, the project would not have been submitted to the E.P.A.

Senator Birrenkott added that the IBC, Institutional Biosafety Committee, has wide faculty and community representation. The people making up this committee are people associated with the University and people who live in the community. They are not only concerned with the overall safety and scientific merit of the project but they have a personal interest in it as well.
Senator McGuire asked if the project was believed to be so safe why such protective measures and communication efforts were being carried out. Kline replied that they were being especially cautious because of what has happened in California, where activists had destroyed a similar project when they dug up the genetically altered plants.

Senator Nowaczyk asked if any environmental activists had been identified in this area, or if any meetings had been held with them. Kline answered that any who were known were invited to attend the meetings.

Senator DuBose asked about the potential for organism movement due to soil insects. Skipper said there is no plan at present to control for this.

Senator Hedden questioned whether the talk about containment might be misleading. He noted that the organism could be spread by both insects and mammals. Skipper responded that no claim could be made for absolute containment. Chicken wire will be placed into the ground to reduce small animal traffic but there were some animals which could not be stopped.

Hedden noted that there have been problems with radioactive wastes being spread by rabbits. Kline added that two graduate students will be employed to monitor the planting. One will probably be looking at insects and the other at mammals. He added that Lennon had given them a mandate to carefully examine the scientific merit and controls before beginning the project.
Senator Murr asked how close the roots would be to the soil surface. Skipper said they would be about 1/2" below the surface. Murr asked if that was sufficient depth so there would be no transfer when people walked in the site. Skipper said that people will wear boots and will autoclave clothing worn at the site. In addition, equipment will be subjected to special rinsing.

There being no additional questions, President Mullins thanked Drs. Kline and Skipper for sharing the information.

President Lennon asked if there were any questions which Senators would like to ask of him. He announced that whenever his schedule permits he will briefly attend Senate meetings so that questions can be addressed to him.

Senator Nowaczyk asked if President Lennon would be willing to come to a meeting and comment on his view of successes and upcoming challenges facing the University. President Lennon said that he would be willing to do this.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of June 9, 1987 were approved as distributed.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Policy. A written report (Attachment B) was distributed.

B. Research. Senator Birrenkott reported that the Committee has not met since the last report. He noted that CURF just went to the
cabinet and that two Directors will be added to the Board. In addition, CURF-FAC will be set up by the Office of University Research to represent Faculty interests in the operation of the foundation. The Office of the University Research will consult with Research Committee about the establishment and operation of this group.

C. Scholastic Policies. The report (Attachment C) was read by Senator Hedden.

D. Welfare. Senator Daniels was not present and no report was submitted. President Mullins reported that Senator Daniels is the Acting Head of his department. A temporary replacement Senator will be elected in the Fall. At the next Advisory Committee meeting a new Chair of the Welfare Committee will be named.

E. University Committees and Commissions. No reports.

F. Ad Hoc Committees. Senator Emeritus Linvill was invited to comment on the Final Report of the Senate Committee to Study Grievance Procedures at Clemson University (Attachment D). Linvill asked that attention be directed to the summary of issues on page 2 and 3 of the report. He suggested that the Faculty Manual Committee review the grammar of the sections dealing with grievance, noting that it appeared that the sections "were written by PhDs for PhDs." Suggested changes in content are included in the Appendix of the report. Linvill said that the committee concluded that "unfairness" is best defined on a case by case basis by the Grievance Board.

Linvill suggested that the Senate Policy Committee needs to review how files are handled for promotion and tenure. He noted that the Provost has suggested that the ideas of the committee in this
regard would be very difficult to implement. The committee believes that there is a need to incorporate opportunities for rebuttal in the process.

Senator Nowaczyk asked about input from attorneys. He noted that University grievance procedures had to be utilized before any civil actions could be initiated.

Linvill reported that Ben Anderson had been most helpful. No problems are evident in the way in which the procedures are written. Grievance Procedure I is mandated by the state. Grievance Procedure II was developed by Clemson.

Senator Nowaczyk asked about the liability of those persons who serve on grievance hearings. Linville responded that the Welfare Committee should investigate this matter. President Mullins noted that the Department Heads are interested in this issue also.

Senator Birrenkott asked about the possibility of hearing GP2 complaints before GP1 complaints. Linvill said that the Provost has stated that GP1 usually addresses the issue of getting rid of a person and doing it fast. However, there may be cases where it would be better if they were reversed.

Senator Birrenkott asked the Chair to clarify the disposition of the report.

President Mullins said that the report could be adopted or it could be referred to Policy Committee for resolutions on portions of it.

Senator Murr asked why his copy has only 8 pages. Linvill replied that the distributed copies only include changes in the report since the last distribution. The Senate President and Secretary have been given complete copies.
Senator Carter moved adoption of the report. Senator Birrenkott seconded.

The Chair was asked to clarify the meaning of "adopt". President Mullins said that "to adopt" means that Senate is recommending that the changes be accepted by administration as they are written. Senate is saying that the recommendations should be implemented.

Senator Murr said that since some recommendations had already been acted upon, it would be redundant to adopt the entire report.

Senator Hedden said that there is a need for some clarification of other issues such as the sequence of Grievances I and II. He recommended that the report be accepted as information and that these issues be reviewed.

Senator Carter said that he was impressed with the work of the committee and could not see what more the Policy Committee could do.

The question was called and the motion to adopt the report passed on voice vote.

V. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Mullins reviewed several issues raised in his report and update (Attachment E). Additional information was provided for some items.

Item 3. The Board has approved the Five Year Permanent Improvements Plan.

Item 9. The Clemson University Research Foundation will receive 3.7% of a grant as overhead money. This money will be deducted prior to the transfer of the funds to the University, rather than being returned to the
Foundation after transfer, so that there will be no possible confusion that state funds are being contributed to the Foundation.

Item 12. A committee will be established to look at issues related to early retirement.

President Mullins called attention to the events being held on campus this week in celebration of the Bicentennial of the Constitution.

Senator Nowaczyk noted the need for the Research Committee to be kept informed regarding the Deans' study of the plan to rank internal research proposals within each college (Item 13).

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Recommendations for Amendments to the Report from the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Structure and Function of the Commissions and the President's Council (Attachment F).

Senator Coulter was asked to offer the resolution for Senator Bryant who was absent. Senator Coulter questioned the presence of a quorum. President Mullins verified the presence of a quorum by count of those present. Senator Coulter moved acceptance of the report with the Policy Committee's recommendations. The major changes suggested would eliminate the Vice-Presidents from the Academic Council; add 7 faculty representatives from the tenurable ranks and chaired professorships and direct that Faculty Senate originate the constitution for the Academic Council.
Senator Carter noted that the Ad Hoc Committee's report had been accepted and then was sent to the Policy Committee.

President Mullins ruled that this report is being introduced as a substitute report. He added that the previous report was received but was not accepted. The substitute report is treated like any other substitute motion, the original report being first perfected by amendments and then the substitute report. After both have been thus perfected, the question is put on the substitute, and finally on the resolution.

Senator Birrenkott said that he did not receive an advance copy of the substitute report. Thus he did not have sufficient time to compare the two reports.

The comment was made that to reduce the unwieldy number of participants it was reasonable to eliminate the Vice-Presidents, but what was the purpose of adding 7 faculty members?

Senator Coulter responded by saying that the President supports research, grants, et cetera; there is concern about emphasis being lost regarding teaching and undergraduate education. The faculty members should be added to represent the Faculty as a body, not the Colleges. The old (present) Council had 34 members, this would be 23 members, in contrast to the original proposal's 21 members.

Senator Nowaczyk said that he had an amendment to offer but that he would defer to Senator Birrenkott if he wanted to offer a motion to table.
Senator Birrenkott moved to table the substitute report. The motion was seconded and passed, 13 to 6.

Senator Nowaczyk said that he was going to offer an amendment to the original report which would amend the composition of the Academic Council, however he would defer to the next meeting.

Senator Carter moved to amend the original report as suggested by Nowaczyk. The motion was seconded.

President Mullins ruled the motion was in order. The original report can be amended. At the next Senate meeting the substitute report would be considered. The substitute report would then be voted on to replace the amended original report. Should the substitute report fail to pass, the amended original report could then be considered.

Senator Nowaczyk spoke in favor of an amendment to the original report (Attachment G). Nowaczyk explained that this amendment would remove from the Academic Council the Vice-Presidents who do not hold academic rank and would replace them with several people, but would not increase the total membership beyond the 21 suggested in the original report. He argued that the Dean of Admissions and Registration would offer important contributions to the work of the Council. The reorganization in both plans would remove the Deans from the Undergraduate Commission so it would be important to strengthen input from that group. The amendment included additional representation by the Chair of the Scholastic Policies Committee, one named Professor elected by the Senate, and the Chair of the Executive Committee of the Department Heads.
Senator Coulter spoke against the amendment noting that it would add two more administrators and that the amendment had already been rejected by the Policy Committee.

President Mullins commented that this amendment would sharpen the original report which would then be discussed.

Senator Coulter asked if this report would then substitute for the substitute report.

President Mullins repeated that this amendment is offered to the original report. Therefore, at the next Senate meeting the substitute report would be discussed. If the substitute report was defeated, the original report, as amended, would be discussed. If the substitute report passed, the original report, as amended, would not come up for discussion or vote.

Senator Carter noted that the Policy Committee did not reject this amendment.

Senator Coulter said that the policy Committee did reject this amendment.

Senator Carter said that this particular amendment was not considered. . .

Senator Coulter interrupted. . .

President Mullins ruled that Senator Carter had the floor. Senator Carter continued, "however a similar amendment was considered."
Senator Coulter asked if Senate was going to vote on something that we tabled?

President Mullins ruled that the original report had not been tabled.

The question was called. The amendment was defeated with 8 voting in favor, 10 voting against.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Senator Meiners moved adoption of a resolution on Presentation of Awards at General Faculty Meetings (Attachment H). The motion was seconded. Senator Meiner stated the purpose was "to restrict awards at meetings of the Faculty to those offered by the University."

Senator Nowaczyk questioned the term, University Awards. He noted that there is a teaching award made by the Alumni Council and a Research Award made by two invited organizations. If AAUP was recognized by the University and included in the Faculty Manual would it be an official award? University Award is an ambiguous term.

Nowaczyk added that he was bothered by a one sentence resolution, more background information was needed.
The question was called and the resolution was defeated, 6 in favor, 11 opposed.

No other new business was offered.

President Mullins reminded the Senate that the August meeting will be held in Olin Hall.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted.

MaryAnn B. Reichenbach, Secretary

**AGRI-BIOTECH INITIATIVE**

A Clemson University Fact Sheet

Clemson University and Monsanto Co. are launching a new research project that could further the science of biotechnology and give South Carolina an inroad to the vast economic development potential of this exciting field.

Under a research agreement between Clemson and Monsanto, university scientists will field test a common soil bacterium that has been genetically engineered so that it can be tracked through the environment. Monsanto developed the genetically engineered microorganism and is funding the field test.

The scientists are preparing an application to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and other appropriate regulatory agencies for approval to conduct the field test.

Field testing is a key in the application of biotechnology to the development of potentially beneficial microorganisms for a variety of uses. After government approval and field testing, genetically engineered bacteria may be introduced into agro-ecosystems to enhance crop productivity. Such organisms already have been tested extensively in laboratory and greenhouse experimentation. Field testing is one of the last steps in assessing their potential benefit. But before field testing can be successful, scientists must answer a crucial question: How can you monitor an organism after it is released into the environment? That is the question Clemson and Monsanto scientists plan to answer.

Monsanto developed a "marker" that has been engineered into Pseudomonas fluorescens, a soil bacterium, enabling scientists to monitor it in the environment. The engineered microorganism has been shown in laboratory tests to have no adverse effect on soil or plants. Clemson and Monsanto scientists simply want to track the modified bacterium through a normal growing season. Clemson plans to plant wheat or soybeans (depending on the time of year the field test begins), treating the soil with the marked bacterium and monitoring it during a growing cycle. If the bacterium can be monitored easily in the environment, Clemson and Monsanto will have made a major inroad into biotechnology.

In effect, the scientists will be doing cutting-edge research on the ecological implications of biotechnology, developing a field-test model and specifications for monitoring organisms in the environment. While the initial test will involve the College of Agricultural Sciences and the College of Sciences, there are spinoff research possibilities for other faculty members.

*Science Digest* reports that biotechnology product sales doubled in 1985, were expected to double again in 1986, and should top $2 billion a year by 1990. By the turn of the century, the annual market value of biotechnology products could be anywhere from $15 billion to $100 billion. At present, the U.S. Department of Agriculture is supporting more than 800 biotechnology projects nationwide at a cost of $75 million. Clemson's initiatives in biotechnology could help attract industries to the state.

Reactions of South Carolina agricultural and environmental authorities to the proposed field test have been very positive. State Commissioner of Agriculture Leslie Tindal said he is "extremely enthusiastic about this project, which addresses a major problem.... I commend Clemson wholeheartedly for this initiative." Lewis Shaw, deputy commissioner for environmental control in the S.C. Department of Health and Environmental Control, said, "We would like to see the number of chemicals in general in the environment reduced.... This is an obvious way to go... a carefully controlled methodology to ensure that it's done correctly."

With the filing of an application to the EPA for the field test, Clemson and Monsanto come one step closer to becoming a part of the biotechnology boom. The agency will closely scrutinize the research project, taking a minimum of 90 days to review and act on it. If the application is approved, the field test could be under way this fall.
FACULTY SENATE
Policy Committee Report
July 14, 1987

The Policy Committee met on June 30 and July 8, 1987. As a result of these two meetings, the Policy Committee recommends two motions to the Faculty Senate. One of these motions concerns awards at University Faculty Meetings and the other is the Policy Committee's recommendation on reorganizing the President's Council.

The first motion will be introduced by Senator Roger Meiners. This resolution was derived from concerns of several faculty members about AAUP awards at the semi-annual University Faculty Meetings. This motion does not "target" AAUP but, all non-University awards. A side benefit of removing non-University awards would be to shorten the meetings or to allow more time for more productive activities such as dialogue with the Provost and President.

The other motion will be introduced by Senator Ed Coulter. This resolution is the Policy Committee's recommendation for the reorganization of the present President's Council. The primary difference between this report and the Ad Hoc Committee's report is the composition of the Academic Council. As background, the only major area of concern expressed during committee discussions has been over the composition of the Academic Council. There has been very little disagreement over other areas of the Ad Hoc Committee report. Senators are urged to consider carefully the difference in composition of the Academic Council.
SCHOLASTIC POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

June 30, 1987

The Scholastic Policy committee met on June 30th. The main item of business was a discussion of the implementation of the new structure for the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee. Of special importance will be whether the Admissions Exception Sub-Committee is allowed to consider all applicants whose acceptance has been recommended, but who fail to meet the minimum predicted grade-point ratio in the college of their choice. Other items of business included the decision to pursue the issue of common exams, advising as it affects scholastic policy, and the problem of non-uniform length of the semester. Furthermore, we are investigating the possibility of recommending a simplified and more uniform continuing enrollment policy.

Members present: Alice Derr; Roy Hedden; Bruce Jenny

Others present: Joe Mullins, Ron Nowaczyk
REPORT OF THE SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Dale E. Linvill, Chairman
Clarence Hood
Jeuel LaTorre
Margery Sly
Robert Snelsire
Holley Ulbrich
Stephen Wainscott
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The grievance procedure now in place at Clemson University has been in effect since 1982. This procedure sets up one process to consider matters of discrimination and a second process to consider issues of "fairness" in promotion, tenure, and job security. An ad hoc committee was appointed in the Fall of 1986 by the President of the Faculty Senate to study the current procedures and make recommendations for improvement.

This committee identified several issues. It recommends actions to correct these issues.

• There is an inadequate number of Grievance Procedure II Board Members to cover cases that sometimes accrue. Expansion of the Grievance Board to Seven (7) members will allow the Chairman to act as a coordinator for the Board and to oversee all cases as they go through review.

• Orientation sessions for new board members are necessary to acquaint them with Board functions. Sessions emphasizing the role of participants and the orderly searching out of information should be conducted by experienced board members in conjunction with administrative personnel.

• There is confusion about materials to be included in a Grievance Procedure II Petition. A policy sheet and petition outline should be developed for use in GP-II cases.

• Although the Faculty Manual contains several statements about "unfair" issues grievable under the GP-II procedure, a re-writing of several sections of the Faculty Manual is necessary to clarify the issue of "fairness" and the Board's role in determining "fairness".

• Determining the difference between grievable and non-grievable GP-II petitions continues to be a problem. The Faculty Manual contains sufficient definitions and guidelines for screening of these petitions. The Board should adopt broad guidelines for reviewing grievances since this is the proper forum in which to air complaints against University procedures and the University's decision making process.

• A determination of a prima facie GP-I case can only be made after the hearing, not beforehand.

• The issue of how promotion, tenure, and reappointment files are processed should be taken up by either the Senate Policy Committee or the Commission on Faculty Affairs. A clarification and modification of the processing procedures can potentially reduce the number of grievance petitions.
The timeline for processing grievance petitions needs modification. The time between receipt of a grievance petition and the initial hearing by the GP-II Board should be no more than thirty (30) calendar days. Time for responses by the Provost and President should be increased to thirty (30) days. The Board's decision should be rendered within ten (10) work days after the final meeting at which statements are taken from witnesses, the petitioner or the respondent(s).

GP-II reviews are best conducted prior to GP-I hearings. Issues put forth in GP-I petitions are many times resolved through the less formal GP-II process.

Appeals to the President in GP-I cases are appropriate since final decisions in such cases must be made at the highest level when necessary. Appeals to GP-II decisions can turn into emotional rather than objective appeals. Guidelines including who can appeal, notification that an appeal has been filed and the form to receive information related to the case should be established for Presidential appeals.

Confidentiality on the part of all parties involved in the grievance procedure must be observed. Breaking the trust of confidentiality only hurts the process and adds nothing to the atmosphere surrounding the case.

There is an inadequate number of Grievance Counselors. Both sides in a grievance petition often need assistance. The number of Grievance Counselors should be increased to at least five (5) selected from five (5) different colleges. These Counselors should be selected from among the tenured Associate and Full Professorial ranks.

Each party to a grievance often needs the assistance of counsel of their choice. This counsel may be an academic advisor, fellow faculty member, or legal counsel. The role of the counsel, however, should be solely advisory with no active access to floor discussion.

Department Heads view of the grievance process is complicated by their frustration with receiving little support from the administration when they are involved in a grievance proceeding. The Administration of Clemson University should provide support and encouragement for its department heads through training in such areas as budget and money management, personnel evaluation, interpersonal skills and a host of other topics relevant to the day-to-day workings of a major University.
INTRODUCTION

The grievance procedure now in place at Clemson University has been in effect since 1982. This procedure consists of two separate processes, one that considers matters of discrimination as defined by the State (Grievance Procedure GP-I) and a second process that considers issues of "fairness" in promotion, tenure, and job security (Grievance Procedure GP-II). As a result of experience during the past five years, some dissatisfaction with the procedures and their implementation has surfaced.

An ad hoc committee was appointed in the fall of 1986 by the President of the Faculty Senate to study current procedures and make recommendations for improvement. This committee was chaired by Dale E. Linvill (Agriculture), Chairman of the Senate Policy Committee. Members of the committee were Clarence Hood (Agriculture), Jeuel LaTorre (Sciences), Robert Snelsire (Engineering), Margery Sly (Library), Holley Ulbrich (Commerce and Industry) and Stephen Wainscott (Liberal Arts).

As part of the review process, input was sought from former Grievance Board chairmen, from department heads and from deans of the various colleges. Communications from the Provost's office were received and interested faculty also provided information used in our discussions. A meeting with the Provost at the beginning of our work brought out many points needing further study.

An article that appeared in ACADEME entitled "Faculty Grievance Procedures Outside Collective Bargaining: The Experience at AAU Campuses" (Estey, M. ACADEME May-June 1986, pages 6-15) offered insight into grievance procedures in place at other Colleges and Universities. Copies of the full report summarized in this article were obtained from the Washington, DC, office of the AAUP for use in our discussions.

The following paragraphs set forth both our findings and our suggestions for improvements to the grievance procedure in use at Clemson University. Suggested Faculty Manual changes are included as an appendix to this report. Other suggested materials are also included in the Appendix.
Issue: Selection of Grievance Procedure II Board Members

The Grievance Board can be easily overtaxed by large numbers of petitions that sometimes accrue especially during the summer months. An enlarged Board would make it possible to conduct simultaneous reviews without putting a heavy workload onto any one Board member. An enlarged Board will both expedite reviews and reduce time commitments of any one member.

We suggest that the Board be increased to seven (7) members elected from the different colleges. All persons elected to the Board should be either Senators or Senate Alternates at the time of their election, and at least one member must be a continuing Senator. All terms of Board members will be for two (2) years.

Elections to the Board will be initially conducted so that staggered terms are established. We suggest that elections for Board members be held in January and that terms be arranged to elect three (3) persons during one Senate year and four (4) during the next Senate year. The Senate Advisory Committee will select one of the Grievance Board members to act as chairman.

Increasing the Board to seven (7) members will allow appointment of a chair whose major responsibilities will be coordination, record keeping, and seeing to the orderly and timely progression of petitions through the grievance process.

The changes we suggest - a January election, staggered terms, selection of an overall chair with coordination responsibilities - insure continuity between Boards by having experienced people always available for election. Members of the Senate will have had the opportunity to work together for several months prior to this election. In addition, it makes possible the election of outgoing Senators to the Grievance Board reducing pressure on active Senate members while taking advantage of experience and knowledge of faculty with Senate experience.

Issue: Training of Grievance Boards

One of the biggest problems associated with serving on a Grievance Board is lack of experience with formal review procedures. There is a need for training both the new Grievance Board members and the Senate Advisory Committee prior to taking part in their first case.

We suggest that orientation sessions for new Grievance Board and Advisory committee members be conducted by experienced Board members, perhaps past Chairmen of Boards, together with the Grievance Counselors and the University Legal Counsel. These sessions will emphasize the role of participants and the orderly searching out of information necessary to decide a case.
The outgoing chairman of the Grievance Board will be responsible for orientation of new Grievance Board members. The President of the Faculty Senate will be responsible for orientation of new Advisory Committee members to their responsibilities in the grievance procedures.

Since GP-I procedures are delegated to Clemson by the Legislature, the GP-I rules are established by the state. Frequent changes in state law makes it mandatory that counselors as well as Grievance Board members be trained in the latest version of the law. University Legal Counsel must participate in this training to assure that relevant changes in the law are adequately covered.

Issue: Materials Required for Inclusion in a Grievance Procedure II Petition

Instances have occurred in which a grievance review was started although the issue had been poorly documented at its outset. Subsequently during the review, it was determined that the issue was not grievable. If additional information had been submitted in the grievance filing procedure, the right of further access to the grievance procedure could have been determined prior to holding these reviews.

Section IIS.3 (page II:30) of the Faculty Manual contains a list of information to be included in a GP-II petition. This list is fairly well disguised within a much too long paragraph. A rewriting of this section is necessary in order to highlight the list of information to be included in a petition.

We suggest that a policy sheet and petition outline be developed for use in GP-II cases. This document will amplify these and other statements in the Faculty Manual. It will contain a list of information that must be included when a GP-II grievance is filed. It will also include a section listing types of information sought during reviews as a guide to the Petitioner. This policy sheet and petition outline can be developed by past grievance chairmen in conjunction with the Provost and University Legal Counsel.

These documents will be very valuable to the Grievance Counselors and to the Advisory Committee. They will be a major part of the training materials used with new Board members.

Issue: Determining the Definition of "Unfair"

There is a perception that Grievance Procedure II lacks a good definition of "unfair" as it applies to matters of judging professional competence. Section IIS, page II:32, paragraph 2, clearly states that "normally not grievable ... complaints arising out of ... judgments and discretionary powers by faculty
and administrators." Thus, only the "fairness" of such decisions and not the decision itself or the improper rendering of a decision is subject to a grievance review.

A Grievance Board can only render a decision about an improper or unfair procedure. They cannot substitute their judgment for that of faculty committees or administrators. They can only recommend a reassessment of a decision if they find that the decision was rendered unfairly.

We feel that although the Faculty Manual contains the above cited statements, some clarification in these sections is necessary. A re-writing of these sections and the inclusion of suggested text will clarify the issue of "fairness" and the Board's role in determining "fairness."

**Issue: Screening of Non-grievable GP-II Complaints**

Several instances have occurred in which documentation to substantiate the nature of the complaint was either insufficient or unclear. Section IIS, page II:32 paragraph 2 of the Faculty Manual clearly states that "normally not grievable (are) ... complaints arising out of ... judgments and discretionary powers by faculty and administrators." This would include "...recommendations concerning nonrenewal of contract and denial of promotion or tenure..." The section also includes a reference to "minor complaints" but does not specify the nature of such complaints.

Some vagueness in language describing the nature of complaints is necessary when differentiating between grievable and non-grievable issues. We feel that within broad guidelines the Board should review grievances. This is the proper forum in which to air complaints against University procedures and the University's decision making process.

Thus, it appears to us that the Faculty Manual contains sufficient guidelines for screening of complaints to be heard under the GP-II procedure. The preparation of a policy sheet and petition outline containing information about items to be included in the documentation will improve the screening process.

**Issue: Apparent "Prima Facie" GP-I Cases**

There have been instances in which GP-I hearings were conducted only to find that evidence presented did not establish the facts necessary for a GP-I hearing. No matter how poorly documentation accompanying a GP-I petition may appear, the hearing body cannot conclude solely on the basis of the petition that there is no prima facie case. The petitioner must have the opportunity to present the case to a hearing body. After hearing the petitioner's testimony, and all evidence presented in their
behalf, the hearing body can conclude that there is not a case and terminate the proceedings.

In essence this action says that if all of the petitioner's evidence is uncontested and everything that the petitioner says is true, the further collection of testimony would not warrant a decision favorable to the petitioner. A determination of a prima facie case can only be made after the hearing, not beforehand.

Issue: Change in Review Process of Promotion and Tenure Decisions

Many grievance claims are filed as the result of promotion and tenure procedures. A few changes in the way personnel files associated with the promotion and tenure process are reviewed can potentially reduce grievance petitions.

Clemson needs a procedure which provides candidates who have failed to receive positive recommendations for reappointment, tenure, or promotion the opportunity to review such recommendations. This opportunity must be available at each step in the review process. Evaluators at each step in the process must be aware of potential grievable complaints that could arise from their decisions based upon erroneous information.

At each step of the way from the peer review committee report through the report of the Provost, the faculty member will have an opportunity to review their recommendations. Further information clarifying issues raised may then be added to the file if the faculty member deems it necessary. The opportunity to add a "disclaimer" or additional information to a negative review can be very helpful in further review of the file.

We suggest that the issue of how promotion, tenure, and reappointment files are processed be taken up by either the Senate Policy Committee or the Commission on Faculty Affairs. These bodies should consider procedures similar to those suggested by Professor R. F. Larson in a letter to this committee. Improvements in the way faculty personnel files are handled can potentially reduce the number of grievance petitions filed.

Issue: Timeline for Processing Grievance Petitions

Everyone involved in a grievance petition is looking for speedy decisions. The timeline as it is currently defined in the Faculty Manual needs to be refined and improved. In addition, it must be impressed upon Grievance Board chairmen that a timeline is designed for everyone's benefit.

We suggest that many of the references to "calendar days" in the current procedure be changed to "work days". A "work day" should be defined as a day on which the University is open for business.
Specific places in the Faculty Manual where this change will improve overall operation of the grievance process will need to be determined in conjunction with the Provost. This change will be minimal yet allow more time for preparation of necessary documents, Board meetings and formulation of decisions.

We suggest that the time between receipt of a grievance petition and the initial meeting of the GP-II Board be shortened from thirty (30) calendar days to fifteen (15) work days. The initial meeting of the Board will be for the sole purpose of determining whether the matter is grievable. If the matter is determined grievable, a Hearing Board consisting of three (3) persons will be assigned and a time set to initiate the review. The review must commence no later than thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the petition.

Orderly and timely resolution of hearings is very necessary in order to forestall potential legal problems. The Faculty Manual currently states that the final report of the Grievance Board's findings must be completed "... no later than ten calendar days after the Board's final meeting on the matter...". This has been interpreted as being the final meeting at which the petition is discussed. We suggest that this policy be changed to have the Board's decision rendered within ten (10) working days after the final meeting at which statements are taken from witnesses, the petitioner or the respondents.

We suggest that the time for responses to a GP-I petition by the Provost and President be increased from the current ten (10) to thirty (30) calendar days. This will allow more time for review of especially lengthy documents compiled as part of the GP-I review process. We see little reason to change time for responses to GP-II petitions.

Issue: Order of conducting GP-I and GP-II hearings.

The order in which petitions are considered is in need of change. Current policy allows concurrent filing of GP-I and GP-II petitions. When this occurs, the GP-I petition takes precedence and hearings for the GP-I petition are conducted prior to conducting reviews for the GP-II petition.

From information received by this committee, we conclude that GP-II reviews are often best conducted prior to the GP-I hearing. Issues put forth in GP-I petitions are many times resolved through the less formal GP-II process. Thus, the added costs and delays inherent in GP-I hearings can be avoided.

There can also be other overriding reasons for establishing the specific order of hearings. Such decisions as dismissal in relation to the budgeting cycle may dictate when a case should be concluded. We also note that since a GP-I petition may involve outside agencies, the legality of delaying a GP-I petition will
need to be determined prior to implementing this change.

**Issue: Appeals to the President**

Appeals to the President in GP-I cases are entirely appropriate. GP-I petitions involve not only Faculty Manual issues but also issues of State and Federal law. Final decisions in such cases must be made at the highest level when necessary.

Appeals to the President of GP-II decisions are another matter. The Faculty Manual states only that the appeal must be made in writing. (Section IIS.7, page II:31) It contains no guidelines on the process or procedures to be followed by the President in reviewing the case. Appeals of GP-II decisions can turn into emotional rather than objective appeals if strict procedures are not followed.

Guidelines must be established for the Presidential appeals process. These guidelines must state who can initiate an appeal to the President. They should include provisions for notifying all parties involved. They should also include the form in which the President is to receive information and from whom this information is to be received.

We suggest that either the petitioner or the respondent(s) can initiate an appeal to the President. The appeal must be written and a copy sent to the office of the University legal counsel. The University Legal Counsel will notify all parties involved - petitioner, respondent(s), Provost, and Chairman of the Grievance Board - that an appeal has been filed.

The President must be free to not only review the appropriate written record but to also conduct interviews with whomever he pleases to obtain a better understanding of the petition. We encourage the President to seek all avenues of information regarding petitions forwarded to him.

**Issue: Confidentiality of Petitions**

The issue of confidentiality was brought to our attention from many sources. We know of instances in which cases and issues surrounding a case were discussed in open meetings. We heard of rumors that Grievance Board members were talking about cases. There have been instances in which Board members have been approached and told of many issues connected with a case.

In our work, however, we have uncovered no instances in which Grievance Board members or Counselors have talked to anyone except other Board members or Counselors as the case may be. Up to this time and to the best of our knowledge, information about cases that has flown through the rumor mill did not originate with the Board or the Grievance Counselors.
We find no problems with members of the Board consulting with one another or with legal counsel on procedures and issues. Counselors also must have this ability in order to assure that similar cases are handled similarly. It often takes consultation with a fellow Board member or Counselor to solidify ideas and support conclusions.

We urge confidentiality on the part of all parties involved in the grievance procedure. Breaking the trust of confidentiality only hurts the process and adds nothing to the atmosphere surrounding the case.

Issue: Counselors for Faculty and Administrators

Counselors add to the operation of Clemson's grievance procedures by applying knowledge gained through working on prior cases. Their experience helps them inform all parties in a grievance about the types of information needed in a grievance petition and what to expect when reviews and hearings are conducted. Current Grievance Counselors act as the "institutional memory" available to faculty as they prepare their case.

Faculty Grievance Counselors have been approached by administrators asking for help in pending cases. Some administrators have requested help on behalf of faculty whom they support while other administrators have asked for assistance in petitions to which they were a party. Although help was given when asked, this is not in the charge given to the current group of counselors.

It is our opinion that Grievance Counselors need to be available for consultation with all parties named in a grievance petition. Counselors functioning in this expanded capacity would be acting much as they are in their current role as counselors available to faculty.

At the present time there are three (3) counselors selected to work with faculty. This number does not contain adequate representation from all colleges. Occasions have arisen and will continue to arise when a counselor is asked to advise someone within their own college.

We suggest that the number of Grievance Counselors be increased to at least five (5) selected from five (5) different colleges. These counselors will be selected from among the tenured Associate and Full Professorial ranks. By increasing the number of counselors, the pool will be large enough for consultation with all parties involved in a petition.
Issue: Role of Lawyers, Counselors and Other Advisors

The grievance proceeding is designed to facilitate gathering of information. It should be conducted to minimize the trauma individuals experience when involved in such matters. Many lawyers either fail to understand the role of the Advisory Committee and Hearing Board in a grievance proceeding or refuse to accept their fact gathering mission. When lawyers are permitted to respond to the facts of a case, to directly present information, and to conduct a "cross-examination", the atmosphere of a courtroom trial can inadvertently be established.

Presentations in recent hearings and summary statements by legal counsel have added to both the length of hearings and to the length and cost of transcripts. Past Advisory Committee members reported that in some cases the active participation of legal counsel may have been detrimental to the grievant's case. The establishment of a "courtroom atmosphere" and the courtroom approach to conducting a hearing must be avoided.

We recommend that each party to a grievance be permitted to have the assistance of counsel of their choice. This counsel may be an academic advisor, fellow faculty member, or legal counsel. The role of the counsel, however, will be solely advisory with no active access to floor discussion. It takes a "hard-hearted" Chairman of the hearing body to enforce such restrictions.

Issue: Department Heads' views of the grievance process.

We heard time and again from department heads about their unhappiness with the grievance process. It is the rare Department Head who is experienced in grievance cases. Consequently they do not know what to expect in a grievance hearing.

The Department Heads at Clemson are often assigned to the netherland between Faculty and Administration when grievance matters arise. They expressed frustration with receiving little support from the Administration in terms of advice and counseling when they were involved in a grievance proceeding. At the same time they feel that little has been done to prepare them for the role of administrator. In depth training in personnel matters will go a long way toward alleviating their fears of the grievance process.

The Administration of Clemson University should provide support and encouragement for its department heads, the individuals at the lowest rung of the administrative structure. We suggest that Department Heads be given training in aspects of their job. This training should include budget and money management, personnel evaluation, interpersonal skills and a host of other topics relevant to the day-to-day workings of a major University.
Department heads should have access to University counselors and be able to confer with them about specific issues raised in grievance petitions. They should be covered by adequate insurance against lawsuits that could arise from grievance issues.
APPENDIX

The committee has identified several issues in this report. It recommends the following additions and changes to the Faculty Manual to correct these issues.

Issue* There is an inadequate number of Grievance Procedure II Board Members to cover cases that sometimes accrue. Expansion of the Grievance Board to Seven (7) members will allow the Chairman to act as a coordinator for the Board and to oversee all cases as they go through review.

Suggested Faculty Manual Statement:
page II:32 next to last paragraph

Composition of the Grievance Board. The Grievance Board shall consist of seven members selected from the ranks of Full and Associate Professors who are members or alternates of the Faculty Senate at the time of their election. The term of service on the Grievance Board shall be two years. The election shall be held each January in such a manner that no more than four (4) Board members are replaced at one time. This restriction in no way inhibits selection of additional members to replace those who are no longer able to serve.

Issue* Although the Faculty Manual contains several statements about "unfair" issues grievable under the GP-II procedure, a rewriting of several sections of the Faculty Manual is necessary to clarify the issue of "fairness" and the Board's role in determining "fairness".

Issue* Determining the difference between grievable and non-grievable GP-II petitions continues to be a problem. The Faculty Manual contains sufficient definitions and guidelines for screening of these petitions. The Board should adopt broad guidelines for reviewing grievances since this is the proper forum in which to air complaints against University procedures and the University's decision making process.

Suggested Faculty Manual Statement:
page II:32 1st para replacement of 2 paragraphs

The Provost together with the Grievance Board may determine that actions other than those specified above are grievable. The burden of proof that actions taken were unfair lies with the Petitioner. The petitioner is responsible for documenting in the petition that there is prima facie evidence a grievable action occurred.

Complaints arising out of authorized exercise of Faculty and administrative judgement and discretionary powers are usually not grievable. It is not the intent of this procedure to have the Grievance Board substitute its judgement of a petitioner's
professional qualifications and performance for that of peer review committees and administrators. Thus usually not grievable are recommendations of contract renewal and denial of promotion or tenure as long as appropriate policies and procedures have been followed.

Minor complaints are usually not grievable. What constitutes a "minor complaint" is left to the discretion of the Provost and/or the Grievance Board.

Issue* GP-II reviews are best conducted prior to GP-I hearings. Issues put forth in GP-I petitions are many times resolved through the less formal GP-II process.

Suggested Faculty Manual Statement:
page II:24 2nd para

If at any time the Provost determines that a Faculty member has filed grievances concurrently under both Grievance Procedures I and II, and that these grievances are based upon the same or a related factual situation, he may suspend processing of one petition until a final decision has been reached on the other petition. Grievance Procedure II petitions will usually be addressed first. The Provost may decide, if it is so desirable, to hear the GP-I petition prior to the GP-II petition. In all cases, the Provost will notify the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate, the Grievance Board and all parties to the Grievance when either procedure is suspended pending outcome of the other petition.

Issue* The timeline for processing grievance petitions needs modification. The time between receipt of a grievance petition and the initial hearing by the GP-II Board should be no more than thirty (30) calendar days. Time for responses by the Provost and President should be increased to thirty (30) days. The Board's decision should be rendered within ten (10) work days after the final meeting at which statements are taken from witnesses, the petitioner or the respondent(s).

Suggested Faculty Manual Statement: GP-I procedures.
page II:26 para 4 et seq.

Procedure. 1) a faculty member who desires to file under Grievance Procedure I must submit a written petition within thirty (30) calendar days after the date of the alleged aggravation. (see footnote) The petition is to be submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee. The grievance petition must state specifically the parties involved, places and dates, and the relief sought. After the thirty calendar days have passed, the faculty member forfeits the right to petition under this grievance procedure. Any actions taken with respect to the faculty member shall become final.
Footnote:

As an example of the time limits, if notification is given that a faculty member will be dismissed for cause, the thirty-day time period begins with the date that the faculty member was notified. The time period does not begin with the effective date of dismissal.

2) The Chairman of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee shall call a special meeting of the committee within ten (10) work days of receipt of a properly submitted petition. A quorum for this meeting shall consist of five members of the Advisory Committee. If the Advisory Committee determines the petition is not grievable under this procedure, the Chair shall notify the faculty member within five (5) calendar days of that decision and the matter is closed.

If the Advisory Committee determines that the matter is grievable under this procedure, the Chair shall notify all parties to the grievance within five (5) calendar days of that decision. At the same time, the Chair shall send copies of the petition to the party(es) against whom the grievance is brought.

The Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate will be the Hearing Panel. They will set a date to start the hearing process no later than thirty (30) calendar days after reaching the decision to hear the petition. Notification of the hearing date will include: a) the time, place and nature of the hearing; b) the procedure to be followed during the hearing; c) a statement of the legal authority under which the hearing is to be held; d) references to the pertinent University statutes and portions of the Faculty Manual; e) a short and plain statement of the matters asserted.

Suggested Faculty Manual Statement: GP-II procedures. page II:30 section 4 et seq.

4) If the grievance is not to be considered by the Grievance Board, the Provost shall review the matter requesting additional information from any person involved as needed. He shall render a final written decision within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of the petition. The written decision will be transmitted to the petitioner and other parties concerned in the matter.

Either the Faculty member or the Provost, with the Faculty member's consent, may request immediate referral of the matter to the Grievance Board. The Board shall meet within fifteen (15) work days after receiving the petition to determine whether the petition meets criteria set forth below delimiting grievable and non-grievable complaints. If the Board finds the matter grievable, it shall set a date for review no later than thirty (30) calendar days after their receipt of the matter. If the matter is determined non-grievable, the Board will promptly
notify the petitioner, respondent(s) and Provost of their decision.

5) If the matter is found grievable, the Grievance Board shall convene a three member Hearing Board. An alternate Grievance Board member shall be assigned to each Hearing Board. This Hearing Board shall conduct an expeditious, orderly and equitable review of the matter requesting additional information from the Provost as necessary. The Board shall allow each of the parties to the petition to present any facts or other information bearing on the matter. (These parties shall not meet with the Board at the same time.)

The Hearing Board shall submit its findings and recommendations to the Provost along with appropriate information, documents and records within ten (10) work days of the final meeting at which they received information from witnesses, petitioner or respondent(s) relevant to the matter. A copy of the Board's recommendations shall be forwarded to the faculty member at the same time it is forwarded to the Provost.

Issue 2 Appeals to the President in GP-I cases are appropriate since final decisions in such cases must be made at the highest level when necessary. Appeals to GP-II decisions can turn into emotional rather than objective appeals. Guidelines including who can appeal, notification that an appeal has been filed and the form to receive information related to the case should be established for Presidential appeals.

Suggested Faculty Manual Statement: GP-I Page II:28 para 1

Findings of fact and recommendations of the committee must be based solely on the hearing record. The majority vote of the Committee shall be the recommendation forwarded to the Provost. The recommendation must be submitted to the Provost within ten (10) work days after conclusion of the hearing. If the hearing procedure has been waived, recommendations of the Committee shall be submitted to the Provost no later than ten (10) work days after completion of their investigation of the grievance.

Both parties to the grievance shall be given copies of the recommendations at the time they are forwarded to the Provost. The Chair shall provide a copy of the transcribed record to both parties as soon as it becomes available.

3) The Provost shall review the record of the hearing and render a written decision within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of the record. The thirty-day time limit shall not begin until the Provost is in receipt of the transcribed record. The decision shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law, separately stated. Copies of the decision shall be sent to all parties to the petition and to the Advisory Committee.
4) The faculty member may appeal the Provost's decision to the President of the University. A written appeal must be submitted within ten (10) calendar days after receipt of the Provost's decision to the Office of the President. If an appeal is made, the President shall review the hearing record and the decision of the Provost and shall render a written decision within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of the request for the review.

5) The faculty member may appeal the President's decision to the Board of Trustees. A written appeal must be submitted to the Secretary of the Board of Trustees within ten (10) calendar days after receipt of the President's decision. Receipt by the Secretary shall be deemed receipt by the Board. (rest of paragraph as is with proper grammar)

Suggested Faculty Manual Statement: GP-II page II:31 para 3

7) Any party may submit a written appeal of the Provost's decision to the President of the University. This appeal must be submitted within seven (7) calendar days after receipt of the Provost's decision. Upon receipt of an appeal, the President will notify in writing the Faculty member, the Provost, the respondent(s), and the Grievance Board Chair.

The President shall review the grievance petition, the recommendations of the Grievance Board and the decision of the Provost. Those persons notified of the appeal may submit additional material to the President either verbally or in writing if they so desire. The President may also seek additional comments from any person involved in the case.

The President shall render a final decision on behalf of the University within thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the written appeal. Copies of the President's decision shall be sent to the Provost, the Faculty member, the respondent(s) and the Grievance Board.

Issue: There is an inadequate number of Grievance Counselors. Both sides in a grievance petition often need assistance. The number of Grievance Counselors should be increased to five (5) selected from five (5) different colleges. These Counselors should be selected from among the tenured Associate and Full Professorial ranks.

Suggested Faculty Manual Statement: page II:24 para 4 et seq

For faculty members (including librarians and academic administrators) seeking assistance in understanding grievance procedures, the Faculty Senate provides the services of grievance counselors. A counselor offers advice on which of the grievance procedures to follow prior to filling a grievance petition. At
the request of the petitioner, the grievance counselor will review the petition before it is submitted to assist in clarifying the grievable allegations. The counselor, however, does not render any decision on the merits or substance of the petition.

Administrators may also seek advice of counselors on grievance matters. Information about general procedures followed in grievance hearings helpful to the respondent can be obtained from the grievance counselors. A grievance counselor will not advise opposing parties in a petition nor will the counselor advise a faculty member from their own college. Individual counselors may seek advice from fellow counselors and may refer their clients to other counselors in order to expedite the grievance process.

Five counselors selected from different colleges will usually be in office at the same time. These counselors are appointed annually by the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee from the ranks of tenured Associate and Full Professors who have a thorough knowledge of the Faculty Manual and the grievance processes. At least one of the five counselors appointed will be an academic administrator. The Advisory Committee will attempt to stagger the counselors' terms on a three-year rotation and to provide minority representation whenever possible.

Issue The each party to a grievance often needs the assistance of counsel of their choice. This counsel may be an academic advisor, fellow faculty member, or legal counsel. The role of the counsel, however, should be solely advisory with no active access to floor discussion.

Suggested Faculty Manual Statement:
page II:27 para 3

Each party to the petition shall be permitted to have the assistance of an advisor of his or her choice in all proceedings. The role of the advisor, however, shall be solely to advise the party. The advisor shall not be permitted to participate in the proceedings in any other way.

"All matters...." (as is with proper paragraphs and grammar)
para 4 same page add punctuation and delete 3rd and 4th sentences.

Issue There is confusion about materials to be included in a Grievance Procedure II Petition. A policy sheet and petition outline should be developed for use in GP-II cases.

SEE ATTACHED DRAFT OF FORM
Grievance Procedure II Petition

In order for the Grievance board and/or the Provost to determine whether or not a matter is grievable you are requested to provide the information indicated below:

1. The name(s) of the specific individuals against whom the grievance is filed.

2. The dates upon which the grievable matter occurred.

3. The specific provision(s) of Grievance Procedure II under which you believe the matter to be grievable (please check the appropriate box)

   [ ] a) the improper or unfair (to the complainant) implementation of departmental, college, or University policies or procedures by persons authorized to implement such policies or procedures.

   Please reproduce below or provide a citation for the specific policies or procedures involved.

   [ ] b) the improper or unfair (to the complainant) application of recognized criteria or guidelines used in formal review processes by persons authorized to conduct such reviews.

   Please specify below or provide a citation for the criteria or guidelines involved.

   [ ] c) the improper or unfair (to the complainant) assignment of professional duties by an administrator.

   Please indicate below the specific duties assigned.
(d) the improper or unfair appraisals (by an administrator) of the complainant's performance

Please indicate below the elements of performance (i.e., teaching, research, services) that have been improperly or unfairly appraised.

(e) the improper or unfair denial (by an administrator) of the complainant's access to departmental, college, or University resources.

Please specify below the nature of the resources that have been denied.

(f) the improper or unfair determination (by an administrator) of the complainant's salary increment.

Please append any relative and relevant data on this subject.

4. If one or more administrators are involved in your response to 3, above, please specify the element(s) of impropriety or unfairness that entered into the exercise of his or her (or their) judgement(s) (e.g., favoritism to others, prejudiced opinion of your teaching or research specialty, etc.)

5. Please list below the supporting documents that are appended to this petition.
6. Please indicate below the specific relief sought.

7. Please indicate below whether you wish this petition to be reviewed initially by the Grievance Board or by the Provost (if initially reviewed by the Grievance Board it will be later reviewed by the Provost with the benefit of the Board's findings and recommendations).
Presidents Report

1. Average raises for faculty will be 2.5 percent with a 0 to 5 percent range. Any raises above 5 percent have to be approved in Columbia. The raises will be effective October 1, 1987.

2. In accordance with the recently passed Freedom of Information Act, the Library now has on reserve a list of salaries of all state employees by name and employer for employees over $50,000, or for employees who hold the rank of department head or higher. All persons with salaries over $30,000 are listed within salary ranges. The Advisory Committee has recommended that a listing of Clemson University salaries be abstracted and distributed to the Senate. I plan to have this accomplished by the end of the summer.

3. The Facilities Planning Committee approved the Five Year Permanent Improvements Plan in essentially the form that was presented to the Senate at the June meeting.

4. The Advisory Committee approved Steve Wainscott and Wes Burnett as Grievance Counselors. This completes our selection of counselor as summarized below.

   Buddy Dillman  Ag Econ  3374
   Madelynn Oglesby  Nursing  3072
   Clay Hipp  Marketing  5286
   Bob Snelsire  E&CE  5915
   Steve Wainscott  Political Sci.  3480
   Wes Burnett  RR&TM  2204

5. The Policy Committee will meet on July 8 to complete their study of the final report of The Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Structure and Function of the Commissions and the President’s Council. Lew Bryan has promised to have a copy of their recommendations in the mail by Thursday, July 9 in order for you to study prior to our July 14 meeting. Please be prepared to discuss. We would like to have something for Provost Maxwell and President Lennon to consider. Although I do not want to act in haste, we have had an adequate amount of time to consider the original report. The major hurdle appears to be one paragraph describing the composition of the Academic Council. In my view the purpose of the Council is to provide the best possible advice to the President on all matters relating to academics in its broadest meaning.

6. At the June meeting, the Athletic Council made recommendations to the President and our NCAA representative, Bobby Skelton, on all issues considered at the recent NCAA meeting. There were no real disagreements between the Council, the Director of Athletics, and Bobby Skelton on the main issues.

7. I need names to recommend to the Honorary Degrees Committee for their consideration. Most candidates for honorary degrees have some ties to the state of South Carolina.

8. Summer is a good time for some to consider writing an article for the Open Forum. Contact George Haselton or Leo Gaddis.
9. The Cabinet approved the Clemson University Research Foundation Policies and Procedures Manual. One small change will be examined concerning whether the overhead money will be deducted from grants prior to the transfer of money from CURF to the University instead of returning the overhead money from the University to CURF. This is to prevent the appearance of placing state money into the foundation.

10. At the Cabinet meeting, Pat Padgett discussed the possibility of obtaining a child care facility. After a lengthy discussion it was suggested that a meeting be held with local operators of child care facilities along with one individual who is interested in building a child care facility with contractual arrangements with the University. I have volunteered our Welfare Committee to work with Pat in setting up a meeting.

11. Another item which was discussed at both the Board of Trustee meeting on July 11 as well as at the Cabinet, is the admission standards required by all South Carolina colleges in 1988. Last year only 58 percent of our entering students met the standards. We should provide some input into this process. David Maxwell suggests that he could use some help in trying to present a reasonable policy to the CHE. I have asked Roy Hedden to consider this problem. This was the subject of the editorial in the Greenville News on July 13. The editorial did not present both sides of the story.

12. At the Board of Trustees Meeting, I reported briefly on several items: our interest in the Performing Arts Center; use of pretax dollars for funding of additional benefits such as the state term life insurance and child care; early retirement plan; and problems relating to admission and continuing enrollment.

13. At the last meeting of the Faculty Senate I reported that the Council of Deans had approved a plan to have a committee within each college rank the proposals submitted to the University Research Grant Committee for University Research Grants and Provost Research Awards. This is being restudied by an ad hoc committee of the Council of Deans.
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Dr. E. Lewis Bryan, Chairman of Policy Committee
DATE: July 9, 1987
SUBJECT: Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Structure and Function of the Commissions and the President's Council

1. As indicated in item 5 of the President's Report, the Policy Committee recommendation is enclosed.

2. The Policy Committee recommendation differs from Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation primarily in the structure of the Academic Council. Please pay particular attention to both structures.

3. Senator Coulter will introduce a motion to accept this Policy Committee recommendation.

ELB/kkh
Enclosure
July 8, 1987

Report of The Policy Committee of The Faculty Senate
Concerning The
Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Structure and Function of the Commissions and the President's Council

The Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate has addressed and modified the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Structure and Function of the Commissions and the President's Council. At the time of the appointment of the Ad Hoc Committee on November 20, 1986, almost all University committees reported through the commission structure. In fact most commissions rarely meet and consequently there has been little activity at the regular monthly meetings of the President's Council. During the current academic year the Council has only met four times. Most decisions are either rendered at lower levels of the administration, made in meetings of the President's Cabinet, or made in meetings with the President and the Vice Presidents. The two commissions that appear to be most active since the inception of the commission structure are the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research. The newest commission, the Commission on Staff Affairs, also serves a definite function, but the items considered by this commission are generally of a different nature than those considered by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research. For this reason the Policy Committee agrees with the Ad Hoc Committee, and recommends that the Commission on Staff Affairs be retained and report directly to the President's Cabinet.
The Policy Committee also agrees in principle with the Ad Hoc Committee that breakup of the present structure into a simpler revised structure should be undertaken for several reasons: (1) in the present structure, the collegiate deans have little direct input to the President of the University, and (2) the size and diversity of the President's Council had not made it suitable for discussing issues, but had made it merely a forum where items were reported from the active commissions and "rubber stamped." A number of the members of the President's Council appear to have little knowledge of the items presented on the agenda, and the absentee rate appears to be excessive.

The Policy Committee, therefore, recommends that the President's Council and its associated commission structure be abolished and replaced with an Academic Council as described in attachment 1. The committee views the President's Cabinet as carrying on the day to day business of the University with all major academic policies being routed to the Academic Council. A description of the new Cabinet is given in attachment 2. The committee hopes that by keeping the Academic Council and President's Cabinet to a reasonable number of members, the groups will function more actively.

If the major recommendations of the committee are implemented, a number of details should be addressed. The present structure of the President's Council is described by a constitution. This constitution describes in detail the functions and makeup of the Council, the commissions, and the committees which report to the commissions. The constitution also describes the frequency of meetings and the makeup of an executive committee responsible for setting the agenda. A similar constitution should be written for the Academic Council through a process
involving a draft document from the Faculty Senate. The committee recommends that the V.P. for Administration be responsible for setting the agenda and providing secretarial help for the Academic Council.

The committees which formerly (or presently) reported to commissions to be abolished are shown on attachment 3 along with suggested new places for them to report. These can be examined in more detail and changes can be made in the Faculty Manual at a later date.
ATTACHMENT 1

Descriptions

(Similar to what will appear in the Faculty Manual assuming that the Administration and the Board of Trustees implement the recent unanimous vote of the President's Council on the new admissions policy)

Academic Council - This body is charged with examining; formulating and making policy recommendations for the University in all academic matters. The body is generally advisory to the President and the Provost of the University although certain of its commission sub-committees are empowered by the Board of Trustees to render final decisions on matters relating to admission, continuing enrollment, and readmission. Currently reporting to the Academic Council are two commissions, the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research.

Members of the Academic Council are: the President of the University (Chairperson); the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Chairpersons of the Undergraduate Studies and Graduate Studies and Research commissions; the President of the Faculty Senate; the President of the Student Senate; the President-Elect of the Faculty Senate; the nine collegiate deans, and seven faculty members representing the tenure track ranks and chaired professors as follows: two assistant professors; two associate professors; two full professors and one chaired professor, to be selected for three-year staggered terms by the Advisory Council of the Faculty Senate, but who
will not be members of that body. Additional nonvoting members may be appointed by the President. Voting substitutes may be authorized by the President.

Details of the organization and membership of the Academic Council, the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research, and associated committees which report to the Commissions are described in the Constitution of the Academic Council. Unless otherwise provided in this section (VI.C), faculty representatives to these commissions and committees are elected by their college faculties for three-year terms (staggered to give continuity) and are limited to two consecutive terms. Faculty Senate representatives, except ex officio members, are elected to one year terms. Except as otherwise provided in this section, student representatives are elected by the Student Senate and, where appropriate, the Graduate Student Association, to one-year terms (renewable once). Similarly, unless otherwise provided, Department Heads are elected by the Organization of Academic Department Heads, and Deans elected by the Council of Academic Deans, to serve three-year terms.

The Commission on Undergraduate Studies reviews and recommends to the Academic Council general policies and procedures on undergraduate studies and academic affairs. The sub-committees of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee have additional responsibilities as described below. The members of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies are: the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies (Chairperson); the Chairperson of the Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee and one additional faculty senator; the Chairperson of the Student Senate Committee on Academic Affairs; three students from different colleges nominated by the Student Body President and appointed by their collegiate dean;
a Department Head elected by the Organization of Academic Department Heads; a representative of the Library selected by the Provost; one faculty representative from each of the nine colleges; the Chairperson of the Scholarships and Awards Committee; the Chairperson of the Honors Committee; the Chairperson of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee; and the Chairperson of the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee. The following committees report to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies.

Scholarships and Awards Committee. NO CHANGE.

Honors Committee. NO CHANGE.

Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee. This committee formulates and recommends changes in the admission policy and continuing enrollment policy of the University. This committee is also responsible for establishing the predicted grade-point ratio for admission to each college within the University. This grade-point ratio will be established in consultation with the Dean of each college, the Provost, and the Vice President for Student Affairs. Students failing to meet this minimum will be admitted only upon approval of the Admissions Exceptions Committee. Members are the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies (Chairperson); the Chairperson of the Student Senate Committee on Academic Affairs; a representative of the Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee; a representative of the Student Minority Council; the Dean of Admissions and Registration; and one faculty representative from each college. Nonvoting members are the Director of Admissions, the Director of Housing, and the Registrar.
Continuing Enrollment Appeals Sub-Committee. This sub-committee is composed of six of the nine elected faculty representatives on the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee and one minority faculty member may be appointed by the Provost, all with staggered terms to ensure continuity. The three faculty committee members not represented on the sub-committee could be consulted regarding appeals of students from their college. Since most appeals are necessarily considered between terms (after grades are in and before registration for the next term), this should be a major consideration in establishing this sub-committee's membership. The Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs (Admissions & Registration) will be the Chair and nonvoting member, and the Registrar will be a nonvoting member.

Admissions Exception Sub-Committee. This sub-committee is composed of the remaining three elected faculty representatives on the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee and two faculty members may be appointed by the Provost all with staggered terms to ensure continuity. Minority representation will be assured by the Provost. The applicants considered by the committee will consist of 1) prospective students whose acceptance has been recommended by the admissions office, but who fail to meet the minimum predicted grade-point ratio requirement in the college of their choice. The Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs (Admissions & Registration) will be the Chair and nonvoting member, and Director of Admissions will be a nonvoting member.
Student Academic Grievance Committee. NO CHANGE.

The Schedule Committee. NO CHANGE.

University Libraries Advisory Committee. NO CHANGE.

Cooperative Education Committee. NO CHANGE.

The Commission on Graduate Studies and Research. NO CHANGE.
Description

(Similar to what will appear in Faculty Manual)

The President's Cabinet. The President's Cabinet advises the President of the University on policy decisions affecting all areas of the University and serves as a communications forum between the President and the various administrative divisions of the University. Chaired by the President, the Cabinet is composed of the Vice Presidents; the President of the Faculty Senate; the President of the Student Body; and the Chairman of the Commission on Staff Affairs.
List of Committees which formerly reported to a Commission to be abolished.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Reports to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>Des. by Comm.</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Manual</td>
<td>Des. by Comm.</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salaries &amp; Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>Des. by Comm.</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshals'</td>
<td>Appt. by Pres.</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Advisory</td>
<td>Elected by Com.</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>Des. by Comm.</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol &amp; Drug Abuse</td>
<td>Elected by Com.</td>
<td>VP Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Affairs</td>
<td>Des. by VP</td>
<td>VP Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>Des. by VP</td>
<td>VP Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid, Student Employment &amp; Placement</td>
<td>Des. by VP</td>
<td>VP Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Advisory</td>
<td>Des. by VP</td>
<td>VP Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Union</td>
<td>Pres. of Union</td>
<td>VP Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Advisory Board</td>
<td>Appt. by VP</td>
<td>VP Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Council</td>
<td>ACC/NCAA Rep.</td>
<td>VP Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Vending Machine</td>
<td>Budget Dir.</td>
<td>VP Business &amp; Fin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Appt. by Provost</td>
<td>VP Business &amp; Fin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>Dir. of Div. of</td>
<td>VP Agriculture &amp; N.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Reg. and PSP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Dir. of SC Ag. Exp.</td>
<td>VP Agriculture &amp; N.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td>VP Business &amp; Fin.</td>
<td>Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape &amp; Site Dev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Env. Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking &amp; Traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Rare Possessions and the Continuing Education Committees as well as the Minority Council were previously listed. The two committees do not exist as standing committees and the Minority Council is a student council.
### INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

#### PRESIDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC COUNCIL</th>
<th>CABINET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 President (ch)</td>
<td>1 President (ch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The Provost of the University</td>
<td>6 Vice Presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Collegiate Deans</td>
<td>1 President of Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 V. Provost for U.S.</td>
<td>1 President of Student Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 V. Provost for G.S.</td>
<td>1 Chairman of Commission on Staff Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 President of Student Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 President of Faculty Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Vice President of Faculty Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Faculty representing the tenure track ranks and chaired professors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 10

The Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research will be retained and report to the Academic Council. The Commission on Classified Staff will be retained with the Chairman reporting to the Cabinet. All other Commissions will be abolished with the various standing committees which presently report to these abolished Commissions reporting as shown in attachment 3. There is the possibility of consolidating and/or eliminating some of these committees.
INFORMATIONAL ITEM

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

4/13/87

COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

Cooperative Education Committee
University Libraries Advisory Committee
Honors Committee
Scholarship and Awards Committee
Student Academic Grievance Committee
Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee
The Schedule Committee (recommendations go also to Commission on Graduate Studies and Research)
Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee

COMMISSION ON GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

Research Advisory Committee
Graduate Admissions Committee
Graduate Studies Advisory Committee
Graduate Awards Committee
Graduate Student Academic Grievance Committee
Patent Committee
University Research Grant Committee
Institutional Biosafety Committee
Protection of Human Subjects Committee
Animal Research Committee
Biomedical Research Support Grant Committee
Excerpt from Original Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Structure
(See p 4 bottom paragraph of original rpt.)

Members of the Academic Council are: the President of the University (Chairperson); the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Chairpersons of the commissions; the Vice President for Institutional Advancement; the Vice President for Student Affairs; the Vice President for Business and Finance; the Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources; the Vice President for Administration; the President of the Faculty Senate; the President of the Student Senate; the President-Elect of the Faculty Senate; and the nine collegiate deans. Additional nonvoting members may be appointed by the President. Voting substitutes may be authorized by the President.

Note that the underlined members have been removed or changed in some way.

As Amended

Members of the Academic Council are: the President of the University (Chairperson); the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Chairpersons of the commissions; the Dean of Admissions and Registration; the President of the Faculty Senate; the President-Elect of the Faculty Senate; the Chairperson of the Scholastics Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate; one holder of a named professorship or chair (elected by the Faculty Senate for a three-year term); the Chairperson of the Executive Committee of the Organization of Department Heads; the President of the Student Senate; the Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources; and the eight collegiate deans. The Vice President for Administration will serve as a nonvoting member. Additional nonvoting members may be appointed by the President. Voting substitutes may be authorized by the President.

Note that the underlined members have been added or changed in some way.
Resolved, That the Faculty Senate recommends that only University Awards should be given at University Faculty Meetings.
I. CALL TO ORDER

President Mullins called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. He announced that Provost Maxwell would be attending the meeting, at the request of President Lennon, to provide some explanation about the differences in the approved budgets of the University of South Carolina and Clemson University. He asked for approval to proceed with the agenda until Provost Maxwell arrived, and permission to interrupt the agenda at that point for his remarks. Approval was granted by assent.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the July 14, 1987 Senate meeting were approved as corrected.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS

President Mullins announced that Senator Halfacre has been appointed Chair of the Senate Welfare Committee. Senator Coston has been elected to fill the term of Senator Daniels until his return. It was also announced that Senator Dubose has left Clemson to take another position, the College of Agricultural Sciences will hold an election for his position on the Senate tomorrow.

A. Policy. Senator Bryan gave the report. Most of the time of this committee has been spent in consideration of the report of the ad hoc committee to review the structure of the Commissions and the President's Council. Their report and the original report of the committee will be
considered by the Senate at this meeting. Senator Bryan urged the Senate to come to a decision on this issue at this meeting and not to delay action any longer.

B. Research. Senator Birrenkott reported that they met on August 17 to respond to a request from the Advisory Committee to recommend membership for a search committee for the new position of Vice-President for Research. Birrenkott announced that each Dean should have received a request from the Office of University Research for the name of a faculty member to serve on CURFFAC. He encouraged the Senators to carefully consider faculty to recommend, the group will be meeting soon and action needs to be taken promptly.

C. Scholastic Policy. Senator Hedden read the report (Attachment A).

IV. SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

President Mullins referred to Item 1 of the President's report (Attachment B) which comments on Faculty salary increases in relation to those received by Faculty at USC. President Lennon was concerned that information relative to this difference be presented to the Faculty so he asked that Provost Maxwell address that issue at the Senate meeting. Provost Maxwell was then introduced.

Provost Maxwell said that the question as he understood it was, "Why is USC able to increase salaries by 4% and we only by 2.5%?" In addition they had no increase in tuition and they did not give any salary increases to administrators. To answer that question the amounts of last years cuts must be examined. At that time the bottom line figure of X (USC) and Y (CU) were established. This year those figures were
multiplied by a factor of 115% for USC and 111% for Clemson. There are several reasons for the difference in multipliers.

First, there are the Step 12 differences. "When a foundation builds a building for you and leases it to you and you get state reimbursement for the lease you obviously save money." Maxwell summarized the mechanics in this area as "creative step 12 accounting," he added that the loopholes used by USC in this manner are now closed.

Secondly, USC had higher credit hours generated, especially for doctoral students. They reported a head count of 1100 doctoral students, about half of them part-time students. These students yielded a FTE of 1900 students. USC did recalculate the figures when asked to do so and came up with a revised figure of 1300 FTE. In addition, they have better accounting of their FTEs. Whenever faculty time is used by students, it is accounted for.

It has been rumored that this accounting included credits equal to the number of credits that the graduate students teach, however this practice has been denied.

Another practice, approved by CHE but not shared with other state schools, is allocating any masters credits beyond the minimum required for the degree as doctoral credits.

Maxwell, when questioned as to whether Clemson would be adopting "creative accounting," said that a meeting was scheduled to set up new rules. When these new rules are established all state schools will follow the same rules.
Maxwell added that once the multipliers were established for the year all schools received the same budgetary treatment. The lump sum for Clemson salary increases actually amounted to 3%, when salary adjustments are taken into consideration.

Maxwell was questioned about the base of the budget. The formula is supposed to be zero based but this explanation gives X and Y as base figures. He explained that, to the extent that the formula is fed by student credit hours and step 12 items, it is zero based. He added that the differences of this year will not carry over into the next year. Clemson also has some step 12 items; the fire department for example, also the Energy Research Center. These are considered historical step 12 items although it is necessary to argue for them each year.

Senator Baron said that he had understood that, in every year prior to this one, the legislature has dictated salary increases and that all state institutions must have the same average increase. Maxwell said that the ceilings have been mandated in some years, in this year they were guidelines. USC reportedly took 2500 exceptions to the budget and control board, Clemson usually takes about 50. It would appear from this difference that no trimming at all is being done this year. Maxwell confirmed that only raises in excess of 5% are required to be submitted this year.

Senator Dyck asked if the exceptions must be funded by the agency. The answer was affirmative. Dyck also asked how step 12 items become salary increases. Maxwell responded that, for example, if leases were reimbursed then money would be available for other purposes.
Senator Baron said that it appears that the legislature allowed more flexibility this year and that USC chose to devote more to faculty salaries. Maxwell agreed that this was true.

Senator Birrenkott said that he understood that USC administrators were not receiving salary increases. Who made the decision and who would make a decision like that at Clemson? Maxwell said that the President was, and would be, the person responsible. However, President Lennon has not indicated any sentiment in this regard. One reason is that the new administrators have cost more than the ones we currently have. He added that our department heads and Deans are paid less than comparable persons are elsewhere.

Senator McGuire asked why USC was creative and we were not, and would it continue? Maxwell replied that there seemed to be no end to deviousness unleashed. "USC does it and backs it up with muscle . . . . Our credibility yields our best results." Maxwell added that USC is a "cafeteria enterprise." They offer a broad range of programs which vary not only in focus but also in quality. "They have something for everyone." Clemson is a selective admission institution and would not be able to compete in a cafeteria program even if we wanted to, which Maxwell declared Clemson did not want to do.

Replying to a question about why Clemson submits 50 exceptions and USC submits 2500 exceptions, Maxwell said, "We can't fund it."

Senator Murr asked what the impact on USC's budget would be if their FTE on a head count of 1100 Doctoral students dropped to 900. Maxwell replied that each doctoral FTE is worth about $10-12 K so a change of that magnitude would approach a 1% reduction in raises.
Senator Baron asked how the figure of 16 students per faculty was derived. Maxwell answered that at every level of student there is a set number of credit hours per FTE. The aggregate of these figures is a ratio to the faculty on the 1-20 (teaching) account. Actually the figure should be lower than 16 because part of many faculty salaries is attributed to account 1-30 (state funded research). Maxwell stated that the actual figure would be more like 14 students per faculty. In response to further questioning he said that the state supported research figure is around 2-3 million dollars, Clemson budgets a figure which is much higher than that, $7-9 million.

Due to the extent of business remaining, questioning of the Provost on this matter was closed. However, President Mullins did ask the Provost whether a letter addressing fringe benefit requests from the Welfare Committee should be sent to him. The Provost said he was awaiting this communication.

Senator Halfacre said the Welfare Committee had been discussing several fringe benefits. Especially, they are talking about opening up the retirement plan options for all faculty rather than just new faculty, allowing buy-out of portions of previous time in other service, and early retirement.

Maxwell commented that he personally would favor the option of discarding service in one war. Currently, to buy retirement plan credit for prior military service requires that the employee buy out all time served. He also cautioned the Committee to proceed carefully on the issue of early retirement. Some plans are advantageous to both the employee and the institution, other plans encourage loss of some of the
best faculty. In addition, Provost Maxwell suggested that another option which they might explore would be having the state pay the employee's social security. He said this is a real advantage because it involves pre-tax dollars.

V. CONTINUED COMMITTEE REPORTS

D. Welfare. Senator Halfacre reported that the committee has received requests to study Faculty salaries and to recommend additional fringe benefits for Faculty. He added that what they were currently considering had just been discussed but that they would welcome any further suggestions.

Senator Baron said that the Board of Trustees had, several years ago, asked the Business Office to periodically survey other institutions for compensation information. The Business Office can get such information easily. Faculty groups cannot get this information easily because institutions are reluctant to share the information with Faculty.

It was suggested that consideration should be given to earning sick leave for summer time teaching. President Mullins said that this issue has been discussed but it certainly could be pursued further.

Senator Gardner asked for consideration of expanding the use of 5 days of sick leave available for care of spouse and/or children to include parents.

E. University Commissions and Committees.

Parking and Traffic. Senator Derr reported that new Faculty/Staff parking spaces have been created and further spaces may be found
by changing to angle parking along some roads. A subcommittee headed by Dr. Clark is looking for other ways to redesign lots.

Some continued annoyance was expressed about the new parking policies, especially limiting registration to 2 vehicles and the use of both stickers and hang tags. It was reported that the Parking Office had not been prepared to handle the registration and fee collection well. Several people had problems and their vehicles were ticketed while attempting to resolve them. The Parking Office had run out of stickers but some vehicles were apparently ticketed anyway.

The rationale for the new practice of differentiating between vehicles belonging to faculty and staff was questioned. Staff believe that their vehicles are more likely to be towed. Some Senators expressed the sentiment that probably it was the other way around and that it was Faculty vehicles which are targeted for towing.

F. Ad Hoc Committees.

Senator Nowaczyk reported on the work of the Senate ad hoc committee to recommend the areas of study for the MacDonald Scholarships. (see attachments to the President's report, Attachment B.) Nowaczyk called attention to the report, the report of how funds had been expended this year, and to the two distribution resolutions (Attachments C and D). Nowaczyk said that the scholarships are limited by financial need and this is the reason that the money cannot be used in conjunction with recruiting. The committee tried to select a few fields rather than use the approach of limiting fields from the total possibilities. In addition to recommending the fields, they have made some additional non-binding suggestions. It is suggested that the areas not be targeted and that no efforts be made for an equal distribution
between them. Rather, the focus would be on students in these fields. Nowaczyk added that wherever it was used, this money would free up money for other areas of study.

Senator Baron said that he was hard pressed to accept the fields identified by the committee. He believed the choices are arbitrary and that there is no justification for these fields over several others. In particular he stated that Nursing, Agriculture and all Engineering fields were equally justifiable.

Senator Birrenkott said the committee had tried to avoid the fields of its members so that they could bring greater objectivity to their recommendations.

Senator Bryan asked if demand for graduates had been considered. Nowaczyk said that it had not as they believed that was emphasizing economic factors over cultural ones.

Senator Nowaczyk moved to accept the report. The motion was seconded. Senator Birrenkott offered the resolution attached as Attachment C as an amendment to the report. The motion was seconded.

Senator Dyck said that although there was merit to the amendment, the first "whereas" related to dollar amounts which was not the charge to the Senate.

Senator Birrenkott said that the will does state that the Senate is to recommend the number of scholarships. A way to do that is to set dollar amounts.
Senator Carter spoke in favor of the amendment. Senators Baron and Stillwell spoke against the amendment. The question was called and a roll call vote requested. The complete vote is attached as Item 1 of Attachment E. The amendment passed 13-12-3.

Senator Kosinski spoke against the report. He said that a poll of the College of Science showed that no one supported the choices of the committee or of making choices anyway. He argued that another field which certainly met the criteria of the will is Computer Science. He also reported that he discussed the issue with Dr. F. Brown, Marvin Carmichael, and Dr. J. Stevenson. None of these people understood the provisions of the will to mean that the fields must be restricted if the Senate believed that all the fields offered at Clemson met the requirements. In conjunction with Don Fowler in the Development Office he had looked at the original will. Mr. Fowler does not believe that anyone would object to distribution of the funds in a manner similar to the way it was done last year. Kosinski asked if there was any Senator who really believes that there are specific fields which could be identified. Additionally, most people interpret the "and" between the words economic and culturally as not mandating equal contribution to both but rather to reflect varying proportions of each factor. Kosinski summarized his remarks by saying that there are not real external constraints on the Senate in distributing this money. The benefit to the nation will depend more on the individual selected rather than on specific fields of study.
Senator Bryan said that the method used last year did not provide equal availability of the funds to all students. The funds were more available to students in Nursing than they were to students in Commerce and Industry because of the total number of students enrolled in each of these Colleges.

The question of acceptance of the committee report was called and the report was not accepted on a vote of 10 to accept, 17 to reject.

Senator Kosinski moved to accept the resolution on distribution of the MacDonald Scholarship money to students in all degree-granting programs at Clemson (Attachment D). The motion was seconded. A friendly amendment was made to accept the recommendations of the report re distribution of funds between graduate and undergraduate students, (25% to graduate, 75% to undergraduate). Kosinski accepted the friendly amendment.

Senator Coston commented that several points of this discussion were interesting. First, that self-professed intellectuals were not able to do what the donor asked of them. Secondly, that emotion became so tied into the discussion when scholarships were discussed. Third, that each year, need based scholarships were not awarded because students don't file the needed forms to receive assistance. Coston urged the Senators to encourage students to apply for the funds whatever distribution was finally accepted.

Senator Dyck said that Mr. MacDonald had earned his money through RCA and stock options. He wanted to be sure that the scholarships did not become attached to something archaic. That is what he was asking of the Senate, to review the program offerings every five years and eliminate
any that were not contributing to the economy and culture of the nation. Dyck said that Kosinski's motion speaks to this issue.

Senator Baron agreed that the Senate discussions have done exactly that. Although not often in agreement with the Provost, he did agree with Maxwell's statements that all of our degree granting programs are acceptable scholarly programs.

Senator Kosinski said that the ultimate job facing the Senate on this issue is to make the right decision.

Senator Bryan spoke against the motion. He said that the proposal does not carry out the provisions of the will and that it is taking money under deceit. He believes that the money should be returned if the Senate is unable to fulfill its charge.

Senator Baron suggested that another approach to the problem would be quick and simple. Each person present could admit that their field is not among the most rewarding and they could vote not to accept the money for their College.

The question was called and a roll call vote was requested. The motion passed, 15 in favor, 12 opposed. The complete roll call vote is listed in Item 2, Attachment E.

VI. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Mullins has referred the question of moving Honors and Awards Day to the Scholastic Polices Committee (Item 2). He noted several related issues such as the possibility that undergraduates would have left the campus and that the need for families to spend additional time on campus might exceed the capacity of the community for accommodations.
Senator Baron commented that the present practice facilitates the attendance of parents at this event.

Still referring to Item 2, Mullins reported that summer admissions question has been referred to Scholastic Policies Committee. He said that the issue arose at the initiative of President Lennon. The prediction for admission score would go as low as 1.4.

Senator Hedden said that he was not aware of Faculty being consulted in any way about this issue.

Senator Baron asked if there was any move to change degree requirements of the involved programs. Mullins replied that he knows of no such plan. Baron asked who would pay for the summer program. Mullins said that it would be funded from the E & G budget.

Item 4. Mullins added that the position related to International Services and Programs would be under the Graduate School. The office is being relocated to Hardin Hall. A search committee has been recommended to the Provost for this position. The Advisory committee has received the recommendation of the Research Committee for the membership of a search committee for the Vice-President for Research. The Advisory Committee will consider the recommendations immediately following this meeting.

Item 10. President Mullins thanked the Research Committee for the work they did in relation to this issue.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Substitute Report Policy Committee on Structure and Function of the Commissions and the President's Council.
Senator Bryan moved that the substitute report submitted from the Policy Committee on Structure and Function of the Commissions and the President's Council [refer to the minutes of July 14, 1987, Attachment F] be removed from the table. The motion was seconded and passed.

Senator Bryan asked that the report not be read because of the lengthy discussions already held and because it has been distributed to each Senator. Instead, he would present the differences between the substitute report and the original report submitted by the ad hoc committee [refer to the minutes of April 28, 1987, Attachment D]. There were no objections to this process.

Senator Bryan reported that the major point of dissention between the reports has to do with the composition of the Academic Council. Both reports agree that the membership should include: the President, the Provost, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the Vice-President for Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Chairpersons of the Commissions, the President of Faculty Senate, the President of the Student Senate, and the President-elect of Faculty Senate. The Policy Committee report adds 7 faculty members: 2 Assistant Professors, 2 Associate Professors, 2 Professors, and 1 chaired Professor, all of these faculty members to be elected by the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee. In addition, the Policy Committee report recommends that the Faculty Senate be charged with developing a constitution and by-laws for the Academic Council.

President Mullins called for any discussion of amendments to this report.

Senator Stillwell asked for clarification of the parliamentary process.
President Mullins explained that the substitute report was now removed from the table and could be discussed and amended. The original report is still active and can also be amended. On further questioning President Mullins said that Roberts Rules of Order describe the following process. A report is presented to the body and referred to a Committee. The Committee studies the report and brings forth a substitute report. At that point both the original report and the substitute report can be discussed and amended. When they are both amended and brought into their best form, the substitute report can be voted on to substitute for the original report. No Senator objected to this interpretation of the parliamentary order.

President Mullins then asked if there were any amendments to the original report.

Senator Nowczyk noted that two written amendments to the original report had been distributed. Senator Nowaczyk had prepared the amendment attached as Attachment F. Senator Dyck had prepared the amendment attached as Attachment G. Senator Nowaczyk said that since they were similar in nature he would, with Senator Dyck's permission, offer a series of motions which would allow the Senate to deal with both amendments. Senator Dyck agreed to this process.

Senator Nowaczyk moved that the following individuals be removed from the Academic Council described in the original report of the ad hoc committee.

the Vice-President for Institutional Advancement
the Vice-President for Student Affairs
the Vice-President for Business and Finance
the Vice-President for Administration
the Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences.

The motion was seconded. Nowaczyk clarified that 16 persons would be left per the original report. The 16 persons would be:

the President
the Provost
the Vice-President for Agriculture and Natural Resource
the 8 College Deans
the Chair of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies
the Chair of the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research
the President of the Student Senate
the President of the Faculty Senate
the Vice-President of the Faculty Senate

The amendment passed without further discussion.

Senator Nowaczyk moved that the following persons be added to the Academic Council, as voting members, and that each proposed addition be voted on separately in the order listed.

Chair of the Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee
A faculty member holding a named professorship or chair
Chair of the Executive Committee of the Organization of Department Heads
President of the Graduate Student Association
Chair of the Senate Research Committee

Senator Dyck offered a friendly amendment that the faculty member holding a named professorship or chair would be elected by the Faculty Senate. Senator Nowaczyk accepted the amendment.
The motion was seconded. The question was called and the motion passed.

Senator Dyck spoke about the purpose of the discussion of membership on the Academic Council. One purpose had been to consider ways to increase faculty membership on the Council which is designed to discuss academic policy. The additional members proposed in this motion would achieve this purpose. In addition, the chaired Professor would provide for non-Senate Faculty representation by a person respected by the Faculty. Dyck said that students should be represented in deliberations about academic policy, the President of the Student Senate, who represents undergraduate students, has already been agreed upon. This motion includes the President of the Graduate Student Association who could speak for the views of the graduate students.

Voting then was conducted:

- Chair of the Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies committee--passed
- Named or Chaired Professor--passed
- Chair of the Executive Committee of the Organization of Department Heads - passed, 16 in favor, 10 opposed
- President of the Graduate Student Association - passed
- Chair of the Faculty Senate Research Committee--passed

Senator Dyck moved to have the removed Vice-Presidents, the Dean of Admissions, and the Director of the Library added to the Academic Council as non-voting members. The motion was seconded.

Senator Birrenkott asked what the contribution of the Vice-President for Administration would be to discussion of academic policy.

President Mullins called attention to the original report which assigned responsibility for arranging the meeting to this position.
Senator McGuire said that these individuals could attend meetings at the wish of the President and could provide information as requested. Therefore, what would be the purpose of adding them as non-voting members.

Senator Dyck called attention to the importance of their activities to the University. He added that their activities affect academics.

Senator Baron noted that the Council membership is advisory. He spoke against adding the Vice-Presidents but in favor of adding the Director of the Library and the Dean of Admissions and Registration.

Senator Birrenkott offered a friendly amendment to add the Vice-President of Research to the proposed list of non-voting members. Senator Dyck accepted the amendment.

Senator Murr and Carter spoke against adding the Vice-Presidents to the Academic Council. It was noted that they had an appropriate forum in their membership on the President's Cabinet.

Senator Stillwell asked Senator Dyck if he could accept a friendly amendment to vote on each addition separately.

Senator Dyck said that if the motion was defeated the additions could be proposed and voted on separately. The question was called and the motion was defeated.

Senator Stillwell moved to add, voting on each addition separately, the Director of the Library and the Dean of Admissions and Registration to the Academic Council as non-voting members.
The motion was seconded and passed
Director of the Library-passed
Dean of Admissions and Registration-passed

Senator Hedden requested a recapitulation of the rationale for adding all the Deans rather than a subset of Deans, especially in light of the President's attendance at the Deans Meetings.

Senator Nowaczyk said that the plan removes the Deans from the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. Adding them to the Council provides the Deans opportunity for input, with balancing faculty viewpoints.

Senator Stillwell moved that the Senate be charged with writing a constitution and by-laws for the Academic Council. The motion was seconded. Senators Birrenkott and Bryan hastily interjected that their respective committees would not wish to undertake this charge.

Senator Nowaczyk asked for the rationale of having by-laws written by the Senate rather than the Academic Council.

Senator Stillwell said that he did not know the rationale but since that was a provision of the substitute report he believed it is important that the Senate consider the issue.

The discussion focused on the fact that this report would be sent to the President as a recommendation. The President will then make whatever decisions he wishes so there is no need to indicate the process of implementation.
The motion was defeated.

Senator Dyck moved that the Senate ratify the By-Laws of the Academic Council after they are drafted. The motion was seconded. After discussion of the ramifications of failure to ratify, Senator Dyck withdrew his motion.

Senator Dyck moved that the Committees on Faculty Development, the Faculty Manual, and Salaries and Fringe Benefits report simultaneously to the Provost and to the Senate.

Senator Bryan suggested that Senator Dyck withdraw his motion and that the Policy Committee reconsider the reporting route of all Committees. Senator Dyck withdrew the motion.

Senator Baron offered the motion again, noting that this was a matter which could be quickly considered. The motion was seconded and passed.

Senator Nowaczyk said that the report contained an editorial error and asked that the Senate accept a correction that the Fine Arts Committee report to the Vice-President for Institutional Advancement. There was no objection to this correction.

Senator Murr moved that the Library Advisory Committee report to the Provost rather than to the Undergraduate Commission. He noted that the Library is concerned with Faculty, Staff, and Graduate Students in addition to undergraduate students. The motion was seconded and passed.

Senator Dyck asked if the Cabinet membership was "cast in stone" or if the President should be given discretionary powers. President Mullins said that President Lennon has already indicated that resource people will be offered attendance at appropriate Cabinet meetings.
Senator Dyck moved that the membership of the Cabinet (in attachment 2 of the original report) be expanded at the President's discretion.

Senator Coston offered a friendly amendment to change the word expand to alter. Senator Nowaczyk suggested that wording consistent with other sections be used, "additional members may be appointed by the President." Senator Dyck accepted this suggestion as a friendly amendment. The motion was seconded and passed.

The question of whether to accept the substitute report for the amended original report was called. The motion was defeated.

The motion was made and seconded to accept the complete original report as amended. The motion passed.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

Senator Baron asked that the points raised by the Provost in his discussion with the Senate be referred to a committee for further consideration. He said that the administrations of Clemson had always asked for the kind of discretion which had been granted this year. When they received it, it had resulted in very poor raises.

It was noted that this would be a good topic for discussion in a Forum article. Further discussion revolved around the issue of administrative deviousness vs a straight forward honest approach to funding.

Senator Hedden said that the Commission on Undergraduate Studies will meet on Friday of this week. If there are issues which should be discussed please bring them to his attention.
IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

MaryAnn B. Reichenbach, Secretary

SCHOLASTIC POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

August 4, 1987

The Scholastic Policy committee met on August 4th. The proposal for summer admissions in Agricultural Sciences, Forestry, Textiles and Industrial Technology Education was introduced to the committee. The committee requests input on this proposal from interested faculty. The proposal will be discussed in detail, and possible recommendations for Faculty Senate action will be made at the next committee meeting (September 1). There was further discussion on the University continuing enrollment policy with agreement that the developing a simplified and more uniformly administered policy should be pursued. Other items of business included a brief discussion of students on probation transferring between colleges, and the potential problems associated with the new high school academic requirements for entering freshmen which will be in effect in fall 1988.

Members present: Robert Kosinski; Roy Hedden; Bruce Jenny

Others present: Joe Mullins
1. A number of faculty have enquired concerning the recent article in the Greenville News which stated that the faculty of USC had received a 4 percent raise in salary. I believe that it is also true that USC will not raise tuition, and that their administrators will receive no pay increase. The reasons for the difference in raises, 4.0% for USC vs 2.5% for Clemson are difficult to explain fully. According to the article, USC will limit to some degree the number of sections of courses offered, and thereby raise the average number of students per section. However one factor for the difference appears to be because the CHE recommendation for USC's budget was 115 percent of the previous years' budget after the imposed cuts, whereas Clemson's recommendation was for only 111 percent. Part of the difference between the 111 and 115 figures was simply that USC took a very liberal interpretation of the CHE formula used for funding higher education in SC. For example one result is that the number of credit hours taken by a typical PH. D. recipient at USC is about 1.5 times the number taken by a PH. D. recipient at Clemson. This is of course reflected in the amount of money received for graduate support. Another factor is that USC received additional money for several line items. One of these items has appeared in a number of articles in the Greenville News, i.e. the payment to their research foundation of a lease for a new engineering building.

2. At a recent meeting of the Council of Deans two items of interest to Faculty were considered. The first of these was a suggestion by Jack Stevenson to move Honors and Awards Day to the day before graduation in May (See attachment 2). The second of these is a proposed plan for summer admissions to increase undergraduate admission in Agricultural Sciences, Forestry, Textiles, and Industrial Technology Education (See attachment 3). We need to act quickly on both of these items. I have asked the Scholastics Policy Committee to make recommendations on these, but the committee needs input from the entire faculty.

3. I urge each of you to be familiar with the facts related to the Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Structure and Function of The Commissions and the President's Council; the substitute report offered by the Policy Committee which was tabled, and the amendment to the original report which was defeated at the last meeting. I would like to get something passed at the August meeting, or else let the administration know that we are not going to recommend any changes in the present structure. To aid in this regard I would like to point out once again that we can examine the substitute report and make amendments to it, make amendments to the original report, and according to Roberts Rules take another look at the amendment which was defeated. I quote from Roberts,

"When an original main motion or an amendment has been adopted, or rejected, or a main motion has been postponed indefinitely, or an objection to its consideration has been sustained, it, or practically the same motion, cannot be again brought before the assembly at the same session, except by a motion to reconsider or to rescind the vote. But it may be introduced again at any future session."

August 9, 1987

Attachment B
I apologize for any confusion which may have occurred at the last meeting. In order to prevent further confusion, if possible please bring any additional amendments in writing.

4. At the Advisory Executive Committee meeting of the Faculty Senate, we recommended that a search committee be formed to fill the newly created position to head the Office of International Services and Programs. This office will report to the Dean of the Graduate School. We also will submit to Provost Maxwell suggestions for a search committee to begin looking for a Vice President for Research. Our Research Committee is going to handle this. If you have suggestions give them to Glenn Birrenkott.

5. I am enclosing a reply to the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance Procedures from Provost Maxwell (attachment 4). I am asking our Policy Committee to consider the reply, prepare necessary changes to the Faculty Manual and bring before the Faculty Senate any changes that are in conflict with the report which has already been adopted by the Senate.

6. After attending my first August graduation ceremony, I am convinced that we have recommended the right approach to help make it an even more meaningful ceremony. I am on a committee chaired by Jerry Reel to consider additional changes in the graduation ceremonies, most of which will be a result of the attendance of faculty in robes at the August and December events. The Board of Trustees and the administration were appreciative of the faculty who voluntarily attended and sat as a group. I personally enjoyed the day festivities which began with a reception in the penthouse for the stage party and their guests, and ended for most with a luncheon in the President's Box following the graduation. In addition the Ch. E. Department hosted a dinner that evening for Dr. Jim Fair, one of the honorary degree recipients.
PRESIDENT'S UPDATE

August 18, 1987

7. At the Cabinet meeting yesterday, a discussion centered around problems associated with parking for special events. The conclusion was about as expected. It is necessary to include parking as a consideration for every event in which you are involved in planning and make sure that Bill Pace is notified of your needs.

8. Provost Maxwell has formed a committee to study the possibility of an early retirement plan for faculty at Clemson. Members are:
   - Dick Simmons Personnel
   - Jim Daniels Ag. Econ.
   - Jack Jones Poultry Sci.
   - Ray Gray Accounting
   - Ted Wallenius Math
   - Jim Miller Ext. Admin.
   - Holley Ulbrich Econ.

9. We have been asked to submit to Provost Maxwell by August 23, 1987, any major items for fringe benefits requiring legislative approval. The major item that we plan to ask for at this time is to extend the Leatherman bill passed last year to allow faculty who were here prior to July 1, 1987 to choose alternate retirement plans.

10. At a previous meeting I reported that the Council of Deans had recommended to Provost Maxwell that the method of distributing money by the University Grants Committee be changed. At the last meeting of the Council of Deans this was reconsidered and the Council recommended leaving the process as is.
REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR THE MACDONALD SCHOLARSHIPS

This past Spring, then Faculty Senate President Larry Dyck appointed a committee to study the charge in Mr. MacDonald's will regarding the Faculty Senate's role in defining fields of study for scholarships bearing the Macdonald name. The specific wording from the will is as follows,

"It is my desire to encourage and assist financially any student in the fields of study promising the most rewarding service to the economy and culture of the nation, the funds to be provided to those with aptitude for and interest in such fields, who could not study or continue their studies without financial assistance. Realizing the importance of fields of study change from time to time, I direct that the Faculty Senate of Clemson University, or its successor as an organization of the faculty of that University, shall after my wife's death and each five years thereafter, giving consideration to the number of scholarships this trust will provide, select the field or fields of undergraduate or postgraduate study, meeting, in the opinion of the of Faculty Senate or similar body, the definition expressed above."

The committee was charged to provide its report at the August meeting of the Faculty Senate.

The committee, with the exception of two members who were away from campus this summer, met several times to review the charge in the will and to identify fields of study. The committee recognized the fact that a case can be made for every field of study providing service to the economy and culture of the nation. We, however, were limited by the term, "most rewarding service" and the fact that a field of study must contribute to both the "economy and culture," not one or the other. Lastly, the service is to the nation rather than being limited to state or regional needs.

The committee used the management of resources with the goal of increasing productivity and prosperity as a working definition of economy. Culture was defined in broad terms to be the sum of ways of living determined by a society. The committee then identified undergraduate and graduate fields of study it felt provided the most promise. These fields of study are listed on the following page with a brief justification for each.
UNDERGRADUATE FIELDS OF STUDY:

Early Childhood Education. The education of the citizens of a society is critical to the society's development and progress from both an economic and cultural viewpoint. The committee felt that early training and education were especially critical in establishing a love of learning and instilling a desire to be a productive member in society.

Elementary Education. The reasoning listed under Early Childhood education applies here also.

Language & International Trade. The committee felt that the increasing direction of the United States as a partner in the international economic community makes this field of study important in maintaining the US position economically. As the need for cooperation at an international level becomes more important, its influence on our culture will also become more evident. Training in this field should provide a unique blend of skills that will be of service to this nation as this country relies more on international cooperation.

Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Management. The increasing time available for leisure activity in our society has both a direct economic and cultural impact on our nation. Providing the best facilities and service to enable citizens to enjoy the benefits of this nation in terms of its natural and man-made resources will be of increasing importance in the upcoming years.

POSTGRADUATE FIELDS OF STUDY:

Architecture. A society is influenced by the environment it constructs. The committee felt that architectural training has an important influence to both the economy and culture of the nation.

Bioengineering. The increasing development of artificial components for the body makes this field of study a potentially critical area for our society as the population grows older. The impact beyond economics will also be felt in terms of the quality of life for the members of our society.

Biochemistry. As the importance of genetic engineering increases in our society, its impact both economically and culturally will be felt across the nation. Training people with the necessary skills to make contributions in this area will be of increasing importance to society.

Microbiology. The reasoning stated for Biochemistry is applicable for this field of study.
Additional Recommendations:

The committee felt that these scholarships would be most effective if used to attract exceptionally talented freshmen to Clemson and to reward continuing students who have performed well in the classroom. Given the constraints listed in the bill, the committee recommends that these scholarships be offered to students who are most deserving academically and show the greatest promise for success in the selected fields of study.

The committee recommends that the scholarships carry substantial stipends. The committee recommends that approximately 75% of the available funds be designated for undergraduate scholarships with the remaining 25% designated for postgraduate scholarships. It further recommends that the undergraduate scholarships could be renewed for a maximum of three additional years beyond the first year. For postgraduate scholarships, the stipend should be in addition to any assistantship or fellowship the student would otherwise have received. The postgraduate scholarship could be renewed for a maximum of three semesters beyond the first semester for which it is awarded.

The committee recommends that the appropriate University committees establish the guidelines and academic requirements for the initial awarding and subsequent renewal of these scholarships. The committee requests that the Faculty Senate be provided with a listing of these guidelines once they are established.

Lastly, the committee views the MacDonald scholarships as an opportunity to attract and reward outstanding students to Clemson. Therefore, it recommends that the scholarships be awarded on the basis of academic promise. The committee feels that the best students in the defined fields of study be offered the scholarships without consideration of ensuring that all of the defined fields are awarded scholarships.

The committee hopes that a mechanism can be implemented that allows for the University Scholarship Committee to rank deserving applicants and continuing students who meet the financial need requirement. MacDonald scholarships could then be awarded to the highest-ranking students in the designated fields of study. It is the hope of the committee that a strict standard of academic promise and/or performance will be used in awarding the scholarships.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
C. BIRKENKUTT
C. HUEY
R. NUSACZYK
MEMORANDUM TO: Ron Nowaczyk  
Associate Professor, Psychology

FROM: Marvin G. Carmichael  
Director of Financial Aid

REFERENCE: MacDonald Trust

The MacDonald Trust made funds available to Clemson University to be used initially during the 1987-88 school year. As specified by the will of Mr. George R. MacDonald and the Declaration of Trust, the Faculty Senate is charged with the responsibility for determining "the fields of study promising most rewarding service to the economy and culture of the nation." The academic areas are to be used as prerequisite eligibility to receiving consideration for support through the scholarship/fellowship program.

The Faculty Senate designated that for the 1987-88 academic year only "any undergraduate major or graduate program resulting in a degree awarded by Clemson University shall qualify as a designated field under the requirements of the MacDonald will." Further, the Faculty Senate suggested that 1/3 of the income be directed toward graduate fellowships and 2/3 would go toward undergraduate scholarships. This distribution met with the approval of President Max Lennon.

The actual distribution of available income was approximately $90,000, with $60,000 being directed to undergraduate scholarships and $30,000 directed to graduate students.

The University Scholarships and Awards Committee enthusiastically adopted a distribution policy for 1987-88 that would direct $5,000 to students enrolled in each of the nine colleges. Each college recommended to the Committee the manner in which scholarships were to be distributed, the number and amounts which were based on the needs of the individual college. The balance of the funds was to be directed to the most eligible student regardless of major.

Scholarships were awarded based on academic performance/potential following eligibility requirements as specified by the donor. The distribution was as follows:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce and Industry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest &amp; Recreational Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University Wide</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

$60,000

Should you need further information, do not hesitate to call on me.

sll

xc Jack Stevenson
II. Growing out of a memo of suggestion from Professor Dick Howell in PRIM to President Lennon, we might consider moving Honors and Awards Day to the day before graduation.

Several advantages to this move are apparent:

--- We would have about one month longer to select the honorees and name the awardees for Honors and Award Day.

--- Probably more parents would be here since they would be here for graduation.

--- Faculty participation would very likely be better. This would also reduce the Saturday/Sunday demand for faculty time.

--- Students other than graduating seniors to be honored could be recognized at departmental ceremonies in the Spring. They would also be listed in the traditional Honors and Awards Day Booklet.

--- Each college could have more leisure time entertaining the families of graduating seniors.

III. As a part of Honors and Awards Day, were it moved to the day before graduation, we could plan a major banquet to include both the President's Honors Luncheon traditionally held at Honors and Awards Day and the Senior Departmental Honors Banquet. For this event we would likely charge parents and off-campus guests some $12.50 or two for $25.00. We could provide a major celebration, perhaps in Harcombe or in Jervey Gymnasium. We could have a single major off-campus speaker, perhaps music or other ceremonial activities, a delicious meal served as the Alumni dinner was in eight lines at four tables. At this meal the Senior Departmental Honors Medallion would be awarded to those who had earned it.

Your comments and suggestions are solicited regarding these proposals.

We still hope for growth in departments offering Senior Departmental Honors programs, and in courses offered for Honors at the 100 and 200 levels.

Any course or program which you may want to consider for either Junior Division Honors or Senior Departmental Honors, I'll be glad to meet with your faculty or discuss them further with you or those you designate.
PROPOSAL FOR SUMMER ADMISSIONS

I. In order to increase undergraduate enrollment in Clemson's unique mission areas (Agricultural Sciences, Forestry, Textiles and Industrial Technology Education) and in an effort to improve the ratio of in-state to out-of-state students, it is proposed that Clemson University

- Create a summer admissions new freshman category beginning June, 1985, and
- Develop a first-year model basic program for these students.

II. Summer Admissions admittees

- students with a genuine interest in the four areas as determined by application on-campus interviews alone and with parents
- students predicting between a 2.0 and a 1.4
- preference given to South Carolinians

III. When

- June 13, 1988, to August 5, 1988
- and Fall and Spring semesters 1988-89
- thereafter, if evaluations are favorable, annually

IV. Potential

- Based on 1986-87 applications, 161 would be most probable
- Could be increased through work with South Carolina guidance counsellors

V. Academic program

- Summer (classes limited to 22 students or fewer)
  Maximum load 8 hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education 101</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>8 sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 103</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>8 sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad. Studies 101</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>8 sections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*
Students divided

Mathematics 105 (5) 4 sections
Mathematics 101 (3) 4 sections
English 100 (3) 4 sections
English 101 (3) 4 sections

Students placed based on Achievement tests and placement tests

Tutors

10 at $1,000 + fringe $11,750

Fall - Maximum load 13 hours

All students

Education 102 (1)
Undergrad. Studies 102 (1)*

Appropriate
Mathematics (3)

English (3)

Science (4)

May include ROTC

Spring - Maximum load 13 hours

All students

Undergrad. Studies 103 (1)*

Appropriate Science (4)
Mathematics or English (3)

One elective

May include ROTC

*Under development
Evaluation

Summer, 1938 - If the student failed Mathematics or English, the student would be counselled to withdraw.

Spring, 1989 - Regular continuing enrollment standards in place

VI. Academic Personnel

- Full-time director (12 month)
  Supervises the Undergraduate Studies courses
  Serves as principal advisor and campus contact
  Establishes "tutor-student" relationships in fall and spring

- Faculty
  Chosen for teaching ability
  Encouraged to establish "tutor-student" relationships

- Tutors
  Ten graduate students: summer small group leaders
  Fall and spring operate mandatory study hall

- RA
  Summer chosen in part as tutors

VII. Support services

- Counseling and Career Planning
  Involved in Undergraduate Studies courses

- Housing
  Development of RA program

VIII. Housing

Must stay on campus
- Summer
  Housed in one dormitory
- Fall and Spring
  Scattered in University Housing

IX. Study Hall
- Mandatory all year
- Staffed by tutors
July 20, 1987

TO: Dr. Joe Mullins  
President, Faculty Senate  
Chemical Engineering, 29 Earle Hall

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

SUBJECT: Reactions to the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on  
Grievance Procedures

1. Expansion of G.P. II Grievance Board

I have no problem with the suggestion that the number of  
GP II Board members be increased and I suggest that it  
be sent to the Faculty Manual Committee so that they can  
incorporate this change in the appropriate manner in the  
Faculty Manual.

2. Training of Grievance Boards

It appears to me that the Faculty Senate, if it wishes,  
can do what is suggested without any changes in the Faculty  
Manual and without requiring any administrative sanction  
or participation by the administration other than the University  
Legal Counsel.

I therefore suggest that you contact Mr. Ben Anderson re'  
his participation. If he agrees, go to it! If his duties  
do not permit his participation the training program would  
probably still be worthwhile. If the Senate has this same  
view, again go to it! If invited I will be pleased to  
participate.

3. Materials Required for Inclusion in a G.P. II Petition

The problem appears to be that the outline of the petition  
appearing in the Faculty Manual does not prevent the submission  
of petitions that do not follow the outline. The hypothesis  
is that if the outline were more prominently displayed  
(perhaps as a separate paragraph) that this would reduce  
the number of poorly crafted petitions.

While I have some doubts about the validity of the hypothesis  
the Senate could ask the Faculty Manual Committee to stress  
the outline (perhaps by separating the long paragraph
in which the outline appears into two separate paragraphs, the second being the outline).

I have no objections to this change.

The Ad Hoc Committee Report also suggests (re' this issue) that a "policy sheet and petition outline" be developed for GP II cases that would amplify the statements in the Faculty Manual on this issue.

I have some difficulty in understanding this suggestion because the Committee did not indicate any deficiencies of the outline or specific portions thereof that need amplification. Nonetheless I would be pleased to consider any proposed draft that is thought to accomplish what the Committee had in mind.

4. Determining the Definition of "Unfair"

The most troublesome paragraph (II:32) is as follows:

Normally not grievable shall be complaints arising out of the authorized exercise of their judgments and discretionary powers by faculty and administrators. Thus, not normally grievable would be recommendations concerning renewal of contract and denial of promotion and tenure, so long as the appropriate policies and procedures had been adhered to.

I believe that the proposed training for members of grievance boards would alleviate the difficulties that we have encountered on this point. Nonetheless, it might be salutary to include a statement in the Faculty Manual something like the following (perhaps immediately after the above quotation as separate paragraphs):

In reviewing such decisions the Grievance Board is not asked to substitute its judgment for that of the faculty or administrator who made the decision that is at issue. The Board is not asked to determine whether or not in the same circumstances it would have made the same judgment or would have reached the same decision. The merits of the decision, per se, are not at issue.

What is at issue is whether or not some unfair or improper influence so colored or affected the judgment
of the faculty or administrator that the decision reached would have been different had no such improper or unfair influence existed. Thus so long as the appropriate policies and procedures were followed the only issues are that of the existence of improper or unfair influences and the extent of their influence upon the decision involved. The complainant has the burden of proof in establishing that such influences existed and that their presence dictated the nature of the decision reached.

5. Screening of Non-grievable G.P. II Complaints

I'm not clear on what the issue is. The Committee appears to have concluded that "... the Faculty Manual contains sufficient guidelines for screening of complaints. . ." However, the Committee also concludes that the policy sheet and petition outline referred to # 3, above, will improve the situation.

My response is the same as in # 3, above.

6. Apparent "Prima Facie" G.P. I Cases

I fear that a little confusion still exists. It's true that in GP I cases the hearing body can not conclude merely on the basis of the petition that no prima facie case exists. The petitioner must be permitted to present his case. However, after the petitioner has presented his case the hearing body can conclude that there is no prima facie case and dismiss the hearing. They don't have to wait for the respondents to present their case.

Such a conclusion by the hearing body is a finding that, in effect, if all the petitioner's evidence is uncontested and everything that the petitioner alleges is true, he still doesn't have a case. Thus, since there's no point in wasting everyone's time the complaint is dismissed for failure to establish a prima facie case.

It appears to me that this is a point to be covered in the proposed training but since it is only one of a number of such points I don't think it needs to be included in the Faculty Manual.
7. Change in the Review Process of Promotion and Tenure Decisions

The recommendation, in essence, is that at every step of the process (peer committee, department head, dean and provost) that the candidate for reappointment, promotion or tenure who receives a negative recommendation be afforded an opportunity to review such recommendations.

I do not believe that this proposal is feasible. The processes at present require much of the academic year for their completion and literally hundreds of cases are involved. The proposal, if implemented, would greatly increase the time that these processes require. Secondly, those receiving positive recommendations at a given point in the process could validly argue for the same privilege on the ground that the positive recommendations might not be as strong as they should be and thus decrease the likelihood of concurrence at a later point in the process. Thirdly, a negative recommendation at one point is not infrequently overbalanced by positive recommendations at later points so that the "review" of the negative recommendation in such cases would turn out to have been pointless.

Finally, it is precisely to correct any error in the processes that the grievance procedures exist. The candidate can have no real grievance against the University until the University has reached its decision.

 Nonetheless, if the Senate or any other entity wishes to study this question and come up with suggestions I'd be pleased to consider them.

8. Timeline for Processing Grievance Petitions

The suggestion is that "calendar days" be changed to "work days" at the appropriate places in the Faculty Manual and the time frames for actions be altered at other points.

I have no objections to the suggestions. The Committee could assist the Faculty Manual Committee in implementing these suggestions.


This is a complex question and the Committee (quite understandably) treated it gingerly. The practise of filing simultaneously under GP I and GP II has become more prevalent, perhaps because filing under both is little more costly
for the faculty member than filing under one. At present, a GP II petition can be deferred until after the outcome of a GP I petition is determined but the opposite possibility is not overtly provided for (i.e., deferral of the GP I until after the GP II is adjudicated).

The Committee concluded that in many instances adjudicating the GP II grievance first might result in withdrawal of the GP I petition. (This is, of course, not necessarily true even if the outcome of the GP II grievance is favorable to the complainant.) The Committee also realized that there are specific circumstances in which a GP I must be heard first and that delaying a GP I so that a GP II may be heard first may raise some legal difficulties.

I interpret the Committee's recommendation to be that the University be given discretion in deciding the order in which these simultaneously filed petitions are treated.

I think that we'd better defer this proposed change until after I have discussed it with the University's Legal Counsel. I can see some major questions that need to be resolved if the GP II precedes the GP I (e.g., how much of the results, evidence and testimony adduced in the less formal GP II proceedings may be introduced into the more formal GP I proceedings)?

10. Appeals to the President

One recommendation is that appeals of GP II decisions to the President:

a) must be in writing (already in the Faculty Manual)

b) may be initiated by the petitioner or the respondent(s) (the Faculty Manual now says "by either party")

c) must include a copy to the University legal counsel

A second recommendation is that the University legal counsel will notify all parties that an appeal to the President has been filed.

I have no problem with this recommendation and I suggest that the Faculty Manual Committee be asked to incorporate these changes in the Faculty Manual.
11. **Confidentiality of Petitions**

This is more an admonition to observe confidentiality (while not prohibiting Grievance Board Members from talking with other Board members or counselors). I agree with the Committee in concluding that breaches of confidentiality are not a major problem.

12. **Counselors for Faculty and Administrators**

One suggestion is that grievance counselors be authorized to assist administrators as well as faculty.

I have no objection to this. I don't see a necessity for a Faculty Manual change as a consequence.

A second suggestion is that the number of counselors be changed from three to five. I have no objection to this recommendation. So far as I recall there is no present reference in the Faculty Manual to the number of counselors so I don't think any Faculty Manual change is needed.

13. **Role of Lawyers, Counselors and Other Advisors**

The recommendation is that lawyers, counselors, or other advisers be denied the privilege of the floor and that the role of these parties be purely advisory.

I agree with this recommendation and suggest that it be sent to the Faculty Manual Committee for inclusion at an appropriate place in the treatment of GP II petitions.

I would like for it also to apply to GP I hearings but I'd better discuss this with the University's legal counsel.

14. **Department Heads' View of the Grievance Process**

The general observation of the Committee that department heads need training in many aspects of their duties is undoubtedly true, even if the Committee's observation is somewhat broader than their charge. The specific recommendation of access to counselors has been treated in earlier issues. It is not clear whether or not the recommendation that department heads be covered by adequate insurance against lawsuits was made after investigation of such coverage.

WDM/b

cc: Mr. Ben Anderson (with enclosure)
Resolution of the Faculty Senate 87-

(As an Amendment to
The Report of the ad hoc
Committee for the MacDonald Scholarships)

WHEREAS: The will of Mr. George R. MacDonald charges the Faculty Senate of Clemson University to select the fields of study promising the most rewarding service to the economy and culture of the nation; and

WHEREAS: Mr. MacDonald's will states that the Faculty Senate must give consideration "to the number of scholarships this trust will provide" in designating the field or fields of undergraduate or postgraduate study; and

WHEREAS: Graduate student scholarships derived from the MacDonald Trust could have a dollar amount less than those for undergraduate students because of tuition waivers and graduate student assistantships; and

WHEREAS: The ad hoc committee for the MacDonald Scholarships defined Biotechnology as Biochemistry and Microbiology; and

WHEREAS: Biotechnology can and is defined in broader terms than Biochemistry and Microbiology by most scientists in the Life Sciences;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

That the scholarships awarded to graduate students from the MacDonald Trust be limited to $2,000 per year; and

That in addition to the fields of postgraduate study explicitly listed by the ad hoc committee for the MacDonald Scholarships, any student pursuing an MS or PhD requiring the use of recombinant DNA (rDNA) or cell/tissue culture techniques shall be eligible for consideration of a MacDonald Scholarship.
RESOLUTION

Whereas, The student aid to be disbursed under the MacDonald Scholarships is a significant fraction of the total "general" academic scholarship funds available at Clemson; and

Whereas, It is difficult, if not impossible, to agree on a few fields of study which "promise the most rewarding service to the economy and culture of the nation;" and

Whereas, the future benefits of awarding a particular scholarship probably depend more on the quality and ambition of the student than on the field of study the student is pursuing; therefore,

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate determines that all degree-granting programs at Clemson University have the potential for excellent service to our economy and culture.

Resolved, That students in all degree-granting programs at Clemson University are eligible to receive MacDonald Scholarship funds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll Call Votes</th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birrenkott, C.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, G.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coston, D.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner, L.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfacre, R.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny, B.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnell, J.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw, D. (alt)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHITECTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulholland, J.</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schutte, S.</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan, L.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derr, A.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesolowski, D.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron, W.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaddis, L.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond, J.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORESTRY &amp; RECREATION RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedden, R.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuire, F.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBERAL ARTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brannock, D.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, S.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudowski, V.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowaczyk, R.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBRARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murr, K.</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NURSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reichenbach, M.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyck, L.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosinski, R.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pivorun, E.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillwell, E.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed amendments to the Final Report of the ad hoc Committee

Page 4 - Bottom paragraph reads:

Members of the Academic Council are: the President of the University (Chairperson); the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Chairpersons of the commissions; the Vice President for Institutional Advancement; the Vice President for Student Affairs; the Vice President for Business and Finance; the Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources; the Vice President for Administration; the President of the Faculty Senate; the President of the Student Senate; the President-Elect of the Faculty Senate; and the nine collegiate deans.

FIRST MOTION: THAT THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS BE REMOVED FROM THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL:
- the Vice President for Institutional Advancement
- the Vice President for Student Affairs
- the Vice President for Business and Finance
- the Vice President for Administration
- the Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences

(The following members would remain (16 members):
- President
- Provost
- Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources
- 8 College Deans
- Chair of Commission on Undergraduate Studies
- Chair of Commission on Graduate Studies and Research
- President of the Student Senate
- President of the Faculty Senate
- Vice President of the Faculty Senate.)

SECOND MOTION: THAT THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS BE ADDED TO THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL, AND THAT EACH INDIVIDUAL BE VOTED ON SEPARATELY IN THE ORDER LISTED;
- Chair of the Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee
- A faculty member holding a named professorship or chair
- Chair of the Executive Committee of the Organization of Department Heads
Amendment to proposed structure and function of the Commissions and the President's Council

COMPOSITION OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Voting Membership

1. President of the University (Chair)
2. Provost and VP for Academic Affairs (Vice-chair)
3. Deans of Colleges
4. Vice-provost for Undergraduate Studies
5. Vice-provost for Graduate Studies
6. Vice-president for Agriculture & Natural Resources
7. President of the Student Senate
8. President of the Graduate Student Association
9. President of the Faculty Senate
10. VP/President-elect of the Faculty Senate
11. Chair Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee
12. Chair Faculty Senate Research Committee
13. Chaired Professor (elected by Faculty Senate)

Non-voting Membership

14. Vice-President for Business and Finance
15. Vice-President for Student Affairs
16. Vice-President for Institutional Advancement
17. Vice-President for Administration
18. Dean of Admissions and Registration
19. Director of the Library

Submitted by Larry Dyck, Senator Biological Sciences

for consideration at the August meeting of the Faculty Senate
I. CALL TO ORDER

President Mullins called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. He introduced Senator Young. Senator Young has been elected by the College of Agricultural Sciences to replace Senator Dubose. Mullins announced that (alternate) Senator Holmes will be replacing Senator Dyck until an election is held; Senator Dyck has been appointed to the position of Acting Department Head.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of August 18, 1987 were approved as corrected.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Policy. Senator Bryan reported that a study of the status of part time faculty positions will be undertaken. This review will include several categories of temporary positions. It was noted that some of these temporary positions have been occupied for as long as 20 years.

The Policy Committee will also review all policy changes made during the past year to determine if they have been included in the Faculty Manual.

At the next Senate meeting the Policy Committee anticipates submitting a resolution which combines the recommendations of the Senate ad hoc committee to study the grievances procedures and the recommendations of the Provost regarding this matter.

B. Research. Senator Birrenkott said there was no report.

C. Scholastic Policies. Senator Hedden gave the report (Attachment A).

D. Welfare. No report.
President Mullins asked Senator Halfacre to report on the Forum to discuss an on-campus child care facility. Senator Halfacre reported an active positive discussion of the issues had been held. The committee studying this proposal will release the results of a survey which they conducted during the past spring. No final report has been submitted by this committee.

E. University Commissions and Committees

Senator Hedden reported that the Commission on Undergraduate Studies met for 21 minutes but that no substantive business had been conducted.

Hedden reported that he had attended the meeting of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee for Senator Jenny. In that meeting information on admissions exceptions had been presented. The records of 90 applicants were brought before the committee. 40 of these records were for athletes which, the committee was informed, were for information only. Thirty five of the 50 non-athletes were accepted.

Dean Skelton was invited to comment. Skelton said that all 90 applicants were reviewed but that the 40 athletes met the requirements for grants-in-aid so were, at the direction of President Lennon, accepted.

Senator Carter said that he had attended the Commission on Undergraduate Studies meeting reported on by Senator Hedden. He believed that an important action had been taken at that meeting in that there had been a vote to accept the report of the ad hoc committee on acceptance of exemption credit waiver of courses required for graduation. Carter asked that Hedden report on that action.

Senator Hedden thanked Carter for calling this omission to the attention of the Senate. He added that future action was unclear. Carter said that it
would go forward to the President's Council as a unanimous recommendation of the Commission. Hedden explained that the action referred to courses which had been given credit by another institution for content demonstrated through examination or waiver. Departmental recommendation is required for the waiver to be given. It was clarified that this did not allow departments to waive University requirements. President Mullins requested that he be given a copy of the report so it may be distributed to Senate members.

Senator Jenny reported that he had attended a called meeting of the University Scholarship and Awards Committee to hear an appeal from a student whose athletic scholarship had been reduced. The committee, after hearing all the information, unanimously supported the decision of the Athletic Department. Discussion will begin soon on the issue of moving Honors and Awards Day.

Senator Nowaczyk reported for the ad hoc committee on Registration. Two items will be voted upon at their meeting tomorrow. The first item involves efforts to eliminate registration lines for those students who have preregistered. Hopefully, the registration process can be conducted through the mail. The second issue is a recommendation to centralize the registration process in one or two buildings.

Senator Derr reported for the Parking and Traffic Committee. Only part of the area near the library has been converted to angle parking because part of the area lacks the necessary road width. Further study is being conducted to determine what other areas can be converted to angle
parking, thus adding spaces. A subcommittee has been established to seek additional ways of improving and expanding parking.

One of the advantages of making parking an auxiliary service will be the ability to carry funds over from year to year. This will allow accretion of money which can be used to improve parking lots.

Derr reported that persons needing tags for a third car on campus can obtain temporary stickers as they are needed. She also noted that variations in the placement of stickers and hang tags are granted through the parking office.

The problem of insufficient spaces for commuter students is seen by the committee as a sign that the changes are working. They believe that commuting students who used to use faculty and staff lots are now using commuter parking. A fence in the area of the Thurmond excavation has been removed to provide additional spaces for the commuting students. An additional temporary lot, near the P & A building, is being considered.

Senator Derr reported that the special faculty tag was obtained because of a belief that Faculty would "like it." Both Derr and the staff representative to the committee expressed that it was contributing to the paranoid feelings of their constituency. She believes that such identifying stickers will not be ordered again.

Senator Bryan said that it was not possible to "drop by the parking office to obtain a temporary sticker." Based on his recent experience, he said that anyone needing to do this should allow an extra 20 minutes.

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

The President's report and update report (Attachment B) were reviewed.

President Mullins said that he believes that only one of the two appointments
to the Athletic Council by the President (Item 2) was an at large position.
He will verify the information.

President Mullins said that the alternative plan for summer admissions (Item 5) was being circulated so that feedback could be given to the Scholastic Policies Committee.
The Council of Deans has reviewed the Senate recommendations for governance restructuring (Item 6) and have made three additional recommendations.

President Mullins and Senator Nowaczyk have an appointment with President Lennon on September 24 to discuss this report. They will also discuss the Admissions Exceptions Committee and the handling of admission of athletes under the new policies adopted this past April.

A brief discussion was held about the reported recommendation of the Council of Deans that all proposals forwarded to the University Grants Committee be ranked by a college committee (Item 7). Senator Birrenkott reported that the Provost believes that this may not be the recommendation of the Council of Deans, he is awaiting written confirmation of their recommendation. It was noted that the Committee could be one or two persons or could be the Dean of the College and that their ranking can be totally ignored by the Office of University Research.

Input re the Advising and Retention Proposal (Item 8) should be given to members of the Scholastic Policies Committee.

Senator Carter moved to adjust the agenda to permit discussion of the scheduled New Business before the scheduled Old Business for the convenience of Dean Skelton. The motion was seconded and passed.
V. NEW BUSINESS

Senator Nowaczyk moved to adopt the resolution on the proposed Academic Learning Center addition to Mauldin Hall (Attachment C). The motion was seconded.

Senator Carter requested that Dean Skelton be invited to speak on this issue. Dean Skelton said that there is a currently existing academic tutoring program for athletes which is under his direction, although it is paid for by the Athletic Department. The program is primarily conducted in rooms located in Daniel Hall. It is necessary to get Dean Waller's permission to use the rooms, there is competition for the rooms, and the activities surrounding the rooms are not conducive to the tutoring activities. Several schools are now opening academic facilities for their athletes. UNC-Chapel Hill has recently opened one and Georgia has just announced that they will build one. "... so it is not a concept entirely new to Clemson."

Skelton said that this concept had been approved at the last meeting of the Athletic Council. He said that this body is made up of faculty elected by their colleges. Skelton said that no state funds would be used for the proposed building. He added that all freshman athletes and all athletes whose GPR is less than 2.0 are required to attend the tutoring sessions. Attendance is monitored and reported to the appropriate coaches. Building a center would free up rooms in Daniel and would make the monitoring function easier. The center would be available for other uses when it was not being used by the athletes. He added that the plans would include a 150 seat auditorium.

Skelton said that we already have the program; we already have an athletic dormitory; so he cannot understand opposition to the plan, especially when it would not cost any money.
Senator Kosinski asked to what extent would the facility be available to non-athletes. Skelton said that no commitment of time had been made. It would provide space for marginal students in the summer. He added that the Athletic Department has been fairly reasonable in allowing use of their facilities. Skelton noted that the new budgeting procedures require that users pay for use of facilities not assigned for their use, the Athletic Department has not suggested any charges for use of this facility.

Skelton said, "You can be against an athletic dormitory, you can be against special admissions for athletes. But the fact that they are here, I don't see how you can be against a learning center to help them achieve enrollment requirements and graduation rates that we want."

In response to a question about graduation rates of athletes Skelton said that the 4 year graduation rate for all athletes at Clemson is close to 40%, "around 38 to 40%." The 5 year graduation rate "approaches 50%." Skelton said that this is about 15% higher than the national average.

Senator Bryan asked if there is an existing shortage of classrooms on campus during the evening hours. Skelton said that "we are not saying that" and added that there are many problems. He pointed out the problem of deciding who is to pay for repairs when furnishings or equipment get broken.

Senator Bryan said that, as an IPTAY member, he is not convinced that this is good stewardship of the monies. Why build a new building when "acres" already exist?

Skelton answered that monitoring is a problem. These are not good students. They are not disciplined or self directed.

Skelton said that he assumed that the building would improve monitoring which
would result in better achievement on the part of the students. He has not seen plans for the center.

Senator Brown asked why an auditorium was needed. Skelton said, "Probably for meetings". He said that the auditorium would have audiovisual capabilities.

Senator Brown said that Drama has needed an auditorium for years, perhaps one could be built that would meet their needs as well.

Senator McGuire asked why the Learning Center could not be open to all students who have a GPR under 2.0.

Skelton said that philosophically he believed that it should be open to all of these students. But IPTAY is funding the project so they were only asking for the athletes. "If we can't have everything we ought to take what we can get."

He added that we do not have a remedial program on the campus.

Senator McGuire replied that when there is already a division on campus between athletics and academics it might be better not to build a center at all than to just provide resources to a special group.

Senator Bradshaw said that the Athletic Department was footing the bill. We might not agree with the plan but in the end we might be recipients of its benefits.

Senator Nowaczyk asked if funds from the Athletic Department or IPTAY are considered by the state as being state funds. He said that Sheheen has made statements to that effect. Skelton said, "He talks that way but he can't do anything about it."

Nowaczyk asked if there has been any formal evaluation of the tutoring program. Skelton said that a faculty group had evaluated it and had given it a positive report.

A suggestion was made that the center might better be located in conjunction
with the Thurmond building. This location would be near the English and Biology labs, would provide better access to other students, and would facilitate completion of that project.

Senator Bryan asked how the program would be conducted if the building were not built. Skelton said that it would continue as it currently exists. Bryan pointed out that the same $1.8 million invested in a program rather than in a building might produce greater results. Skelton said that it was to Clemson's advantage to have the best facilities for everyone. He said that the highest number of applicants that Clemson has ever had occurred in the year after the national football championship. He added that Proposition 48 has helped us get better student athletes but "it doesn't help us to have them flunk out." He said that the concept, not the location, was all the Athletic Council has approved. He urged Senate approval of the concept already approved by our elected peers.

The question of ownership, and thus ongoing financial responsibility, of the building was raised. Skeleton said that the building would belong to the University.

President Mullins noted that the Athletic Council does not yet consist of elected faculty members. The newly elected members were not yet attending and those present members with 3 year terms were completing them before elections would be held for those positions. Mullins noted that he had not voted at that meeting, he is neutral to the concept but is opposed to the location. Several members spoke in favor of the concept but against the location. The suggestion of attaching it to the Strom Thurmond Center received support from several Senators. The location of the center was of concern in much of the discussion. During this discussion Skelton corrected the perception that
Mauldin Hall is an athletic dormitory, he said that it is primarily a football dormitory.

Senator Nowaczyk said that his major objection to the proposal was that the learning center was proposed as an addition to Mauldin Hall. He expressed concern that the athletes would be further isolated. He noted that the proposal described Mauldin Hall, with the addition, as a "living learning center" which suggests that the athletes would be isolated in this area. He asked how many students the Senators thought would feel that they had open access to a Learning Center attached to a football dormitory. Nowaczyk said that he was opposed to approving such a general concept because of the varying interpretations of that approval.

Senator Carter spoke in opposition to the resolution. He said that it is a negative resolution and that we should send a note of commendation to the Athletic Department instead, praising their intent to support the academic achievement of the athletes.

Senator Birrenkott said that he too believes the resolution is negative and that the Senate should widen this "cloistered" discussion to a much wider forum.

Senator McGuire asked that the Senators read the resolution; nowhere does it say that the Senate is opposed to a learning center. It says that the Senate is opposed to a learning center attached to Mauldin Hall.

Senator Murr said that the fourth "whereas" appeared to be the most negative part of the resolution. He is in favor of the Academic Learning Center but opposed to the Mauldin location. He pointed out that the proposal includes consideration of "a TV room, a game room, and a counselors apartment," these things do not seem much related to a strong academic program. Murr offered a
friendly amendment to delete the statement "and, Whereas, the proposed academic center will include facilities, such as computer facilities, that are not available adjacent to other student housing;" which was accepted. The question was called and a vote of 12 in favor, 11 opposed was recorded. A roll call vote was requested and is included as Item 1 of Attachment F. This vote resulted in 12 in favor of the resolution, 12 opposed to the resolution, 2 abstaining. The motion was defeated.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Senator Hedden introduced the resolution from the Scholastic Policies Committee (Attachment D) on the Summer Admission program, the motion was seconded. Hedden said that some members of the committee were not opposed to a summer admissions program but were opposed to restricting the program to the "special mission areas of Clemson." In addition, there is concern about costs, numbers of students served, and questions about the need for a special administrator for the program.

Senator Bradshaw read a note which he received from a member of his College, suggesting that he oppose the resolution because state supported schools cannot be elitist, that is the privilege of private schools.

Senator Kosinski spoke in favor of the resolution. The present system allows for exceptions to the admission standards. The proposal has hidden costs, especially to the College of Liberal Arts, and needed courses do not currently exist.

Senator Nowaczyk said that the proposal speaks more to quantity than to quality. It is not a summer program, but a program which requires special resources during the Summer, Fall, and Spring.
Nowaczyk also expressed concern about "using the best teachers" for the program, this means that the best students would not have access to the best teachers.

Senator Gaddis spoke against the resolution as it is stated. He agreed that we should not be elitist, but neither should we accept those who have no chance of being successful. He moved adoption of another resolution (Attachment E) as a substitute resolution. This motion was seconded.

Senator Kosinski moved to amend the Scholastic Policy Committee resolution by deleting the last "resolve" and inserting the last "resolve" as proposed by Senator Gaddis. The motion was seconded.

After debate, the question, and a roll call vote were called. The roll call vote is recorded as Item 2, Attachment F. The amendment passed, 12 in favor, 11 opposed.

Senator Mulholland offered a friendly amendment to put the eighth "whereas" of the Scholastic Policies Committee resolution (Attachment D) after the fifth "whereas" in the resolution proposed by Senator Gaddis (Attachment E).

Senator Birrenkott requested that the resolution be read into the record so that he "could know what [he] was voting on."

President Mullins read the resolution:

WHEREAS the administration of Clemson University has proposed a program of special summer admissions to prospective students having predicted GPR of 1.4 to 1.8 and entering one of the University's unique mission areas (agricultural sciences, forestry, textiles, and industrial technology education) in order to increase enrollment in the respective programs, and

WHEREAS new enrollment programs should be directed toward increasing the academic standards by attracting superior students, and
WHEREAS the proposed program would, if successful, bring a lowering of academic standards to the University, and
WHEREAS the proposed program would, if unsuccessful, bring frustration to students given unrealistic hopes and aspirations, and
WHEREAS the program is relatively uneconomic and the burden placed inequitably, and
WHEREAS there presently exists a process for admitting academic exceptions; and
WHEREAS there are institutions of higher learning supported by the State of South Carolina whose commission it is to provide the services intended by the program, be it
RESOLVED that Clemson University refrain from the proposed summer program, and further be it
RESOLVED that Clemson University seek alliances and develop recruitment measures with TEC centers, community colleges, and junior colleges to attract qualified enrollees for depleted programs.
The question was called. President Mullins stated the question as substituting the substitute resolution as amended for the original resolution as amended. The resolution to substitute passed, 14 in favor, 7 opposed. Senator Carter moved to table the substitute resolution to permit discussion within the Colleges. The motion was seconded and defeated, 5 in favor, 14 opposed. Senator Carter appealed the decision of the chair, saying that the Senate by-laws require that a matter on which a vote is taken had to be distributed to the members a week in advance of the meeting. The Parliamentarian read the
pertinent Faculty Manual content; material has to be given to the presiding officer one week prior to the Senate meeting.

President Mullins, noting that the resolution had been sent to each member in advance of the meeting, ruled that the vote was in order but offered to take a vote on whether the matter should be voted on at this meeting. Senator Carter requested that the matter be put to a vote. The Senate voted to consider the matter, 14 in favor, 5 against.

Senator Tesolowski said that he had checked with the Department Head of the Industrial Technological Education program; he knows nothing about this proposal. In addition, the Department Head believed that the reference might be to the Education in Industry program. Senator Hedden added that there are a lot of people who would be directly affected by the program and who had heard nothing about it. The program was presented by Vice-Provost Reel and Dean Skelton to the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee after someone in the administration decided that those were the target areas.

Senator Carter requested a quorum count.

President Mullins affirmed the continued presence of a quorum.

The question was called and the resolution, FS 87-9-1, passed 14-3.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

MaryAnn B. Reichenbach
Secretary

Senators Absent: J. C. McConnell (Bradshaw attended), M. Drews, W. Baron (Sparks attended), V. Rudowski, E. Pivorun, E. P Stillwell.
The Scholastic Policies Committee met on September 1. The main topic for discussion was the proposed summer program for agriculture, forestry, industrial technology management, and textiles. The committee members directed the Chairman to draft a resolution for consideration by the Faculty Senate. With further input from the Advisory/Executive Committee, and consultation with individual committee members, a final resolution was drafted. In addition, the functioning of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee was discussed. Advising of students on probation desiring to transfer between was also briefly discussed.

Members present: Bruce Jenny, J. C. McConnell, Susan Brown, Alice Derr, Leo Gaddis, Roy Hedden, Sandy King, Robert Kosinki, Wayne Madison.

Others present: Joe Mullins.
1. Susan Brown was appointed by the Advisory Committee of the Senate to chair the Grievance Board. Most of you know Susan has a law degree and has been active in grievance procedures in the past.

2. Frank Mauldin, Director of Human Resources, and Betty Hubbard, EDP Production Services Supervisor, have been appointed by President Lennon as at large members of the Athletic Council.

3. Gordon Halfacre and I submitted a letter suggesting changes to the SC Retirement System Laws which Provost Maxwell sent to President Lennon with his recommendation (see attachment #1). The request had to be in prior to August 25. A lot of the work on the comparison of the Police Officers Retirement Plan was done by Ron Herrin and Ray Thompson, and we would like to thank them for their cooperation. It is interesting to note that the Police Officers Retirement Plan was one of the features in the recent SC Retirement Systems Update which you should have received.

4. After a public hearing in Washington, the Monsanto-sponsored project received approval from EPA's Biotechnology Science Advisory Subcommittee on Premanufacture Notice. A final decision from EPA could come as early as September 15.

5. Two members of the Scholastics Policy Committee agreed last week to propose an alternative plan to the summer admissions program offered by the administration (see attachment #2). Time did not permit them to have it considered by the Scholastics Policy Committee, and it is being distributed to you for consideration and response to the committee members at this meeting of the Senate and also later.
6. The Council of Deans approved the amended version of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Structure and Function of the Commissions and the President's Council with the following changes:
   (a) Director of the Library be made a voting member of the Acad. C.
   (b) Membership of the Acad. Council include 9 Deans
   (c) Membership of the Commission on Undergraduate Council include a representative of the Library

Ron Nowaczyk and I have scheduled a meeting to discuss this and other items with President Lennon on the 24th of September.

7. The Council of Deans recommended to the Provost that all proposals forwarded to the University Grants Committee be ranked by a college committee prior to submission.

8. I am distributing for your consideration An Advising and Retention Proposal submitted to the Council of Deans by Jerry Reel. The deans of the colleges will bring back to the Council how they would propose to set up such an advising scheme in their college. We need to discuss this and advise our Scholastics Policy Committee on what action to take.

9. The Faculty Senate minutes starting with the August meeting are now available on DORIS. Searching these and other documents can be done by either typing

   B4  

or

   LOGON;CICS4  

 means to enter

 means blank

I believe that in the future this will be very helpful to keep us from reinventing the wheel. The Faculty Manual will be placed on DORIS shortly.
MEMORANDUM

TO: President Max Lennon

FROM: W. David Maxwell, Provost

SUBJECT: Fringe Benefit Issues for 1987-88

Attached is a memo from the Faculty Senate (and supporting documentation) that contains two suggestions.

With respect to the first suggestion (making optional retirement programs available to all faculty and administrative personnel) I have no objection.

The second suggestion, however, on early retirement I believe to be premature and I would not favor our advocating it in its present form. The problem is that, while it clearly indicates the benefit to the individual, the interests of the University are not, in my opinion, adequately safeguarded. In its present form I fear that it would encourage many of our very best faculty to take early retirement and then accept other employment. I believe that we should study this second suggestion more thoroughly.

I also believe that the Welfare Committee of the Faculty Senate could be most helpful by compiling comparative information from other institutions on both of these issues.

WDM/ep

Attachment

cc: Dr. Joe Mullins
    Dr. Gordon Halfacre
MEMO TO: Dr. Max Lennon, President, Clemson University

THROUGH: Dr. David Maxwell, Provost

FROM: Joe Mullins, President, Faculty Senate
       Gordon Halfacre, Chairman, Faculty Senate Welfare Committee

SUBJECT: Suggested Changes to the South Carolina Retirement System Laws

Listed below are two suggestions for your consideration to improve the laws governing the South Carolina Retirement System. Detailed explanations of each suggestion are attached.

1. To allow all faculty and academic administrative officials the opportunity to participate in an optional retirement system.

2. To allow members the opportunity to retire earlier and purchase any portion of withdrawn, educational, maternity, and/or military service (as was recently passed for Federal and out-of-state service).

Attachment
1. Recommendation: To allow all faculty and academic administrative officials the opportunity to participate in an optional retirement system.

Allowing existing faculty the opportunity to participate in an optional retirement system would allow them the freedom of tailoring their retirement plans to suit the needs of their personal situations. Many of our faculty have transferred to Clemson University after the completion of many years in retirement systems in other private and state institutions. This would allow them the opportunity to consolidate all their retirement investments into one account, as opposed to the present Retirement System that does not allow retirement credit from private institutions, and allows retirement credit from public institutions as an expensive purchase (usually much more money than can be withdrawn from the previous system for the same number of years of retirement credit).

This benefit in itself might be used as an incentive tool for Clemson University in that it would offer a benefit that some other states may not allow.
2. **Recommendation:** That employees in the South Carolina Retirement System be allowed to retire at age 55 with 25 years service with full benefits for Normal Retirement. Early Retirement at age 50 with 25 years service, reduced by 5% for each year under age 55. These provisions would be similar to the benefits or requirements with the Police Officers Retirement System (PORS).

**Basis for Recommendation:**

1. Under the present contribution to SCRS the employee contributes 4% on the first $4,800, then 6% on the balance of salary with the employer contributing 7% for retirement on the employee's total earnings. Under PORS, employee contributes 5% of salary and employer contributes 7.3%. Listed below are the total contributions per year to the Retirement System for different salaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>SCRS</th>
<th>PORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>1,854.00</td>
<td>1,843.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>3,145.00</td>
<td>3,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>5,104.00</td>
<td>4,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,000.00</td>
<td>7,054.00</td>
<td>6,725.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see in all these examples, the total contributions are more to the SCRS than they are to the PORS and yet under SCRS Normal Retirement is 65, PORS is 55.

Retirement for full Service Retirement -
SCRS age 65 or 30 years service, PORS age 55 with five (5) years service or 30 years credited service.

Early Retirement -
SCRS is age 60 with 5% reduction for each year under age 65, while PORS is age 50 with 5% reduction for each year under age 55.

There are also differences in the retirement benefits between SCRS and PORS - with the benefits higher for PORS.

This recommendation is based upon the assumption that the benefits for Police Officers are actuarially sound. With this assumption and the fact that more is being contributed to SCRS per employee with the same salary than to PORS, then we could also assume that the requirements and benefits for retirement would at least be equal for the two programs.

If this proposal were accepted, it would reduce or eliminate the need for several other suggested changes such as:

1. To reduce the cost of buying the final five years.
2. The option to purchase part instead of ALL of Military Service or non-member service.

Information sources - Ron Herrin and Ray Thompson
Proposal No. 2 for Summer Admissions

The attached proposal is regarded as a simplification of the one formulated by the administration. Nevertheless, it maintains the spirit of providing increased opportunities for more S.C. residents to enter Clemson while meshing more closely with regulations under which all currently enrolled students are governed—e.g., coursework required for graduation would be the same for both regularly and specially admitted students; continuing enrollment policy would be same for both groups; current administrative structure would govern both groups, with no new administration necessary or desired.

Basically, all students would be required to enter in the summer rather than the fall and complete a remedial core of courses, then enroll as less than a full time student (13 hrs. maximum load) in the following fall and spring semesters. After the first year, if in fact this system works, then they should lose their identity among the crowds and be subjected to the same expectations as all other sophomore, junior and senior students.

This proposal seems advantageous in that the probabilities of a low predicted GPR student’s success can be evaluated prior to implementation of a more structured (and costly) program, such as the originally proposed program presented by the administration. Also, the quality of Clemson’s educational offerings is in no way jeopardized.
PROPOSAL FOR SUMMER ADMISSIONS

I. All colleges that desire to participate should be allowed to do so. While summer admissions may be most attractive today to those disciplines involving Clemson's unique mission areas, there could well be other disciplines who would like the same opportunity. Effectively, this is the current practice as different colleges have varying entrance requirements already -viz., different predicted GPR's, etc.

II. Summer admissions admittees

- students with a genuine interest in a college degree as determined by application and on-campus interviews alone and with parents. A screening committee to include reps from various colleges participating in program and the admissions office could conduct interviews and screen candidates.

- students predicting 1.4-2.0 included for consideration

- preference to South Carolinians

III. When

- June 13, 1988 to August 5, 1988; Fall and Spring semesters 1988-89; with similar arrangement each year thereafter.

IV. Academic Program:

- Summer Semester

  All students should take Education 101, 102, 103. Additionally, students should complete the lowest level English and Math courses normally expected in their chosen curriculum except that those scoring <350 on SAT verbal would automatically be enrolled in remedial English (English 100). Class size should remain small (<22). Also, all students should be expected to successfully complete on some summer date(s) a shortcourse in librarianship. Students failing to satisfactorily complete these courses should be advised of the improbability of completing a degree.

- Fall and Winter Semesters:

  Begin normal curriculum courses, except limit courses to maximum of 13 credit hours. Advising becomes critical in selecting the proper course loads.
Evaluation of whether or not to continue past the freshman year—determined by university continuing enrollment policy (which will hopefully be revised).

V. Support Services

- Counseling and Career Planning
- Tutors - available as needed and at students expense

VI. Housing First Year

- Summer
  Housed in university dormitories

- Fall and Spring
  Scattered in University Housing, if available.
An Advising and Retention Proposal

I. The Problem

When compared to other major state universities, Clemson, up to this point, has a very good record of retention of its undergraduates. Indeed, if a period of five years from the date of entry is surveyed, about two-thirds of the actual entering freshmen graduate (1980 to 1985).

However, there are problems. First, the retention of black students through to graduation is less than fifty percent. Second, black student retention percentages on a year-by-year basis are somewhat lower than whites or other ethnic minorities. The most recent years' data (1984 and 1985) indicate that the retention gap between white and black students may be increasing.

There are many reasons why students do not return, such as homesickness, dislike of the campus or other students, and a feeling of depersonalization. However, a follow-up study done with black students who did not return indicates that nearly three-fourths do not come back because of academic reasons. As the undergraduate student body grows and the research thrust of the University increases, it is probable that among all students, black, white, and other minorities, alienation will increase and that a sense of academic failure will also increase. More than anything else, this can damage the teaching mission of the University. Several very similar land-grant universities have avoided the problem. This plan imitates much of what they have done.
One useful approach to this potential problem is to create a strong advisement and retention program for the University. This should have collegiate and centralized components.

Unfortunately, Clemson's advising system does not appear to be in good shape. In 1985 and 1986, Dr. Corinne Sawyer, in concert with the Academic Advising Committee, surveyed faculty advisors, department heads, and students' advising at Clemson. Certain points stood out. First, faculty advisors generally were assigned the duties of advising on an overload basis. Second, the advising workload was heaviest in those colleges where the teaching load was perceived by the faculty as being great. Third, while the faculty advisors recognized the obligations of advice or major fields, general education, electives, and academic regulations, they were less certain about or willing to undertake the tasks of academic intervention, conference arranging and tutoring, all critical to retention. Fourth, few advisors could be available throughout the work week on a regular basis.

Department heads had perceptions of the advising task at odds with the advisors on some issues. For example, most heads expected the advisor to keep close track of the student and to intervene when needed. Nearly half thought the advisor should arrange tutorial help for weak students. Less than twenty percent of the faculty agreed.
Student surveys indicate a lack of advice in such matters as career planning, financial aid and help funding tutors. They found it difficult to find their advisors and found little interest on the part of the advisor in them. Again the colleges in which the advising appeared more satisfactory were generally those with low numbers of students and low teaching loads. This leads to the conclusion that there simply is not enough time available to the faculty to do the kind of advising that leads to student academic progress.

Some universities and professional groups have done a great deal of research on advising. Most strongly link excellent advising with very high retention. Most agree that advising must be available throughout the work day and merely a telephone call away at other times. In addition, there is agreement that the advisor must have clerical support, quick access to records, and the support of the college administration.

In an effort to study possible models in depth, Sawyer attended national and regional sessions of academic advising conferences, participated in an American Collegiate Testing service workshop, and visited institutions similar to Clemson which had developed well-regarded systems. The proposal, which draws from all these sources, relies most heavily on Auburn's, Tennessee's, and North Carolina State's experiences. The proposal was endorsed in principle in 1986 by the Academic Advising Committee and the Faculty Affairs Commission.
II. The Proposal

Each college should be allotted money to hire retired faculty who would serve as the primary advisor and academic retention officer for the college. That advisor or advisors should be available every day, have access to and appointments scheduled for by the dean's secretary, and should be housed in the college's central office. The advisor should be current with all curricula in the college and because of the advisor's professional stature be able to arrange for conferences and tutorial sessions. The advisor would need an office, file space, and a computer terminal. All adds and drops would be handled by the advisor. The advisor should be sensitive to student study and career choice problems and should know where to direct the student for more help.

In addition, the Undergraduate Studies office should have an Advising and Retention coordinator and two guidance counselors. Students changing curricula should use this staff to discuss and plan for changes. Special emphasis should be placed on the contact that these persons would have with freshmen and minority students. These persons also would be the primary advisors for undeclared majors, arranging for preference tests, interest inventories and interviews to help move these students towards informed decisions. All students withdrawing from school should discuss those decisions with these counselors. The coordinator would work closely with the Counseling and Career
Center and the Office of Student Development, in addition to the college deans and advisors to improve minority retention, keep general retention strong, and greatly improve the access to and quality of academic advising.

III. The Timetable

Should the President agree to this program, I would want to search for, select, and hire the Coordinator by January 1, 1988. The colleges should move on the same schedule. Thus by summer and the new student orientation, the new system could be in effect.
Getting remedial ed off college campuses

OV. Carroll Campbell reopened a sore subject for state colleges and universities last week when he said remedial education doesn't belong on college campuses.

A Commission on Higher Education study concluded the same thing last year, and suggested a sound alternative for handling the problem of college-bound students who need extra help: Four-year colleges should turn their remedial programs over to the state's technical schools.

Providing catch-up education is much more in line with the TEC mission of imparting basic job skills, including literacy, than that of colleges and universities charged with bestowing higher education. And as Campbell told college officials at a state Budget and Control Board meeting recently, getting remediation off the college campus "increases your academic excellence."

Its removal has another, more uncomfortable, effect, however: It reduces the number of students enrolling at four-year colleges, which in turn reduces the amount of money flowing into enrollment-driven college budgets.

This is one reason some South Carolina colleges are resisting the tougher admission standards set to take effect next fall. They look with trepidation at a study that discovered only 31 percent of last fall's entering college freshmen had completed all the high school courses the new standards require.

Of course, those students were not required to meet the new standards; next fall's entering freshmen have been warned since 1983 they will be. College-bound students and those guiding them shouldn't be thought so dumb as to have ignored the widely distributed notices.

The overriding reason state colleges and universities hang onto remedial education is that it's highly lucrative to do so. Some 49 percent of college students take remedial courses nationwide. At South Carolina State College, the figure approaches 70 percent. State colleges are playing catch up for a tremendous number of students. As CHE executive director Fred Sheheen said Wednesday, the political and financial ramifications of denying college access to so many students all at once would be too great for this state to bear.

However, the state could follow Campbell's suggested phase-out plan and eliminate remedial classes from the state's three university campuses. The other four-year colleges could follow more gradually.

As elementary and secondary education improves, there's hope the classes will phase out naturally.

The state higher education community — especially its universities — are talking about quality a great deal these days. Campbell has offered a litmus test of just how much of it they really mean.
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION CONCERNING ADDITIONS TO MAULDIN HALL

Whereas, the Faculty Senate appreciates the intent of Vice-President Lomax and the Athletic Department in proposing the establishment of a permanent academic learning center which would support the student-athlete at Clemson;

Whereas, the Faculty Senate in 1986 recommended to the University and the Athletic Council that student-athletes at Clemson University not be isolated from the rest of the student body;

Whereas, the proposed addition of an Academic Center adjacent to Mauldin Hall can isolate these student-athletes further; and,

Whereas, the proposed academic center will include facilities, such as computer facilities, that are not available adjacent to other student housing;

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate opposes the addition of an academic center to Mauldin Hall; and,

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate recommends that the University pursue the establishment of an academic center with tutoring and computer facilities which would be available on an equal basis to all students.
14 May 1987

MEMORANDUM

TO: Manning N. Lomax

FROM: The Ad Hoc Committee to Study Renovations and Additions to Mauldin Hall
        Robert W. Robinson
        Almeda Rogers
        Mark Wright

RE: Renovations and Additions to Mauldin Hall

Per your request of 1 May, the ad hoc committee has conducted and completed an initial study of the above-mentioned project.

A report is attached for your review.

MAW: kw

p.c.: Dr. Max Lennon
       Mr. David Larson
       Mr. Jack Wilson
A REPORT ON: RENOVATIONS TO MAULDIN HALL
MAULDIN HALL ACADEMIC CENTER

At the request of Manning N. Lomax, Vice-President for Student Affairs, an ad hoc committee - Almeda Rogers, R.W. Robinson and Mark Wright - has conducted and completed an initial investigation of renovations to and the addition of an academic center for Mauldin Hall. This report contains a preliminary renovation and space program, an analysis of site concepts and cost estimates for the outlined scope of work.

PROGRAM

A variety of renovations and maintenance actions were discussed by the committee. The scope of this report is limited to the renovations which include the expansion of the restrooms on floors two through four and refurbishment of the ground floor lounge.

Expansion of the restrooms can be achieved by converting the adjacent and little used "utility rooms" to shower areas. Work would include demolition of an existing wall, creation of the shower room, and the installation of additional fixtures within the existing restrooms.

Upon completion of the academic center, the existing study rooms which have been constructed within the ground floor lounge would be removed. The expanded lounge would be refurbished (new floor covering, paint and furniture) and subdivided into two relaxation/T.V. areas. The partitioning would probably be implemented with some form of "room dividers."

Asbestos removal can be approached in two ways - complete prior to the renovations or incrementally with each phase of the work program. The latter presumes a complete change-out of the light fixtures.

The preliminary space program for the Academic Center is outlined below. The proposal is similar to facilities at the University of North Carolina.

Further consideration may be given to including a T.V. room, a game room, and a counselor's apartment. However, the site and cost analysis do not consider these optional activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC CENTER</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EST. ASF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Computer Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>150 seat auditorium with audio-visual capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>4 offices for academic staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>15, 8-10 seat tutoring rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>10, 16-20 seat meeting rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1, 50 carrel study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,920</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITE CONCEPTS

Three site concepts have been examined and are attached. All present design challenges and require the relocation of utility lines:

Concepts A and B locate the addition north of the existing structure. Although an initial thought was that the Academic Center could be a prototype addition to the low-rise dorms, a third structure would completely destroy the ambience and privacy of the President's home.

Concept C is fundamentally a westward addition and may, as shown, allow the creation of a "stand alone" auditorium which could also be utilized as a classroom space.

Although these studies are very preliminary, the committee prefers Concept C for the following reasons: (1) infringement on open space is less than that in A & B; (2) views north from the dormitory rooms remain unimpaired; and (3) the potential to create a large classroom exists.

COST ESTIMATES

Cost estimates for the renovations, the Academic Center and the total project are provided below. Estimate A reflects the expected cost if the asbestos were completely removed, while B reflects the cost of project specific removal.

The estimates do not include the previously noted spaces that may be added to the Academic Center. The "utilities" line item should be considered an indicator as actual cost will depend on the site and extent of relocation required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Expansion</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$545,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Lounge</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Light Fixtures</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Renovations</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$685,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,321,875</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E Fees</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency/Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Construction</td>
<td>$1,876,875</td>
<td>$1,876,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project</td>
<td>$3,576,875</td>
<td>$2,561,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

The proposed renovations and additions to Mauldin Hall will, if implemented, provide scholarship athletes with an excellent living/learning center. The members of the ad hoc committee stand ready to assist in the implementation process.

This process is perceived to consist of the following steps:

1. Approval of the Academic Center concept.
2. Development and Approval of the Space and Activity program.
3. Development, review and approval of design parameters.
5. Project establishment.

14 May 1987
MAW:kw
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Administration of Clemson University has proposed a summer admissions program to increase enrollment in the University's unique mission areas (Agricultural Sciences, Forestry, Textiles and Industrial Technology Education), and to increase the ratio of in-state to out-of-state students through enrollment of academically marginal students (predicted freshman GPR of 1.4 to 2.0); and

WHEREAS, a predicted 77% increase in entering freshman in the mission area curricula seems unrealistic; and

WHEREAS, 79% of all incoming students change majors between their freshman year and graduation; and

WHEREAS, the projected graduation rate of students with low predicted GPR is poor; and

WHEREAS, a 6% increase in freshman enrollment due to academically marginal students could lower the overall quality of the student body of Clemson University; and

WHEREAS, 76% of the South Carolina high school students applying to Clemson University are accepted; and

WHEREAS, the need for a full-time program administrator is questionable; and

WHEREAS, there presently exists a process for admitting academic exceptions; and

WHEREAS, the colleges (Liberal Arts and Sciences) which will be most-involved in teaching these students will bear the majority of the costs, but will receive few of the benefits; and

WHEREAS, the cost per student has not been defined nor has the source of the revenue been identified; and

WHEREAS, the faculty in the affected colleges were not consulted during the development of the proposed program; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate recommends to the Administration that the summer admissions program not be adopted; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate is willing to work with the Administration in developing a summer program more acceptable to the faculty senate.
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the administration of Clemson University has proposed a program of special summer admissions to prospective students having predicted GPR of 1.4 to 1.8 and entering one of the University's unique mission areas (agricultural sciences, forestry, textiles, and industrial technology education) in order to increase the enrollment in the respective programs, and

WHEREAS new enrollment programs should be directed toward increasing the academic standards by attracting superior students, and

WHEREAS the proposed program would, if successful, bring a lowering of academic standards to the University, and

WHEREAS the proposed program would, if unsuccessful, bring frustration to students given unrealistic hopes and aspirations, and

WHEREAS the program is relatively uneconomic and the burden placed inequitably, and

WHEREAS there are institutions of higher learning supported by the State of South Carolina whose commission it is to provide the services intended by the program, be it

RESOLVED that Clemson University refrain from the proposed summer program, and further be it

RESOLVED that Clemson University seek alliances and develop recruitment measures with TEC centers, community colleges, and junior colleges to attract qualified enrollees for depleted programs.
ROLL CALL VOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birrenkott, G.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, G.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, R.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner, L.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfacre, G.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny, B.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw, D.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulholland, J.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCE &amp; INDUSTRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, S.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derr, A.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesolowski, D.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaddis, L.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond, J.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparks, P.</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORESTRY &amp; RECREATION RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedden, R.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuire, F.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brannock, D.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, S.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowaczyk, R.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murr, K.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reichenbach, M.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haselton, G.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosinski, R.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, A.</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, P.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>