MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
JANUARY 10, 1989

1. Call to Order. President Nowaczyk called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m. He welcomed George Alexander, Director of Administrative Program Services, who attended the meeting as a visitor.

2. Approval of Minutes. The minutes of November 15, 1988, and December 6, 1988, were approved as distributed.

3. Committee Reports
   A. Senate Committees
      Policy Committee. There was no formal report. Senator Reichenbach reported the committee is studying several items, including the sale of complimentary textbooks.

      Research Committee. There was no formal report. Senator Hammond said the committee is studying the return of indirect costs, policies for dealing with non-tenured track personnel and several issues concerning graduate students and graduate student programs.


      Welfare Committee. Senator Baron reported the committee is studying payment of thesis advisors during the summer, fringe benefits, and customary fee schedules of Blue Cross/Blue Shield. Senator LeBlanc requested that the faculty survey on fringe benefits be returned to her not later than Thursday, January 12.

   Senator Baron called attention to a memorandum from Larry Ellis, Executive Director, S. C. State Employees Association, regarding Budget Proposals of the Budget and Control Board for 1989-90 (Attachment B). Baron urged Senators to make colleagues aware of the budget proposals and to contact State Senators and Representatives regarding these issues. He also requested President Nowaczyk to include a portion of the memorandum in the next issue of the Newsletter.
Ad_hoc_Committee_on_Institutional_Research.

Senator Dunn presented the Report of the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Institutional Research (Attachment C). He called special attention to the supervision chart on page 3, pointing out that the Office of Institutional Research will move from supervision of the Office of Business and Finance to the Office of Information Management.

Senator Dunn reviewed the committee's recommendations concerning the Office of Institutional Research. Senators needing additional information may contact Dunn.

In order to determine the consensus of the Senate in time to place the Report of the ad hoc Committee on Institutional Research on the Agenda of the Academic Council in February, President Nowaczyk will circulate a mail ballot for the recommendations of the committee. (The report and recommendations, FS89-1-1 P, were accepted by the Senate. Attachment D is a tabulation of the vote.)

B. Committees and Commissions of the University. There were no reports.

4. President's Report. President Nowaczyk called attention to "Ideas for a Stronger Graduate Program." Comments regarding concerns of the Graduate Student Association should be directed to President Nowaczyk to be forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Organization of Department Heads.

President Nowaczyk called attention to "Guidelines for Student Recruitment Program," outlining the Clemson Scholars Program. The program offers a scholarship covering the cost of all annual academic fees to the top-ranked student in each of the state's public high schools. In each case if this student is not black, an additional scholarship will be offered to the school's top-ranked black student.

Senator LeBlanc expressed concerns regarding the Clemson Scholars Program, stating that the program is "too wide open" and that taxpayers should not be paying for the brightest students to make C's at Clemson. LeBlanc added these students should maintain at least a 3.0, with perhaps some leniency in the freshman year. It was pointed out that the athletic/academic scholarships, as well as many others, require at least a B average or better. Senator Coulter said, "If we are going to call (these students) scholars, they are going to have to do better than a 2.5."

President Nowaczyk referred issues related to the Clemson Scholars Program to the Scholastic Policies Committee.
5. Old_Business

A. Election_of_Grievance_Board_(GP-II)_Members.
President Nowaczyk stated that revisions in the Faculty_Manual require seven members on the Grievance Board. Three members will be elected for one-year terms ending January 1990, and four members will be elected for two-year terms ending in January 1991.

President Nowaczyk called for additional nominations to the GP-II Member Ballot (Attachment E). There were no additional nominations for the one-year position. For the two-year positions, President Nowaczyk reported that Senator Conover (Forestry) and Senator Hogan (Architecture) have agreed to have their names placed in nomination. Senator Baron nominated Peter Sparks (Engineering) for a two-year term.

It was moved and seconded that the nominations be closed; the motion passed unanimously. The following Senators were elected to serve on the Grievance Procedure Board:

One-year terms: Lewis Bryan (Commerce & Industry), John Luedeman (Sciences), and MaryAnn Reichenbach (Nursing).

Two-year terms: Edwin Coulter (Liberal Arts), Doyce Graham (Agricultural Sciences), Ken Murr (Library), and Richard Conover (Forestry).

6. New_Business

A. Resolution_for_a_Proposal_on_Summer_School Salaries. Senator Baron introduced the Welfare Committee's statement and proposal dated January 1989 (Attachment F). Baron pointed out that the salary for teaching a course in summer school is approximately 40% less than the salary for teaching the same course during the academic year.

The committee recommends that salaries for teaching in the summer school be increased over a three-year period. Baron said that if funds for the "Provost's Research Awards" and the "Summer Minority Recruitment Program" were deleted from the summer school budget, the first increase in the suggested scale would almost be supported financially by that change.

There followed discussion on the requirements of state law relative to earnings from summer school teaching.

"Summer School Salaries: A Statement and Proposal - January 1989" (FS89-1-2 P) (Attachment F) was approved with one dissenting vote.
B. Resolution for a Proposal for a "Sick-Leave Days Employee Committee". Senator Baron withdrew the resolution, stating that the Business Office has created an employee committee to deal with a University pool of sick leave days.

C. Resolution on Changes for Faculty Manual. Senator Reichenbach introduced "Resolution on the Faculty Manual." She pointed out that the resolution endorses only the process of reorganization of the Faculty Manual and also that the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees would continue to approve the items to be included in the Manual.

"Resolution on the Faculty Manual" (FS89-1-3 P) (Attachment F) was approved unanimously.

D. Discussion on the Commission on Higher Education's (CHE) Proposals for Accountability and Assessment. President Nowaczyk called upon Vice President Halfacre to take the chair. Senator Nowaczyk presented and moved acceptance of "Draft of Response to CHE's Planning Prospectus and Guidelines for Institutional Effectiveness (Attachment H). The motion was seconded.

Senator Nowaczyk pointed out that the recommendations were his own and not those of a Senate committee, but that a working document was needed to provide meaningful feedback to the Administration.

Senator Young, noting the recommendation that the criteria for accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) be used as a guide in assessing Clemson's effectiveness, said he was not sure if the service role of the University would be covered adequately. Senator Nowaczyk replied he would assume the service role would be covered in item 4.3 of the Table of Contents of SACS's 1988 edition of Criteria for Accreditation: Commission on Colleges. Senator Young recommended that the item be supplemented adequately.

Senator Kosinski asked if the overall thrust of response is to reaffirm the importance of faculty participation and to emphasize that the evaluation process must be within the institution. Senator Nowaczyk replied that is the intent of the recommendations.

Senator Nowaczyk added that the Office of Institutional Research could be responsible for coordinating many of the activities related to assessment for SACS and CHE. He further stated that the recommendations appear to be consistent with USC's plans.
Following full discussion, "Clemson University Faculty Senate Recommendations Concerning CHE Planning Prospectus and Guidelines for Institutional Effectiveness" (FS89-1-4 P) (Attachment H) were approved unanimously.

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

York Brannock, Jr., Secretary

Margaret Cannon, Staff Secretary

REPORT OF THE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
December 1988

The Scholastic Policies committee met on 29 November. Continuing enrollment was the major item for discussion.

Senator Gaddis distributed the draft of a proposal (attached) which he planned to make at the next Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee meeting. The proposed policy removes the "2.3 escape clause" from the Announcements and makes it an internal policy of the Appeals Committee.

Senator Kosinski reported on a meeting he and President Nowaczyk had had the previous day with Stan Smith. At the Smith meeting we discussed the technical details of the SPC's proposed study on the GPR's maintained by successful (eventually graduating) students and the companion study on the graduation rates of students who win appeals versus those who are suspended. At today's SPC meeting we discussed the variables we wished to have included in the appeals dataset. As a result of both the SPC meeting and later discussions with President Nowaczyk, Senator Kosinski requested that Mr. Smith extract the variables mentioned on the attached memo of 7 December 1988. Mr. Smith was very cooperative and thought that we could complete the study by the end of January.

Senator Young reported that a questionnaire on teaching awards which he and Senator Hogan had sent to all department heads had resulted in eight replies. Senators Young and Hogan will attempt to secure a more complete response from the offices of the academic deans.

Senator King volunteered to serve as a SPC representative on a Commission on Undergraduate Studies committee which is studying the student advising system at Clemson.

Robert Kosinski
Chairman
Scholastic Policies Committee
MEMORANDUM

TO: Stan Smith, Registrar
FROM: Bob Kosinski, Senate Scholastic Policies Committee

SUBJECT: Variables for study on the success of the appeals process

On 29 November the Scholastic Policies Committee met and discussed the variables we would like you to include in the appeals study. We have settled on the data below. The dataset will be all students who were subject to suspension in May of 1984 under the new rules.

* Appeals status (e.g., a 1 for a student who won an appeal in May of 1984 and a 2 for a student who either lost an appeal or never made one);

* Graduation status (e.g., a 1 for a student who has graduated, a 2 for a student who is still enrolled here, and a 3 for a student who left without graduating);

* Race (e.g., 1 for white, 2 for black, 3 for other);

* Sex (e.g., 1 for male and 2 for female);

* College at time of suspension (numerical code for each college);

* Number of subsequent semesters of probation which student experienced from May of 1984 until the present;

* Number of subsequent suspensions which student suffered from May of 1984 until the present;

* Withdrawal hours which student had unused in May of 1984;

* Credit level at time of suspension or successful appeal, and credit level at the end of every subsequent semester until the end of the record;

* GPR at time of suspension or successful appeal, and GPR at the end of every subsequent semester until the end of the record.

If I can be of any assistance in explaining any of these variables, please do not hesitate to call me.
For your consideration--
JL Gaddis 11/29/88

Initial failure to qualify for continued enrollment will result in suspension from the University for the next regular academic semester. Notice of academic suspension will appear on the permanent record.

Suspended students will be permitted to enroll in summer school and may have their regular enrollment reinstated immediately if the summer school work brings their cumulative grade-point ratio above the minimum standard.

Any student subject to suspension may appeal for continuing enrollment. Appeals will be granted only in the most exceptional cases. Only one such appeal may be made before suspension begins. The progress of a student granted an appeal will be monitored and governed by the Appeals Committee on Continuing Enrollment.

It is proposed that the above substitute wording replace the paragraphs beginning "However... Initial... and Suspended".

Reasons.
1. The 2.3 or 2.2 "escape" provision has been removed from the Announcements. The provision as conceived by the ACE committee last meeting is really an automatically granted appeal. It would only apply to second semester freshmen who did badly in the first semester and well in the second and to victims of the step function. Any other individual would have been under the purview of the Appeals Committee already. The appeals committee already has some automatic appeals granting for one grade point short, the escape could be readily implemented. Our alternative remands the student to the Appeals Committee for continuing monitoring anyway.
2. It is difficult to write all the desired actions into the Announcements without verbosity. The proposed structure allows the detailed committee decisions to be made without modification of the Announcements.
3. The wording proposed clarifies an ambiguity in the present wording which in one place implies appeals after summer school and, in another, implies appeals with or without summer school.

Not a part of the above consideration---

There remains a difficulty in the writeup concerning the fine distinctions of the spring and fall semesters and the summer session. If the policy is written to allow suspension following a regular enrollment period, the ACE committee may have internal policy to delineate for practical purposes whether such action is actually performed.
December 7, 1988

TO: SCSEA State Board and Chapter Board Members
FROM: Larry Ellis, Executive Director

BUDGET PROPOSALS OF THE BUDGET AND CONTROL BOARD FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1989-90

Each year the Budget and Control Board composed of the Governor, State Treasurer, Comptroller General, and the chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees make the first budget proposals for state government. These recommendations go first to the House of Representatives to its Ways and Means Committee and then to the Senate. Final approval of the budget does not occur until almost the end of the legislative session in early June. It is obvious to me that we will need that time to secure better benefits than those now recommended.

Quite frankly, these recommendations of the Budget and Control Board represent the most discouraging set of proposals for state employees that I can recall.

The Board recommends a 2% cost-of-living increase for state employees in July 1989 and a 2% merit program effective January, 1990. In order to fund the 2% merit program at a cost of $10,800,000, the Budget and Control Board directed a reduction in employee and retiree insurance benefits equal to $10,800,000. To come up with this $10,800,000, the Board determined that the major medical deductible be increased to $200 from the current $100, and the hospital deductible be increased $50 to $200. Please, remember the hospital deductible applies on every hospital visit. These reduced benefits would take effect January, 1990. Governor Campbell had initially proposed that these deductibles go to $300 each.

To add further disappointment, employees and retirees will likely face a 15% increase in their insurance premiums for dependant coverage January 1, 1990. Employees and retirees in effect will pay significantly more for much lower insurance benefits.

-over-
This proposal further means that retirees on fixed incomes and in need of high quality medical insurance are being required to help fund employee pay raises through reduced medical benefits. That is most unfair and certainly very detrimental to this state's retirees.

The Board recommended approximately $23,000,000 for the 2% cost-of-living raise out of approximately $180,000,000 available above this current year's budget. A two percent cost-of-living raise is less than half the current inflation rate of 4.5%.

Two members of the Budget and Control Board opposed these budget proposals. Grady Patterson, State Treasurer, and Bob McLellan, chairman, House Ways and Means Committee opposed these Budget and Control Board recommendations. The next budget recommendations will be made by the House Ways and Means Committee. Over the next few weeks, the twenty-five House members on Ways and Means will decide on their budget priorities for fiscal year 1989-90. I've enclosed a list of the Ways and Means Committee members.

All of us need to speak with our House members about our concerns. If your House member is a Ways and Means Committee member, ask them specifically for strong efforts on behalf of employees and retirees. If your House member does not serve on Ways and Means, ask them to speak with their Ways and Means colleagues on your behalf.

Thanks very much.
WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Robert N. McLellan, Chairman - Oconee
Dill Blackwell - Greenville
Larry Blanding - Sumter
William D. Boan - Lancaster
Henry Brown - Berkeley
Marion P. Carnell - Greenwood
Dick Elliott - Horry
John G. Felder - Calhoun
Sam Foster - York
B. J. Gordon, Jr. - Williamsburg
Jean L. Harris - Chesterfield
Patrick B. Harris - Anderson
D. N. Holt - Charleston
Jim Johnson - Laurens
Harriet H. Keyserling - Beaufort
Herbert Kirsh - York
Jarvis R. Klapman - Lexington
James G. Mattos - Greenville
Jennings G. McAbee - McCormick
Will McCain - Orangeburg
Woodrow M. McKay - Florence
Douglas E. McTeer, Jr. - Hampton
Timothy F. Rogers - Richland
McKinley Washington, Jr. - Charleston
Daniel E. Winstead - Charleston

Address and Telephone Number for members of the House Ways and Means Committee:

Representative ___________________________
Blatt Building
P. O. Box 11867
Columbia, SC 29211

(803) 734-3144
Report
of the
Faculty Senate
Ad hoc Committee on Institutional Research
FS89-1-1P

Membership: Dr. B. Allen Dunn, Chairman
Dr. George Alexander
Dr. Janet LeBlanc
Dr. D. Henry Pate

INTRODUCTION

The Ad hoc Committee on Institutional Research was charged by President Ron Nowaczyk to evaluate Clemson's newly created Office of Institutional Research. The Committee was to evaluate the following:

1. Examine the need for an Office of Institutional Research
2. Identify different models of Institutional Research Offices at other educational institutions
3. Make recommendations regarding Clemson's newly created office

PROCEEDINGS

On September 14, 1988, the Committee met with Mr. David Fleming, Head, Office of Institutional Research; and Ms. Helma Gentry, Assistant to the President. Below are listed the proceedings of the meeting.

History

Dr. Lennon recognized early in his presidency that Clemson needed an office to compile and release the various reports required of the University. This need was later received as a recommendation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. During the Fall of 1987, the decision was made to create an Office of Institutional Research, and in February 1988, Mr. David Fleming was named Head of the new office. In July 1988, Ms. Helma Gentry distributed a questionnaire to the President, Vice Presidents, Associate Vice Presidents, and Deans requesting information on the roles and responsibilities of the office. Currently, the office is receiving comments on a proposed Mission Statement.

Purpose

Mr. Fleming stated the purpose of the Office of Institutional Research was to:
1. Serve all the campus community
2. Function as a source of information, but not as a decision-maker
3. Serve as a focal point for data interpretation
4. Enhance faculty time, by preparing reports previously compiled by the faculty

and that goals and objectives of the office would be evaluated annually.

**Scope of Activities**

The office is presently engaged in a variety of activities. These include:

- **Self-Studies.** Self-studies require evaluations of all aspects of the University, not just academics.

- **Commission on Higher Education.** The commission requires a series of reports filed on a periodic basis.

- **Fact Book.** Assists the Office of University Relations in preparing the University Fact Book.

- **FTEs and Campus Census.** Compiling information on time allocations, and numbers of students, faculty, etc.

- **Summer School Surveys.** Collecting basic information on summer school attendance, needs, etc.

- **Graduate Surveys.** Receiving feedback from graduates and their employers.

- **Faculty Surveys.** Collecting basic information on Clemson faculty.

- **Minority Reports.** Meeting federal and state reporting requirements for minority students, faculty, and staff.

- **Professional Organization Reviews.** Compiling data to assist colleges and departments with accreditation reviews.

- **Cutting Edge Requirements -** Compiling data to meet the requirements of the planning prospectus and effectiveness measures of the Cutting Edge program.

- **Budget Reviews.** Compiling and analyzing University data to be used in the budget process and in budget justification.

The Head is also a member of a southern university group which is working to standardize reporting and establish procedures for data exchange. This will allow more accurate comparison between universities.
Supervision

The office is administered by the Vice President for Business and Finance. It responds to requests from the President, other Vice-Presidents, and Provost.

Organization

Currently the office has a staff of three and future projections foresee growth not to exceed five. Below is illustrated the organization chart for the office.

Institutional Research Survey

Ms. Helma Gentry discussed a questionnaire which was sent to the President, Vice Presidents, Associate Vice Presidents, and Deans collecting opinions on roles and responsibilities of the Office of Institutional Research. Thirty questionnaires were sent out and seventeen returned.

Mission Statement

A mission statement for the office has been prepared and a draft copy is attached to this report.
Recommended Requirements

In fulfillment of a University contract for consulting services, Richard C. Gray issued a final report in November 1988 entitled, "Assistance with the Organization and Functional Definition of a Department of Institutional Research". The report made recommendations concerning the functional development, space, personnel, and equipment requirements for the Office of Institutional Research.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Criteria

In its "Criteria for Accreditation", the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools recommends an Office of Institutional Research. A copy of that portion of the report is attached.

INSTITUTION RESEARCH MODELS

There are three primary models for Offices of Institutional Research found on campuses today. These are referenced in Paul L. Dressel's book, Institutional Research in the University: A Handbook. These models are:

1. Applied Research Model

These offices search for truth, understanding, predictability, and control but they avoid involvement in current operations. The goal of these offices are studies which force administrators and faculty to examine their practices and goals. No attempt is made to effect change directly, but work is concentrated on identifying problems, producing data which force attention to problems, and suggesting alternatives.

This model produces offices which are the "conscience of the university", for they raise questions and propose solutions. If the work of the office is primarily in the academic area, then it should be located in the Office of the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

2. Current Operations Model

The current operations model produces offices which expedite daily operations, and are more concerned with efficiency than effectiveness. These offices have a tendency to become so involved in operations and identified with the administration that they accept the limitations of the present situation. In many cases, total involvement occurs in formulating budget requests and the collection and manipulation of financial data. Budget procedures require the focusing on resource allocation, and these activities become all-absorbing in terms of time and energy.

If the office is primarily concerned with management and budget, it should be located in the President's Office. In this location it would influence academic programs. If placed in the Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance, it is effectively removed from the academic
3. Research Support Model

Offices created on the research support model do not conduct research but provide a knowledgeable staff and resources to coordinate institutional research activities of other offices, and to advise researchers who need help. Faculty desiring assistance can receive help in defining needs, and identifying offices, data banks, and individuals who can supply information. These offices also coordinate certain data files.

These offices function as catalytic agents in the university by encouraging and aiding institutional activities, and not engaging in specific projects.

The director of offices following this model could be designated as a Vice-President concerned with planning and institutional studies. The Vice President for Institutional Research should not have a large number of operating offices to coordinate nor be involved in current operations.

COMMITTEE CONCERNS

The concerns of the committee regarding Clemson's Office of Institutional Research are:

1. The office is removed from academic oversight, but can influence academic programs.

2. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs has no direct administrative control over the office.

3. The office has the potential of expanding its work into areas which would be opposed by the faculty, for example, teaching evaluations.

4. The University has many offices collecting data and preparing reports. Is the Office of Institutional Research a duplication of effort?

5. What is and will be the relationship between the newly created Vice President for Research and the Office of Institutional Research?

6. The office has the potential of becoming an administrative tool and isolating itself from the faculty.

7. The office has the potential for unregulated growth.

8. The proposed comprehensive testing of students would be a misuse of University resources and subject to erroneous interpretations.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee makes the following recommendations concerning the Office of Institutional Research:

A need exists at Clemson for an office which can coordinate the multiplicity of reports required by state and federal agencies, and accrediting organizations. It is essential the University maintain consistency in its reporting efforts, and produce quality reports befitting its stature. The primary functions of such an office should be to coordinate reporting and assist in data collection processes. It is recommended that the University administrative structure include an Office of Institutional Research.

It is recommended that Clemson adopt the Research Support Model for its Office of Institutional Research. Offices created on this model conduct research only at the request of other offices and provide knowledgeable staff and resources to coordinate institutional research activities with other units, and to advise researchers who need help. Faculty desiring assistance can receive help in defining needs, and identifying units, data banks, and individuals who can supply information. This office houses and submits required reports in conjunction with other units. Reports for which this office might have responsibility would be CHE reporting, SACS requirements, and national salary surveys.

At present the Office of Institutional Research is duplicating efforts of other University units, and in some cases superceding them. Various University offices are currently maintaining files and analyzing data. It is recommended that a review be made to identify areas where duplication of effort is occurring, and these be eliminated. The Office of Institutional Research does not need to engage in responsibilities assigned to Administrative Programming Services. The Office should function in an archival and clearing house mode responding to requests from other units.

In order to insure academic accountability and that the Office is placed in the University structure where it can properly and most effectively serve the objectives of Clemson, it is recommended that the Office of Institutional Research be assigned to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Its present location under the Vice President for Business and Finance is considered to be disadvantageous, and not in the best interest of the University.

Because of the relationship of the Office of Institutional Research to other University units, and the potential impact of this Office on University governance and decisions concerning the faculty, it is recommended that the Academic Council be assigned as a steering-governing body for the Office. This arrangement will allow greater scrutiny of the operation of the Office and insure that it is fulfilling University needs. Because of the diversity of activities in which the Office is engaging and anticipates engaging in, it is imperative that an oversight function be assigned.

The scope of activities in which the Office of Institutional Research potentially could be involved logically may result in staff growth. Unregulated growth could divert resources of the University from areas of need; therefore, it is recommended that the staff of the Office be kept to a minimum, be primarily
clerical in composition, and that staffing levels be set and regulated by the Academic Council.

The proposed Mission Statement of the Office of Institutional Research contains provisions which are subject to various interpretations. In order to clarify the mission of the Office, it is recommended that the Academic Council review the Mission Statement and recommend changes.

The committee further recommends that: this report be adopted by the Faculty Senate; a copy be sent to the Provost, then forwarded to the President, Vice President for Business and Finance, Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning, and the Head of the Office of Institutional Research; the President of the Faculty Senate be directed to place discussion of this report on the agenda of the Academic Council; and the Academic Council be requested to respond to these recommendations.
Mission Statement of the Office of Institutional Research

The Office of Institutional Research serves as a source for comprehensive information about Clemson University. The primary function of the Office is to collect, comprehend, combine, and analyze data pertaining to a range of operational activities at Clemson University, and to store these data in a historical database that can be referenced in the future. The Office is also concerned with the systematic evaluation of financial and fiscal resources, and other areas requested by the Administration in order to assist in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the institution.

In this role, the Office will support the self-study process required for maintaining accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and will coordinate the preparation of institutional reports for IPEDS, HEGIS, and information submitted to the Commission on Higher Education. It is the responsibility of the Office of Institutional Research to collect and analyze comparative data from peer institutions for the executive branch.

In addition, the Office of Institutional Research assists colleges, departments, and other units of the University in gathering information and preparing reports pertinent to measuring programmatic outcomes, and assessing these outcomes in relation to institutional goals, CHE program reviews, and outside accrediting groups.

The Office of Institutional Research also provides advice on the development and refinement of state-level information systems, on state funding formulas and the data requirements for them, on studies of special interest in higher education in the state, as well as on the information required for state-level master planning.

Journals and books on higher education and, particularly, the literature on research in higher education will be reviewed by the Office which will develop a working library of publications. The library will be maintained in the Office but will be available to others. The interests of institutional researchers may lead to publications that contribute to the general body of literature on higher education.

Data and information collected and managed by the Office of Institutional Research may be used elsewhere in the University for purposes other than planning, policy formulation, and strategic decision-making. For example, the Office of University Relations may seek data to include in press releases or publications about the institution. Similarly, general or specific data may be required to
support proposals for external funding for research or other purposes. The Office of Institutional Research should be asked to serve as the principal source of such data and information.

The Office of Institutional Research may be called upon to provide information on planning, policy, and other issues facing the University; this function is a natural consequence of institutional research activity. The products of institutional research need to be interpreted and their implications explored. Following this, the consequences of alternative courses of action need to be described and qualified.

The Office will ensure the confidentiality of sensitive information and the anonymity of individuals. The Office will also ensure that information is released only to appropriate individuals and groups in accordance with pertinent federal or state laws.
institution should study periodically its statement of purpose, taking into account internal changes as well as the changing responsibilities of the institution to its constituencies.

Appropriate publications must accurately reflect the current statement of purpose, and institutional programs must be designed to achieve that stated purpose. The institution's educational program, educational support services, financial and physical resources, and administrative processes must be adequate and appropriate to ensure that the institution meets and continues to achieve its stated purpose. Finally, the planning and evaluation processes must be designed to demonstrate that the institution's purpose and role are being fulfilled.

Section III
Institutional Effectiveness

The quality of education provided by member institutions is the primary consideration in the decision to confer or reaffirm accreditation. The evaluation of educational quality is a difficult task requiring careful analysis and professional judgment. Traditionally, accreditation has focused attention almost exclusively upon institutional resources and processes. It has usually been assumed that, if an institution has certain resources and uses certain processes, effective education will occur. A comprehensive approach to accreditation, however, takes into account not only the resources and processes of education (such as faculty and student qualifications, physical plant, fiscal resources and other elements addressed in the Criteria) but also the evaluation of the results of education and plans for the improvement of the institution's programs.

The level of institutional quality depends not only on an institution's educational processes and resources but also on the institution's successful use of those processes and resources to achieve established goals. Institutions have an obligation to all constituents to evaluate effectiveness and to use the results in a broad-based, continuous planning and evaluation process.

3.1 PLANNING AND EVALUATION

To focus attention on the effectiveness of the educational program, the institution must establish adequate procedures for planning and evaluation. The institution must define its expected educational results and describe how the achievement of these results will be ascertained. Although no specific format for this planning and evaluation process is prescribed, an effective process should include:

1. broad-based involvement of faculty and administration;
2. the establishment of a clearly defined purpose appropriate to collegiate education;
3. the formulation of educational goals consistent with the institution's purpose;
4. the development of procedures for evaluating the extent to which these educational goals are being achieved; and
5. the use of the results of these evaluations to improve institutional effectiveness.

In addition to establishing procedures for evaluating the extent to which their educational goals are being achieved, institutions should ascertain periodically the change in the academic achievement of their students. Procedures used to evaluate instructional programs may include: peer evaluation of educational programs; structured interviews with students and graduates; changes in students’ values as measured by standard instruments or self-reported behavior patterns; pre- and post-testing of students; surveys of recent graduates; surveys of employers of graduates; student scores on standardized examinations or locally constructed examinations; performance of graduates in graduate school; performance of graduates of professional programs on licensure examinations; or, the placement of graduates of occupational programs in positions related to their fields of preparation.

Institutions with research or public service missions must develop and implement appropriate procedures for evaluating their effectiveness in these areas.

The appropriateness of any evaluation procedure depends upon the nature of the institution and the institution's goals for instruction, research and public service. The Commission on Colleges prescribes no set of procedures for use by an institution and recognizes that an effective program to evaluate institutional effectiveness will usually require the use of a variety of procedures.

3.2 INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Because institutional research can provide significant information on all phases of a college or university program, it is an essential element in planning and evaluating the institution's success in carrying out its purpose. The nature of the institutional research function depends on the size and complexity of the institution and may vary from a part-time operation to an office staffed by several persons. All institutions, however, must engage in continuous study, analysis and appraisal of their purposes, policies, procedures and programs. Institutions should assign administrative responsibility for carrying out institutional research. Institutional research should be allocated adequate resources, and those responsible for it should be given access to all relevant information. Institutions regularly must evaluate their institutional research function.
To: Faculty Senators  
From: Ron Nowoczyk  
Date: Jan. 13, 1989  
Subject: Mail Ballot on Recommendations from ad hoc Committee on Institutional Research

(Check One)

Yes No  
☐ 13 ☐ 2  Recommendation (from page 6 of the report by paragraph)
☐ 13 ☐ 3  Para. 1 - Office is needed
☐ 18 ☐ 0  Para. 2 - Office should be similar to Research Support Model
☐ 18 ☐ 0  Para. 3 - Avoid duplication
☐ 18 ☐ 0  Para. 4 - Reports to Provost
☐ 15 ☐ 1  Para. 5 - Academic Council as steering/governing body
☐ 18 ☐ 0  Para. 6 - Staff kept to a minimum
☐ 18 ☐ 0  Para. 7 - Mission statement reviewed by Academic Council
☐ 13 ☐ 1  Para. 8 - List of who should get report

__________________________________________
Return by Thursday Jan. 19th

Signature
One-year position (3 to be filled)

___ Lew Bryan (C & I)
___ John Luedeman (Sciences)
___ MaryAnn Reichenbach (Nursing)

Two-Year Positions (4 to be filled)

___ Ed Coulter (Liberal Arts)
___ Doyce Graham (Ag. Sciences)
___ Ken Murr (Library)
Courses taught in the summer at Clemson University have become an important part of the educational offerings at Clemson University. For COOP students, students in the College of Education and many others, they are a vital part of the educational program. Summer school was once considered a program which allowed students to make up deficiencies accrued during the previous academic year, this is no longer the case.

Summer school was organized as a self-supporting program, the salaries of participating teachers generated by tuition payments. The result has been that salaries in the summer have been limited. Instructors receive less for teaching a course during the summer than they do for teaching the same course during the other two academic semesters, although it is the contention of the university that course offerings in the summer are as academically sound as those offered in the fall and spring semester.

We therefore suggest, that teachers should be paid as much for a summer course as for the same course taught during the fall or spring semesters.

The full-time teaching load during the regular academic year is four three-credit courses, with the faculty member expected to participate in such additional activities, as advising students and committee work. Participation in research or public service activities will result in a reduced teaching load. Thus, a teacher receives 12½ per cent of his/her normal salary for each course taught. We suggest faculty members teaching in the summer school should be paid the same amount for the same courses. We suggest that, the notion that, summer school be self-supporting, is no longer appropriate and that the allocation of funds for summer school should be done in the same way as for all other E and G supported programs.
It should be noted that summer school tuition does not simply pay the expenses of the program, the largest of which is faculty salaries. The income generated from summer school tuition also funds the "Provost's Research Awards" and the "Summer Minority Recruitment Program". These two programs required 1.8 per cent and 9.8 per cent, respectively, of the 1988 summer school budget. It is not questioning the value of these programs when we say that, in effect they are being funded through the efforts of teachers who are paid less in the summer to teach courses than in the fall and spring semesters. We do not understand why these programs should be expected to receive their funding from summer school tuition.

A faculty member currently receives 2% per cent of his/her academic salary for each credit hour taught in summer school. We suggest that a faculty member should receive 4% per cent per credit hour.

We suggest that the change be accomplished in three increments, beginning with the summer of 1989.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer Program</th>
<th>Suggested Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3.25 per cent per credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3.75 per cent per credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>4 per cent per credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully Submitted:
Welfare Committee,
The Faculty Senate
Resolution on the *Faculty Manual*

WHEREAS: the *Faculty Manual* currently contains many items of purely informational nature not directly related to contractual or policy concerns; and

WHEREAS: the procedures for updating these frequently changing items are cumbersome; and

WHEREAS: alternate methods, such as DORIS, now exist to provide updates of this information for each faculty member in a more timely manner;

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Faculty Senate requests the Board of Trustees of Clemson University to endorse the reorganization of the *Faculty Manual* into a section dealing with contract and policy and a section dealing with informational items; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the procedures for revising the informational section be simplified to no longer require the approval of the Senate or the Board of Trustees.
Clemson University Faculty Senate Recommendations concerning CHE Planning Prospectus and Guidelines for Institutional Effectiveness

January 10, 1989

Introduction

The Clemson University Faculty Senate meeting in regular session on January 10, 1989 reviewed and discussed the Commission of Higher Education's Planning Prospectus and Guidelines for Institutional Effectiveness, both dated November 11, 1988. The Faculty Senate appreciated the 60-day extension for consideration of both documents. The following report contains the Senate's recommendations to the Administration of Clemson University. The report follows the organization of the two documents.

As an overall comment, we commend the Commission and the Legislature of South Carolina for noting the need to assess higher education in the State. The Faculty Senate recognizes and shares the desire to improve the quality of higher education in South Carolina. While supporting the call to assess higher education, the Faculty Senate of Clemson University calls upon the State to assess the funding process to support higher education. Efforts are needed not only to achieve 100 percent formula funding, but also to include funding based on the quality of education and service provided to the State.

Comments and Recommendations with regard to the Planning Prospectus

1. The Faculty Senate agrees that Clemson University should have a planning process that provides institutional planning information to the CHE. The Senate believes that it is important for Clemson University to maintain its "individual planning process."

The Faculty agree that an effective planning process can aid in meeting the four outcomes outlined on Page 1 of the Prospectus. We are pleased to note that the document begins with the assertion that "each public institution of higher learning in this State maintains its individual planning process." Given that the process is designed "to facilitate institutional planning that is responsive to emerging trends and issues" the Faculty encourage that the process be developed within institutions. Allowing for different approaches to the planning process will encourage innovation among the state institutions and will permit the institutions to identify those challenges which they feel best equipped to tackle.

CHE's organization and dissemination of the information from the various institutions will be a challenge for CHE. However, the Faculty feel that an overly prescriptive process will not further the goals of CHE in using the State Plan to meet timely issues. We support the view on Page 6 that "The State Plan is not intended to be static or inviolate but rather a guide that reflects national, state, and local environmental conditions and changes of import to South Carolina higher education."
2. The Academic Council and the Vice Presidents should coordinate activities under the direction of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in developing the Plan for Clemson University. Once the Plan has been fully debated and discussed among the University Community, it should be forwarded to the Clemson University Board of Trustees for its approval and submission to CHE.

In order for the planning process to proceed in an orderly fashion, coordination is critical. The Senate believes that the Academic Council and Vice Presidents should be the primary participants in coordinating the development of the planning process. The overall responsibility for the development of the Plan should rest with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Provost as the chief academic officer of the University is the logical choice to assume overall responsibility given that the primary emphasis of the Plan is to assess and maintain educational quality.

For the Plan to be accepted by the University community, it is necessary for faculty, staff, and students to contribute to its development. Input from and consultation with appropriate groups such as the Student Senate, Graduate Student Association, University Commissions, and the Faculty Senate must occur. The Senate believes judicious use of these groups will facilitate development of the Plan.

The Board of Trustees must assume final responsibility for approving the Plan developed. The importance of the planning process to Clemson University's future development and evolution requires careful consideration and approval of the Plan by the Board of Trustees.

3. The Faculty must have a substantial role in the development of the plan especially with regard to the instructional, research and public service components.

As the primary providers of instruction, research and public service, the Faculty must bear primary responsibility for the development of these components of the Plan. The Faculty include all those holding faculty rank including administrators, deans, and department heads. A number of University organizations including the Commissions on Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, Council of Deans, Faculty Senate, and Organization of Department Heads should be utilized.

While it is critical that time spent on the development of this plan not detract from meeting the Faculty's primary goals, the potential impact of the plan on the educational and research missions of the University require faculty input. To allow for as little disruption as possible, the Senate recommends that the officers and chairs of the various groups work with the Provost and Academic Council in assigning specific responsibilities.
Faculty who have the expertise and are interested in participating in the development of the plan should be encouraged to do so. The University should use faculty expertise whenever possible in terms of developing and implementing the planning and assessment process. When appropriate, faculty should be employed during the summer months or on an overload basis.

4. Sole responsibility for development and issuance of the state-wide planning document should be given to the Council of Presidents and the Commissioner of Higher Education rather than the CHE Committee on Planning and Assessment and the CHE Executive Committee. Furthermore, the Planning Schedule in Appendix II of the Planning Prospectus should be modified by the Council of Presidents and the Commissioner of Higher Education to more accurately reflect the time needed to implement the plans and process.

If individual institutions are to maintain their own individual planning processes then the chief executives of each institution in cooperation with the Commissioner of Higher Education are best equipped to draft the state-wide plan. Given their familiarity with planning and educational concerns, the chief executives of the respective institutions are best suited to draft the state-wide plan. It is not clear what the CHE Executive Committee and the CHE Committee of Planning and Assessment would add to the process.

Careful consideration needs to be given to the agenda for implementing the process. The 60-day extension will necessitate a revised planning schedule. For the institutions to undertake a coherent and manageable planning process, sufficient time must be allotted. Again, the chief executives in consultation with the Commissioner of Higher Education should develop a reasonable schedule.

Comments and Recommendations with regard to the *Guidelines for Institutional Effectiveness*.

1. The Senate recommends that Clemson University use the Table of Contents of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools’ 1988 edition of *Criteria for Accreditation: Commission on Colleges* as a guide for assessing Clemson University’s effectiveness.

   The Commission on Colleges of SACS provides a listing of the criteria necessary for an institution of higher education to be accredited in the region. Since Clemson University must follow these criteria and CHE acknowledges that their proposed guidelines are based on those from SACS, the use of the SACS guidelines will facilitate assessment. The Table of Contents from the *Criteria for Accreditation* is attached.

2. Assessment programs for General Education, instructional effectiveness, entry-level skills necessary for College Work, achievement of students transferring from two to four year institutions, remedial and developmental programs, academic performance of student athletes, library usage and collection department procedures, and research must include substantial faculty involvement.
While faculty involvement is appropriate at all levels of assessment, the assessment programs listed above are most closely related to the mission of the faculty and must be faculty-driven. The faculty must assume primary responsibility for developing these assessment programs. While the plans of other institutions may serve as models, no particular methods or procedures must be assumed to be included as part of the assessment unless mandated by SACS.

Appropriate existing faculty groups and committees should be used in developing these assessment procedures. Input from academic departments should be encouraged and provided for in the development of the assessment programs.

3. The Faculty Senate expresses concern in regard to CHE developing programs related to 1) success of entering students in meeting college/university admissions prerequisites and 2) remedial and developmental programs.

The guidelines identify several areas in which programs are being developed or administered by the Commission. Two of these are of particular concern to the faculty. The responsibility of setting admissions standards and establishing remedial and developmental programs rest with the faculty and administration of the individual institutions and should not be the prerogative of the Commission. The Senate agrees that the Commission has the right to institutional data assessing admissions and the success of remedial and developmental programs.

4. Contrary to the Commission’s assertions on Page 8, the Faculty Senate believes that assessment data will be used in comparing South Carolina institutions with one another.

Much of the documentation provided by CHE is designed to standardize the type of information provided by individual institutions. The Faculty Senate believes it is somewhat naive to assume that comparisons will not be made among institutions within the State. In many instances, such comparisons may be appropriate. However, the different missions of institutions may make some comparisons inappropriate. The Senate sees no way of preventing inappropriate comparisons. Yet, we feel they will occur.

5. The Faculty Senate questions whether or not the Commission staff is the best group to review the assessment procedures.

On Page 8 of the Guidelines the Commission staff is charged with the responsibility of reviewing the adequacy of each institution’s assessment program and discussing alternate assessment methodologies when the staff deems an institution’s program is inadequate. Unless the staff has received formal training and is experienced in the area of assessment in higher education, such responsibilities are unwarranted.
## Contribution/Pledge by Academic Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACAD. UNIT</th>
<th># CONTRIB.</th>
<th># IN UNIT</th>
<th>PROPORTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRES/V PRES</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN/V PROV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMER PRES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop. Ext.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Econ.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Econ.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Eng.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agronomy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Sci.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua/Fish/Wild</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Sci.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp. Stat.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Sci.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hort.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant. Path.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry Sci.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edisto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pee Dee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandhill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Res.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg./Public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Chem.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG. SCI.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean's Off.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch. Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Sci.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vis Arts &amp; Hist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Stud.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECT.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean's Off.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acct.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mil. Sci.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aero. Stud.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem/Sec Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind. Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other Ed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACAD. UNIT</th>
<th># CONTRIB.</th>
<th># IN UNIT</th>
<th>PROPORTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean's Off.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frosh. Eng.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio Eng.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cer. Eng.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem. Eng.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civ. Eng.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E &amp; C E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind. Eng.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech. Eng.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. Graphics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRMT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR &amp; REC RES</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf. Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil &amp; Rel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polit. Sci.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Serv.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad. Prog.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean's Off.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol Sci.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Sci.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math. Sci.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Sci.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiol.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics/Astr.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCES</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER ACAD.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROBERT MULDROW COOPER LIBRARY

Dr. Robert Kosinski, Scholastic Policies Committee, Faculty Senate
145 Long Hall

Dear Dr. Kosinski:

I would like to offer my opinions on the Guidelines for the Clemson Scholars Program that was discussed at the Faculty Senate Meeting on Tuesday.

First, the title of the scholarship, as it stands, is acceptable. A "scholar" is defined as "one who attends a school or studies under a teacher; a pupil." It is unfortunate that many people infer the connotation of "intellectual elite" or "professorial" from this word.

Secondly, the eligibility requirements need clarification. Although I realize the practice is common, I do not think the student's academic average (or for that matter, race) should be the criterion of eligibility. What about other factors like potential? Outstanding ability in a particular area? Need? Are these taken into consideration? If so, they ought to be spelled out; if not, they ought to be taken into consideration. In many cases a hundredth of a point separates the top ranked from the second ranked student. To award one scholarship to the top student and the second scholarship to a Black student, whose average may be considerably less than student number two, is a slap in the face to student number two.

As an alternative I suggest that the scholarships be awarded to students with academic potential or promise as determined by a vote of the teachers and guidance counselors at each school. This method would give classroom teachers a say-so in the process and would allow greater use of judgment and not a reliance on averages, which are not always accurate in predicting future academic success, or on principals, who seldom know the backgrounds of students.

Thirdly, to require the student to maintain a GPR of only 2.50 for a full scholarship (four years at that!) would do more harm than good--to the student and to Clemson--in the long run. In effect, such a requirement would tell the student: "You are fine the way you are. Don't put forth any extra effort. The rewards will come to you."

As an alternative I suggest that the amount and or duration of the scholarship be reduced, so as to allow a greater number of students to receive benefits, and that the GPR increased to 3.0. Such a requirement clearly sends the message: "You must earn and pay for your education; nothing comes for free." By working and paying for his education, even if it is only a small part, a man develops self-esteem and a sense of accomplishment, virtues that cannot be "educated into" a man, learned from a how-to book, or legislated by social programs.

In conclusion, I base these opinions on my experiences as a high school and junior college teacher in Georgia. I don't mean to sound preachy; I hope my suggestions help.

Sincerely yours,

Dennis S. Taylor
Library Faculty Senate (Alternate)
TO: Faculty Senators  
Former Senate Presidents  
W. David Maxwell  

FROM: Ron Nowaczyk  

DATE: January 22, 1989  

SUBJECT: Update on the Centennial Professorship  

I would like to let you know where we stand with regard to the Senate’s effort to fund the Centennial Professorship. The current amount pledged to the Professorship stands at $22,595 as of January 6. I have enclosed a breakdown of contributions according to various classifications, including academic departments.

To this point, letters asking for contributions have been sent to all faculty. Over the holidays, I sent letters to approximately 200 faculty emeriti for whom we could get addresses. And, over the past two months I have met with several departments and/or colleges and I know several of the Senators and former Senate presidents have done the same.

The effect of the mailings to the faculty has now subsided and it is time to initiate another push among the faculty. I met with the former Senate presidents last week to solicit their suggestions. Following that meeting, I met with Ms. Terri Oswald with the Loyalty Fund to discuss those suggestions. The following strategy evolved from those meetings.

FEBRUARY STRATEGY:

1. During the week of January 23, I will send letters to all Senators, former Senate Presidents, Vice Presidents, Deans, Vice Provosts, and Assoc./Asst. Deans who have not contributed asking them to again consider contributing.

2. Rather than undertaking a second mailing, a contact person will be identified within each academic department. These individuals may be Senators, former Senate Presidents, or individuals who have already contributed. They will be asked to meet with me prior to February 1 in groups of 15 to 20 to discuss the fund-raising effort. Following those discussions, they will
be asked to contact individuals within their departments personally. Envelopes and pledge cards will be provided. Currently about 10 percent of the general faculty have contributed. We need to at least triple that percentage. This effort will be geared for the month of February and will be the major push.

3. I will contact several faculty emeriti to ask for their help in personally soliciting from the faculty emeriti. Again, I will ask former Senate Presidents and current Senators to help me in identifying faculty emeriti who could best help us.

4. Senator Stringer is heading up an ad hoc Committee drafting specific guidelines for selecting the Centennial Professor. I hope that this committee will provide a report in February. I would like to use this item to gain some publicity for the effort in the Tiger and internal campus publications. I will also talk with Jack McKenzie in University Relations to explore other publicity opportunities.

5. I will pursue the possibility of publicizing the campaign in an upcoming alumni newsletter and mention the possibility that alumni can contribute in the name of a favorite professor if they would like to do so. This possibility was presented to the Loyalty Fund office last week.

The campaign effort has reached the point at which another major boost/effort is needed. I would like to see us concentrate some of our efforts to this task during the next several weeks and increase faculty participation. I will be happy to discuss ideas or suggestions you may have.

xc: Mr. Jack McKenzie
Ms. Terri Oswald
Ms. Ann Smith
February 6, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ron Nowaczyk

FROM: Bill Stringer, Dudley Blair, Richard Calhoun

RE: Deliberations on Centennial Professorship policies.

The above committee met on January 23 to draft policy statements on call for nominations, selection criteria and composition of the selection committee, for consideration by the Senate. Attached is our proposed verbage for these purposes.

Attach.

/dh

This item will be discussed at committee report the Feb. meeting.

Ron
DRAFT

Centennial Professorship

Selection Criteria

The Centennial Professorship Selection committee shall be guided by the following criteria:

1. Demonstrated excellence of scholarship in one or more of the following:
   -- Undergraduate and/or graduate teaching
   -- Basic and/or applied research
   -- Extension education.

2. Evidence of substantial contribution to intellectual atmosphere and quality of life in the state and nation.
Centennial Professorship

Call for Nominations

You are invited to submit nominations for the first awarding of the Centennial Professorship at Clemson University.

The Centennial Professorship is a two year rotating award supported by an endowment funded jointly by Clemson Faculty and the Council for Higher Education.

All members of the Clemson Faculty headquartered on Campus and in other locations in the State are eligible for Nomination, and faculty members may nominate themselves. Nominees will be considered on the basis of demonstrated excellence of scholarship in one or more of the following: undergraduate and/or graduate teaching; applied and/or basic research; and Extension education. The intent of the Centennial Professorship is to reward effective faculty scholars who are making substantial contributions to the intellectual life of the state and nation.

The term for each appointment will be for two years and will be non-renewable. The Professorship will rotate among the various Colleges in the University. The Award will provide a salary supplement and expenses for the Centennial Professor; the actual allocation will be determined by the Provost and the recipient.

Nominees will be asked to submit curriculum vitae and supporting materials to the office of the Faculty Senate President. These materials will be reviewed by a Selection Committee consisting of the most recent ex-President of the Faculty Senate and four faculty members selected by the Advisory committee of the Faculty Senate.
DRAFT

Centennial Professorship
Composition of Selection Committee

The Centennial Professorship Selection Committee will be composed of five current Clemson University faculty members. One member of this Committee will be the most recent ex-President of the Faculty Senate. The remaining four members will be selected by the Faculty Senate Advisory committee. One will be selected from the list of named professorship faculty. A second will be selected from a list of faculty with some administrative responsibility. The remaining two members will be selected to assure that the complete committee contains a representative from each of the teaching, research and extension functions of Clemson University.
The committee met and approved the response to the petition requesting that a policy be developed to prevent solicitation of complimentary copies of texts. The report is attached.

Other items of discussion were:

1) The need for development of a statement on use of vertebrate animals in research, teaching, or testing which would be included in the Faculty Manual. The policy and protocols exist but are not currently included in the manual.

2) The need for clarification of the eligibility of faculty members to apply for sabbatical leave after they have taken such leave.

The committee anticipates submitting resolutions on these issues for the March Senate meeting.

Continued discussion was held regarding a method to obtain faculty input during evaluation of administrators. The committee is still awaiting a response to our October 26, 1988 memo that the administration provide input about requests for faculty to perform duties without compensation during the summer months.
RESPONSE TO PETITION RE SOLICITATION FOR PURCHASE OF COMPLIMENTARY BOOKS

January, 1989

In response to a petition which requested that a "University policy that would prohibit individuals from entering University premises for the purpose of soliciting the purchase of textbooks" be developed, the policy committee has reviewed existing University positions and policies and statements supplied by the Association of American Publishers, Inc.

Most of the buyers who enter the premises to solicit Faculty complimentary copies are working for organizations which resell the books to bookstores. Selling complimentary copies of textbooks is estimated to result in a loss in royalties to professor/authors of $10 million a year. This reduction in economic return appears to be related to a reduction in willingness to author texts; thus limiting the academic resources available to students. Students do not benefit from the resale because they usually are required to pay 75% of the new book price for the books obtained through this method. In addition, publishers compensate for the lost revenue by increasing the cost of all textbooks. Among the Universities who have addressed this problem is Drake University; their Faculty Senate has said that resale of complimentary copies of textbooks is unethical and urged the administration to discourage purchasers on campus. The Faculty Senate of the University of North Carolina, Wilmington, deemed the sale by faculty of unwanted complimentary texts unprofessional. They have suggested that departments maintain their own libraries of complimentary texts, donate the material to institutional libraries, or award the books as prizes in class. "If a book is genuinely unwanted, a faculty member can choose to throw it away."

The Policy Committee believes that Clemson University has sufficiently addressed the problem and calls the attention of the Faculty to the following statements from the Faculty Manual:

Faculty shall eschew any exploitation of students for private advantage...(II:3)

Faculty also have responsibilities to their colleagues, deriving from their common membership in a community of scholars. (II:3)

No faculty member may use ... his/her official position or activities in any way that would result in financial gain for himself/herself or for any other person. (II:4)

Responding to questions from the policy committee, The Vice President for Student Affairs affirmed that solicitors must request permission from the office of Student Development (Kirk Brague) before entering University buildings for this purpose. Mr. Lomax suggests that Faculty seeing persons not in possession of this permission should contact the University Police. A copy of the policy on external sales and solicitation is attached to this report.

The committee notes the existence of policy and the Administration's expressed willingness to enforce the policy. Therefore we encourage any faculty member who wishes to stop book solicitation to avail themselves of the enforcement mechanism.
SALES AND SOLICITATION

Use of University Lands and Facilities

All organizations not directly connected with, and an integral part of, the University should be denied access to University lands for the purpose of soliciting funds or selling products to raise funds from personnel of the University community. State and institutional policy prohibits the use of Clemson University property in any enterprise for private or individual profit that is in competition with commercial enterprise in the area. Accordingly, no facilities should be made available to entrepreneurs for private gain.

Advertising and Solicitation by Private Enterprise

Policies for advertising, sales and solicitation by private enterprise or non-University personnel are as follows:

1. **Advertisements.** Advertisements for private enterprise on campus are prohibited except through the student media, U.S. mail and other methods authorized by the Office of Student Development. The posting of unauthorized fliers and posters is prohibited. Kiosk posting by private enterprise must be approved by the Office of Student Development and is regulated by Student Government. The placement of fliers on vehicle windshields, exterior walls, trees, sidewalks or light poles is prohibited.

2. **Distribution of Materials and Personal Solicitation.** Political campaign material, religious information and fliers announcing events of public interest, as well as personal solicitations, may be undertaken only in designated areas during designated times. These designated areas and times are as follows:
   a) Areas—Union plaza, Union courtyard, Union square, Cooper Library walkway and Bryan Mall.
   b) Times—12:00 noon-1:30 p.m. and 4:30-7:30 p.m., Monday-Friday. Solicitation activities in these areas must be registered in advance with the director of the University Union. Any person wishing to distribute materials inside a University building must have permission from the official responsible for that building. No off-campus business, organization or individual may distribute materials by sliding them under doors in University housing. No items may be passed out in the vicinity of the registration/matriculation area. Any other areas for distribution must be approved by the Office of Student Development.

3. **Athletic Events.** The sale or solicitation of any goods, wares or merchandise of any kind on the campus of Clemson University within a one-half mile radius of intercollegiate athletic events is prohibited except when such sale or solicitation for sale is being performed in accordance with valid written contract between the vendor and Clemson University. Such requests must be presented to the business director of the Athletic Department or the director of sports promotions. This provision does not apply to the sale of tickets to athletic contests, which is governed by state law. Any person violat-
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
FEBRUARY 14, 1989

1. Call to Order. President Nowaczyk called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. Special Order of the Day. President Nowaczyk introduced Dr. T. L. Senn, President of the Class of 1939. Dr. Senn outlined three projects of the Class of 1939's fiftieth anniversary of graduation: the establishment of a scholarship in each of the nine colleges, the continuation and expansion of the Botanical Gardens and Arboretum, and a Faculty Award for Excellence. Dr. Senn introduced Mr. James O. Sweeney, another alumnus of the Class of 1939, who described the Award for Excellence.

Mr. Sweeney stated the purpose of the award is to recognize Faculty for outstanding contributions to the student body, the University, and the community at large. The award will consist of a one-time check in the amount of $5,000. The Class of 1939 plans the construction on campus of a brick tower which will house the old bell from Tillman Hall and plaques on which will be inscribed the names of the winners of the Award for Excellence.

The class requests input from the Faculty Senate with regard to the selection process. It is anticipated that each of the colleges would be requested to submit nomination(s) to a screening committee; at-large nominations also would be accepted. The committee would present several nominations to the Faculty Senate for a secret ballot to select the award winner.

Senator Baron suggested that to give the process the consideration it deserves, the Faculty Senate should make its voice known through the committee that has been established for the Centennial Professorship.

Mr. Sweeney commented that the class hopes to have the selection process in place by mid year and to announce the first award winner at the December 1989 graduation.
Senator Halfacre moved acceptance of the Resolution Concerning the Class of 1939 Gift (FS89-2-1 P) (Attachment A). The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes from December 14, 1988, General Faculty Meeting. The minutes were approved as distributed.

4. Approval of Minutes from January 10, 1989, Faculty Senate Meeting. The minutes were approved as distributed.

5. Committee Reports

A. Senate Committees

Policy Committee. Senator Reichenbach reported that the committee found adequate University policy regarding solicitation for purchase of complimentary books and noted the Administration's willingness to enforce the policy. Faculty knowing solicitors not in possession of permission from the Office of Student Development should contact the University Police.

The Policy Committee is developing a statement for the Faculty Manual on the use of vertebrate animals in research, teaching, and testing. In addition, the committee is developing a resolution with regard to the eligibility of Faculty for sabbatical leave after they have taken such leave.

Senator Reichenbach and President Nowaczyk are scheduled to meet with the Provost to discuss the issue of a stipend for the University Marshal, the method for obtaining Faculty input into the evaluation of administrators, and the issue of Faculty performing duties without compensation.

Research Committee. Senator Dunn reported that at the request of Vice President Gogue, the review committee for Cutting Edge Research Incentive Funds for 1989-90 was surveyed to determine any flaws in the procedures. The committee cited two minor issues. It was felt the economic criteria was too severe, and several committee members questioned the focus areas to which they were assigned.

Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Kosinski reported the major work of the committee dealt with a resolution concerning elimination of waivers of out-of-state fees for
academically outstanding students. The resolution will be presented under new business.

The committee is continuing a study of the GPR's attained by students on appeal and thereby and the success of the appeals process. Other items to be considered by the committee are the Clemson Scholars Program, the Program for Engineering Enrichment and Retention (PEER), and the analysis of Clemson University Student Evaluation of Instruction (CUSEI) forms for graduate courses.

Welfare Committee. Senator Baron reported that the committee is scheduled to meet February 15 to discuss the fringe benefits proposal and a response on Summer School salaries.

Senator LeBlanc reported that, as a result of the Fringe Benefits Survey, the committee is structuring a tier program of priorities to be brought before the Senate meeting in March.

Ad_hoc_Committee_on_the_Centennial_Professorship. Senator Stringer reported that the committee has drafted policy statements on nominations, selection criteria and composition of the selection committee. (Due to today's full agenda, the committee report will be considered at the March meeting of the Faculty Senate.)

B. University_Committees_and_Commissions. Senator Kosinski reported the Commission on Undergraduate Studies has taken action to review the appeals process and to require that any proposed standards must be approved by the commission. This action is favorable to the Senate's request to reform the continuing enrollment process.

Senator Baron reported that the Committee on AIDS is interested in Faculty input. If Faculty want information about the health programs on campus, the committee is prepared to respond.

6. PRESIDENT'S_REPORT. President Nowaczyk reported the Budget and Control Board has proposed a 2% cost-of-living increase July 1, and a 2% merit increase in January to be funded by an increase in medical and hospital deductibles. The State would be putting in only 2% for a 4% raise; employees would be making up 2% by a reduction in benefits.
President Lennon suggested that Faculty Senators meet with key legislators to discuss this issue. Wade Green, in Public Affairs for the University, has been requested to schedule meetings in Columbia for a small group of Faculty Senators to confer with Representative McLellan, House Speaker Sheheen, Senators Waddell and Lindsay as well as local Representatives in the House.

Mr. John Newton, Associate Vice President for Business and Finance, has sent letters to the 21 peer institutions used for salary comparisons and asked for detailed information about fringe benefits for faculty and staff. This is part of a long-term process to list priorities for improving fringe benefits and salaries for the faculty and staff.

Contributions to the Centennial Professorship total approximately $27,000. The drive is now in the second phase, and President Nowaczyk has sent letters to the Department Heads asking for meetings with Faculty to discuss funding for the Centennial Professorship. Meetings for this purpose are also scheduled with Emeriti Faculty.

7. **New Business**

A. **Report on the Status of Recreation at Clemson University.** Dr. Jim Pope, Director of Physical Training & Intramural Sports, discussed activities in the Department of Intramural Sports.

Within the last five years, the department has become a large campus recreation system. The department is charged with providing programming for students and staff members and the direction of all the facilities on campus, including Fike Recreation Center, East Beach, the Indoor Tennis Center, outdoor tennis courts, and the Alumni Park area. In 1975-76 there were approximately 95,000 visits to Fike Recreation Center; in 1988 there were over 250,000 visits to the center. This year the competitive intramural program is the largest in the history of the University.

Dr. Pope introduced Mrs. Dewilla Gaines, Assistant Director, who described intramural programs. In 1988 11,901 students, faculty, and staff played on 1,577 intramural teams. In addition, 29 aerobics classes serving 2,000 persons are open each week to students, faculty, and staff. Approximately 300 students are employed in intramural programs.
Dr. Pope described changes in the system due to the high cost of services. The issuing of T-shirts and shorts must be discontinued as laundry service costs $30-$40,000 per year from a total annual budget is approximately $413,000. With the current volume of usage, the only other option would be to decrease hours or programs. Monies generated by the recreation system (rental and membership fees) go into the general fund and, therefore, are not available to the recreation system.

Dr. Pope said he hoped the recreation system within the last four or five years has been open to the Faculty’s needs. He added, "If you have needs, we want to meet those needs within our limited resources. We believe that we can do that most of the time."

Senator Birrenkott said that he has had more contact from Faculty regarding discontinuance of the uniform laundry service than on "any scholastic thing we have done for years. It's right up there with parking."

There followed discussion on the discontinuance of the laundry service in Fike Recreation Center and the internal allocation of funds. President Nowaczyk will appoint an ad hoc committee to study these issues. Senators interested in serving on the committee are requested to contact President Nowaczyk.

B. Resolution Concerning Elimination of Waivers of Out-of-State Fees for Academically Outstanding Students. Senator Kosinski introduced the resolution from the Scholastic Policies Committee (Attachment B). Kosinski pointed out that the waivers are vital to Clemson’s attempt to attract outstanding non-resident students. Non-state resident students comprise approximately 32% of the student body; outstanding out-of-state students make up 40% of the top 10% of the student body. In the Honors Program, 38% of the students come from out of state.

Formula funding from the State is based on the number of students at Clemson. The State has determined that 50% of educational costs should be paid by out-of-state students and 20% by in-state students. Formula funding is reduced by a corresponding amount without allowance for waivers. There are currently 150 academic waivers in force at a total cost to the University of $489,000. It is the University’s decision to grant waivers, and in doing so the University foregoes the collection of those revenues. Clemson then reduces its operating budget by the amount of the waivers.
The Commission on Higher Education (CHE) will meet March 2 to consider recommending the elimination the University's out-of-state waivers or an increase in the scholarship requirements for them. Some of the waivers are based on scholarships as low as $250. Senator Kosinski pointed out that if the CHE limits the University's ability to grant these, one more prohibition will be put on the University in setting its own priorities.

There followed discussion regarding the issue of foregoing loss of revenue to the University in order to attract outstanding students from other states.

The Resolution Concerning Elimination of Waivers of Out-of-State Fees for Academically Outstanding Students (FS89-2-2 P) (Attachment B) was approved unanimously.

8. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

York Brannock, Jr., Secretary
Margaret Cannon, Staff Secretary

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION IN APPRECIATION OF
THE CLASS OF 1939 GIFT

FS 89-2-1 P

Whereas, the Clemson University alumni from the Class of 1939 have undertaken a project honoring the fiftieth anniversary of their graduation;

Whereas, this project also commemorates the Centennial of the establishment of Clemson University;

Whereas, the project will result in a financial gift recognizing excellence among the Faculty of Clemson University;

Whereas, this recognition includes the annual selection of an outstanding Faculty member; and

Whereas, a permanent memorial will be established on campus by the Class of 1939 listing these Faculty;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate of Clemson University on behalf of the Faculty express deep appreciation to the alumni of the Class of 1939 for this significant gift;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate, if requested by the alumni of the Class of 1939, offer support and advice in the development of the selection process for this annual recognition; and,

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate on behalf of the Faculty pledge that the Faculty of Clemson University will uphold the standards and expectations associated with this gift to Clemson University.

This resolution was passed unanimously during the February 14, 1989 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Ronald Nowaczyk, President
Faculty Senate

D. York Brannock, Secretary
Faculty Senate
RESOLUTION CONCERNING ELIMINATION OF WAIVERS OF OUT-OF-STATE FEES FOR ACADEMICALLY OUTSTANDING STUDENTS

FS89-2-2P

Whereas, The University benefits by having students with superior academic qualifications;

Whereas, Clemson University attracts outstanding students from our region by including a waiver of out-of-state tuition as part of the scholarship;

Whereas, These waivers do not increase formula funding to Clemson;

Whereas, The University so values academically outstanding students from out-of-state that it foregoes revenue in order to attract them;

Whereas, The University should be able to set its own budgetary priorities in order to attain its educational goals; and

Whereas, The Commission on Higher Education is considering recommending changes in state law which would eliminate or limit Clemson's ability to grant out-of-state tuition waivers;

Resolved, That the Faculty of Clemson University oppose the elimination or limitation of waivers of out-of-state tuition for academically outstanding students from other states.
1. **Call to Order.** President Nowaczyk called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

2. **Special Order of the Day: Report from the University Committee on Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits.** Dr. Harold Albert, Chair, reviewed the work of the Committee on Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits. For 1988-89, $1,000,000 was available for salary adjustments; for academic year 1989-90, $800,000 is projected.

Twenty peer institutions were chosen for a study on faculty salaries. Last year the average salary for a Professor at Clemson was 11% less than the average for a Professor at the peer institutions. For Associate Professors the difference was 7% less; for Assistants, 5% less. Calculations were made by disciplines, and in some departments at Clemson the average salary of Professors was as much as 26% below the average salary of Professors at the other institutions.

This year at the Professor rank, Clemson is 9% below the average of peer institutions. At the Associate Professor rank the University is 6% below; and at the Assistant Professor rank, 2% below.

Last year the committee recommended that distributions be made by the department heads within the individual departments. The department heads used various methods in distributing the funds. It was recommended that the deans be allowed 10% of the funds to adjust individual salaries.

The committee is using the same procedure in its study this year. The goals are to obtain some degree of equity with other institutions and to achieve internal equity. It is expected that the committee will make final recommendations to the Provost by May 1. President Nowaczyk said that the comparison data by discipline and rank will be distributed to the Faculty at an early date.
Next year the committee plans to complete a study of race and gender differences. The committee has also begun a study of salary adjustment for department heads.

Dr. Albert pointed out that salary adjustment money is internally generated; it is not the same as money allocated by the State for salary increases. He encouraged Faculty to express concerns in writing to the committee at any time.

3. Approval of Minutes. The minutes of March 14, 1989, were approved as distributed.

4. Committee Reports

A. Senate Committees

Policy Committee. Senator Reichenbach reported that the committee has considered a proposal regarding the President’s Collection. It was decided the committee's function was merely to raise questions and not to rewrite the proposal. Committee concerns are listed in the Report of the Policy Committee for April 1989.

Research. Senator Hammond called attention to the report of the committee and the summary of the committee's work during 1988-89 (Attachment A). The committee continues deliberations on return of indirect costs generated by research grants. Recommendations will be made to the Faculty Senate after further study. The Vice President for Research requested a recommendation from the Research Committee regarding Library hours during holidays. The committee recommends that the Library remain open a part of the time during vacation periods (except for specific holidays).

Scholastic Policies. Senator Gaddis, reporting for Chairman Kosinski, said a modified form of the Faculty Senate Resolution on the Continuing Enrollment Policy (FS87-12-3 P) is under consideration by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. The modifications include a continuous curve for continuing enrollment, a December check, and a limit on the number of appeals allowed a student. Senator Gaddis further reported that a subcommittee of the Scholastic Policies Committee studied rewards for teaching and found no deficiency of rewards in most areas of the University.
Welfare. Senator Baron reported that a bill before the House of Representatives sets forth the following changes in the retirement system: a reduction in the time required for retirement from 30 years to 25 years and an increase in the factor for retirement benefits from 1.7% to 2%. There is a separate bill which would allow public school teachers to use 45 days of sick leave for retirement benefits. With regards to these issues, Senator Baron suggested that Faculty contact Robert McLellan, the Representative from Oconee County and Chair of the House Committee on Budget; or Nell Smith, the Senator from Pickens County.

Senator Baron called attention to the annual report of the Welfare Committee (Attachment B). The committee had submitted "An Agenda for Fringe Benefits Improvements" (FS89-3-1 P). Two resolutions (FS89-1-2 P and FS89-3-4 P), calling for an increase in summer school salaries, have been rejected.

Senator Baron listed items he would like the Senate to consider in 1989-90: 1) Needs of Clemson's best students. 2) Monies allocated to undergraduate programs. 3) Fringe benefits proposal. 4) Increases in salaries for summer school. 5) Stronger support of Faculty Senate by colleagues.

B. University Committees and Commissions

Commission on Undergraduate Studies. Senator Kosinski reported that the commission voted to allow the Scheduling Office to publish exam schedules with course schedules at the beginning of each term for a trial period of two years. Kosinski further stated that on April 14 he will present to the commission recommendations of a subcommittee on a new policy for continuing enrollment.

5. President's Report. President Nowaczyk called attention to changes in the retirement plan contained in House Bill H3609. A request has been forwarded by the Administration to the Legislature asking that faculty be provided the same benefits as public school employees. Regarding proposed changes in the State health care plan, Senators are urged to solicit views from colleagues and to forward input to the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee.

President Nowaczyk requested feedback from Senators and colleagues with regard to the draft of a Faculty Senate Report on
Scientific Misconduct and Research Ethics (Attachment C). The report will be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval at a later date. Nowaczyk called attention to an article entitled "Foul!" from *Time* magazine, April 3, 1989. The item will be placed on the agenda of the Athletic Council.

Separate from the Drug-Free Work Place Act, the University is developing a policy to meet the Drug-Free Work Force Act. This act involves stricter policies and applies only to certain Defense Department research. It is President Nowaczyk's understanding that no research at Clemson currently falls under this act. Vice President Gogue's office is coordinating the development of this policy.

6. Old Business.

A. Resolution on Fike Recreation Center. Senator Gaddis said that through student activity fees, Fike receives approximately $25 per year for each student for continuing expenses. The committee found that purchasing and laundering athletic uniforms for use in the Recreation Center costs approximately $15 per year per person.

There is a threat to curtail the laundry service at Fike Recreation Center. On behalf of the ad hoc committee, Senator Gaddis presented a resolution opposing the curtailment of privileges at Fike Recreation Center. Senator Gaddis substituted the last paragraph as follows:

Resolved: That fees for use of the facility be reasonably and objectively based. These fees appear to be $25 (parity with student contribution) for use and $15 (estimated cost) for furnishing and laundering uniforms.

The Faculty Senate Resolution on Fike Recreation Center (FS89-4-1 P) (Attachment D) was approved unanimously.

B. Resolution on Restoring Funds to State Health Care Plan. President Nowaczyk stated the Faculty Senate at the University of South Carolina has passed a resolution requesting that the Legislature restore to the State Health Plan the monies (and accrued interest) it has withdrawn from the fund over the years. Nowaczyk introduced a resolution similar to that passed by the USC Faculty Senate. The motion was seconded. Faculty Senate Resolution on Restoration of Funds Withdrawn from the State Health Plan (FS89-4-3 P) (Attachment E) passed unanimously.
C. Discussion on Nomination/Selection Criteria for Centennial Professorship. President Nowaczyk reported $30,002 in the fund for the Centennial Professorship. He requested that the nomination and selection criteria be deferred to allow for wider input in defining the nomination and selection process.

7. Remarks from Outgoing Senate President. President Nowaczyk expressed appreciation to returning Senators Dunn and Gaddis, chairs of ad hoc committees; and Senators Kosinski and Hammond, chairs of standing committees. Nowaczyk thanked Gordon Halfacre, Vice President/President Elect; and Ken Murr, Chair of the Faculty Manual Committee, for their contributions to the work of the Senate. President Nowaczyk also expressed appreciation to Senators Baron, Birrenkott, Brannock, Bryan, Drews, Haselton, King, McConnell, Reichenbach, and Stillwell, who are leaving the Senate.

President Nowaczyk said the Administration asks the Faculty to respond in a timely fashion to many issues. It is often necessary to reply to the Administration before issues can be debated in Senate meetings and colleagues can provide feedback. Therefore, colleagues need to rely on the Senators to make informed decisions and comments to the Administration. Nowaczyk added, "I assure you that the Administration wants to use the Senate; and as long as we respond in a timely and responsible fashion, we will be getting input into it."

York Brannock, Jr., Secretary

8. Introduction of the New Faculty Senate President. President Nowaczyk passed the gavel to the new President of the Faculty Senate, Dr. Gordon Halfacre.

On behalf of the Senate, President Halfacre presented Dr. Nowaczyk a plaque expressing appreciation for dedicated leadership as Faculty Senate President, 1988-89.
9. New Business

A. Introduction of New Senators. President Halfacre called upon the new Senators to introduce themselves: Carl Thompson (Agricultural Sciences), Elizabeth Carney (Liberal Arts), Joseph Louderback (Commerce & Industry), Hallman Bryant (Liberal Arts alternate), Buvenesh Goswami (Commerce & Industry alternate), Paula Heusinkveld (Liberal Arts), Alston Steiner (Sciences), and J. M. Kennedy (Engineering alternate).

B. Remarks of the New Faculty Senate President. President Halfacre stressed the importance of maintaining liaison with faculty senates at other colleges and universities on matters of common concern. He said the agenda for the year will be set according to the aspects of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, assessment by the Commission on Higher Education, and strategic planning.

9. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Kenneth Murr, Secretary

Margaret Cannon, Staff Secretary

Members absent: R. Young, D. Graham, P. Rosson, J. LeBlanc, M. Drews, R. Meiners, H. Pate, R. Conover, A. Madison, J. Luedeman, E. Pivorun
REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

The Senate Research Committee met Tuesday April 4, 1989. Three issues were considered: (1) an ad hoc Committee Report on Misconduct and Research Ethics Policy, (2) research indirect costs and (3) campus services required by faculty during University vacation periods.

Issue (1): An ad hoc Committee report on Scientific Misconduct and Research Ethics, authored by R. J. Schalkoff, Paar Rosson and George Haselton, was reviewed by the Research Committee. The Research Committee endorsed the major portion of the Report which included: 1. Introduction, 2. Definition and 3. Framework for Policy Implementation. Several recommendations relative to Section 4, Proposed Implementation, were made informally to Senator Nowaczyk, who was present at the meeting. The most significant recommendation was that it is not necessary to have a standing committee on research misconduct. In the opinion of the Research Committee, appropriate ad hoc committees can be constituted as needed for each particular case.

Issue (2): The Research Committee continued its deliberations on return of indirect costs generated by research grants. Information has been received from most of the Colleges concerning the policies which each employs. This information indicates that there is a considerable difference between what is done in the various colleges.

Although there was some sentiment to conclude the deliberations with a resolution to the full Senate, the Committee concluded that with further study a stronger and more useful resolution could be brought forth at a later time. Information currently available on policies in the various colleges on the return of indirect costs to departments and individuals is given in a table attached to this report.

Issue (3): The Research Committee has been requested by V.P. Gogue to assess the needs of the faculty for services during periods when the university is not in session. He requested a specific response at this time relative to the library.

After deliberation, the Committee agreed to recommend that the library be kept open a part of every day during the complete period when the university is not in session, except for the day (such as Christmas) on which a holiday occurs. During the period that the library is open it should be possible to use interlibrary loan and have access to on-line search. The Committee feels that this access to the library is necessary for a research university with foreign graduate students and faculty who frequently work during vacation periods.
During the most recent December break, the library was closed December 22 - December 27 and December 31 - January 2. The recommended policy would have required that the library have some open hours during an additional seven days. The library was open every day during the most recent Spring break and thus no additional hours would have been required.
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ON RETURN OF INDIRECT COSTS

**Question 1.** What percent of the indirect costs returned to the college is allocated to the department which generated the grant/contract?

**Question 2.** Is the percent fixed or does it vary yearly?

**Question 3.** Is there a cap on the amount of money returned to the department?

**Question 4.** Do your departments have a uniform method for allocating indirect costs? If so, how was that method developed? If not, how is the decision made at the department level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80 %</td>
<td>fixed</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>policy new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>still being refined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>fixed</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>faculty vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 %</td>
<td>may vary</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>fixed</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dept head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st $5000 to PI, fixed</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $5000, 1/3 to PI up to $10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF CONSIDERATIONS AND ACTIONS
FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
1988-1989

Membership

Michael Drews, Textiles
Allen Dunn, Forestry (Acting Chairman Summer semester)
Doyce Graham, Agronomy and Soils
Joe Hammond, (Chairman)
George Haselton, Earth Sciences
Ed Pivorun, Biological Science
John Ryan, Sociology
Eldon Zehr, Plant Pathology and Physiology

Resolutions

Resolution on Savannah River Research and Education Corporation

Issues Considered and Summary of Actions

Issue: Savannah River Plant Proposal.
Action: Above Resolution.

Issue: Indirect Costs Rates/Determination.
Action: Recommend survey of other universities to determine Clemson's competitive position.

Issue: Position of Research Associate.
Action: Recommend Senate go on record as in favor of supporting a strong Post-Doctoral program and investigate several aspects of position.

Issue: Fund allocation from increasing graduate enrollment.
Action: Recommend that Senate inquire as to disposition of these funds (issue still open).

Issue: Patent regulations on ideas and plant varieties.
Action: Recommend that Senate investigate protection of faculty rights in these situations.
Issue: Guidelines for allocation of Cutting Edge Research Incentive Funds.

Action: Letter to V. P. Gogue giving modified allocation criteria and a proposed system for allocation of the funds.

Issue: Review of University Research Incentive Policy.

Action: Review of policies with inputs from Al McCracken. Research Committee to review policies for the return of indirect costs.

Issue: Selection of faculty members to review proposals for Cutting Edge funds.

Action: Polled entire University faculty for nominations. Twenty reviewers, four in each of five areas, selected from two hundred four nominations.

Issue: Return of indirect costs.

Action: Survey of policies in the Colleges and report to Senate

Issue: University services required during holiday periods.

Action: Recommendation to V. P. Gogue

Liaisons with Other Entities

Research Committee representative attended two Clemson University Research Foundation Faculty Advisory Committee (CURFFAC) meetings.
Welfare Committee Report 1988-89 Academic Year

The Welfare took on two major tasks during the 1988-89 academic year, the development of a fringe benefits agenda and a quest for increased salaries for faculty teaching in the summer school.

The agenda for improved fringe benefits was submitted to the Faculty Senate at the March 89 meeting. This agenda was accepted by the Senate unanimously and forwarded to the University administration for consideration and possible action. Professor Janet LeBlanc should be recognized as having initiated and developed a faculty questionnaire which, provided a basis for the proposed fringe benefits agenda.

The Committee initiated discussions with Professor Jerry Reel, Vice Provost, on the topic of salaries for summer school. A review of the past five years budget for summer school (requested by Ron Nowaczyk) showed that summer school has been making a substantial profit over this period of time. Based on the budgetary disclosures and consideration of the purpose and need for summer school, the Committee submitted two resolutions requesting an increase in summer school salary. The Provost has rejected our request for a salary increase for the summer of 1989.

Janet LeBlanc with assistance from Ron Nowaczyk and others prepared the 1988-89 University salary report.
FACULTY SENATE REPORT
on
SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT AND RESEARCH ETHICS

I. INTRODUCTION

This document is intended to lead to adoption and publication of a policy statement to maintain and promote high ethical standards in the conduct of research at Clemson University. The description "research" is used in general sense (as opposed to "Scientific Research") to yield a policy applicable to all academic disciplines at Clemson.

During recent years, the frequency and severity of scientific misconduct has increased, resulting in many public and private funding organizations demanding that universities adopt policies to deal with scientific misconduct in an effective manner.

Research institutions have a critical responsibility to provide an environment that promotes integrity, while at the same time encouraging openness and creativity among scientists. Care must be taken to ensure that honest error and ambiguities of interpretation of scientific findings are distinguishable from outright scientific misconduct. To address all allegations of fraud or misconduct, definition, policies, and procedures must be in place to facilitate and guide such processes.

II. DEFINITION

Misconduct:

1. The serious deviation, such as fabrication, or plagiarism, from accepted practices in carrying out research or in reporting the results of research.

2. The substantial failure to comply with requirements affecting specific aspects of the conduct of research; e.g., the protection of human subjects and the welfare of laboratory animals.
This definition includes the following:

1. Falsification of Data--Ranging from fabrication to deceptively selective reporting, including the purposeful omission of conflicting data with intent to falsify results.

2. Plagiarism--Representation of another's work as one's own.

3. Misappropriation of Others' Ideas--The unauthorized use of privileged information (such as violation of confidentiality in peer review), however obtained.

Inquiry:

Expedition, gathering, and review of faculty information to determine if an investigation is warranted.

This is not a formal hearing, but a process designed to separate frivolous, unjustified, or mistaken allegations from facts regarding the incident.

Investigation:

A formal examination and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine if an instance of misconduct has taken place. If misconduct is confirmed, the investigation determines the seriousness of the offense and the extent of any adverse effects resulting from the misconduct.

Disposition:

Nature and severity of action taken as a result of investigation of allegations.

III. FRAMEWORK FOR POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

A. Overall Structure

Whenever an allegation or complaint involving the possibility of fraud is made, an inquiry - the first step of the review process - should result. In the inquiry state, factual information is gathered and expeditiously reviewed to determine if an investigation of the charge is warranted. An inquiry is
not reviewed to determine if an investigation of the charge is warranted. An inquiry is not a formal hearing; it is designed to separate allegations deserving of further investigation from frivolous, unjustified, or clearly mistaken allegation.

B. Procedure to Handle Inquiry Regarding Misconduct

1. The Vice President for Research and the Faculty Senate President will appoint a committee of three faculty members to a Committee of Inquiry with one individual appointed as Chair.

2. For any specific allegation or set of allegations, the Committee of Inquiry will conduct the inquiry to determine if an investigation is warranted.

C. Procedure to Handle Investigation Regarding Misconduct

1. If an investigation is warranted, the Committee will recommend that the Vice President for Research and the Faculty Senate President appoint an investigative board of no fewer than five faculty members to conduct a full investigation. Consideration in the selection of Faculty should be given to expertise in the area of investigation.

2. The investigative board will review all materials, question relevant parties, and allow for all parties to present their views. The investigative board will meet in closed sessions.

3. The investigative board will make a recommendation with regard to the charge of misconduct and report its findings to the Vice President for Research, who will forward the report along with his or her own recommendations to the President of the University.

Among the Guiding Principles of either procedure should be:

A. To maximize confidentiality for the respondent during the full process and for the complainant during the inquiry phase.
B. To assure the respondent a fair hearing.

C. To minimize the number of individuals involved in the inquiry and investigative stages.

Individuals chosen to assist in the inquiry process should have no real or apparent conflicts of interest bearing on the case in question. They should be unbiased, and have appropriate background for judging the issues being raised.

Consultation of University legal counsel is probably necessary.

IV. PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURE

A. Consideration of the definitions, policy and framework outlined in Sections I through III by the Faculty Senate and the Office of University Research.

B. The development of appropriate language that will enable the policy to be adopted by the University community.

C. Adoption of the formal policy by the Faculty Senate, the Administration, and the Board of Trustees.

* Portions of this statement were excerpted from:


Part I: Introduction
Part II: Definition
Part III: Framework_for_Policy_Implementation
Part IV: Proposed_Procedure
RESOLUTION ON FIKE RECREATION CENTER
FS89-4-1 P

Whereas, The Recreation Director has done a commendable job of maintaining and encouraging the use of facilities by the entire University community;

Whereas, Budgetary limitations have caused the decision to be made to cancel the issuance of laundered uniforms for participant's usage;

Whereas, The aforementioned decision causes inconvenience to hundreds of faculty members who pay a fee for use of University facilities;

Whereas, The action appears to be another in a series of measures tending to erode benefits to faculty members;

Whereas, The benefits offered at Fike Recreation Center are an effective tool in recruiting and retaining both faculty and graduate students;

Whereas, The unfortunate decision may result in discouragement of faculty participation in fitness programs which enhance their total performance; and

Whereas, The insalubrious decision may result in the de facto sponsorship of unsanitary conditions in the locker rooms of Fike Recreation Center;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate opposes the curtailment of privileges at Fike Recreation Center;

Resolved, That the University administration reevaluate to prominent priority the physical welfare of the faculty as encouraged by fitness and recreation programs, including measures of convenience supporting said programs;

Resolved, That the prominence of such an evaluation be displayed promptly by a reversal of the intent to discontinue the laundering of uniforms; and

Resolved, That fees for use of the facility be reasonably and objectively based. These fees appear to be $25 (parity with student contribution) for use and $15 (estimated cost) for furnishing and laundering uniforms.
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION ON RESTORATION OF FUNDS WITHDRAWN FROM THE STATE HEALTH PLAN

FS89-4-2 P

Whereas, Current and projected health care costs indicate that changes will be necessary in the State Health Plan:

Whereas, The Legislature's actions of withdrawing nearly $33,000,000 from the Health Plan in recent years has hurt the State Health Plan; and

Whereas, The University of South Carolina Faculty Senate has resolved that the Legislature restore these funds prior to any increases in premiums or reductions in benefits;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate of Clemson University joins with the University of South Carolina Faculty Senate in calling for the restoration of those funds withdrawn plus accrued interest prior to any changes in the premiums or benefits being implemented in the State Health Plan.
1. **Call to Order.** President Halfacre called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The minutes for April 11, 1989, were approved as distributed.

3. **Appointment of the Senate Parliamentarian.** President Halfacre appointed Senator Edwin Coulter to serve as Faculty Senate Parliamentarian for the current year.

4. **Election of Senate/Faculty Representatives to University Commissions and Committees.**

   Senator Dunn moved that the election of faculty to the various Committees and Commissions by the Faculty Senate be by the highest number of votes received, with each member of the Faculty Senate being allowed to cast one vote for each position to be filled. No one will be allowed to cast more than one vote for the same person for a single position. For those Committees or Commissions with more than one vacancy, the candidate receiving the highest number of votes will fill the first vacant position, the candidate receiving the next highest number of votes the second position, etc., until the positions are filled.

   Senator Coulter seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

   President Halfacre presented the nominees for Commissions and Committees as listed on the Faculty Senate ballot (Attachment A). He called for additional nominations. The following nominations were received from the floor:

   **Open Forum:** Kenneth Murr  
   **Greek Affairs:** Thomas E. Skelton
Financial Aid, Student Employment & Placement:  
William Stringer
Administrative Disciplinary Committee alternate:  
Edwin Coulter

It was moved and seconded that the nominations be closed. The motion passed. President Halfacre appointed Senator Dunn and Senator Kennedy to count the ballots.

The following Senators were elected to serve on Commissions:

- Undergraduate Studies: Edwin Coulter
- Graduate Students & Research: Alan W. Madison

The following Senators were elected to University Committees:

- Scholarship and Awards: Paula Heusinkveld
- Cooperative Education: Paula Heusinkveld
- Traffic and Parking: Henry Pate
- Honors: Doyce Graham
- Admissions & Continuing Enrollment: Joseph Louderback
- Safety & Fire Prevention: Eldon Zehr
- Computer Advisory: Robert Schalkoff
- Fine Arts: Leo Gaddis
- Committee on the Handicapped: Jeri Milstead
- Academic Advising: Alston Steiner

The following Senators were elected to a Senate Committee:
- Open Forum: John M. Harris, Kenneth Murr

The following Faculty were elected to University Committees:

- Recreation Advisory: Ben Sill
- Alcohol & Drug Abuse: Richard Conover, Jan Williams
- Greek Affairs: Thomas E. Skelton
- Financial Aid, Student Employment & Placement: William Stringer
- Patent and Copyright: Max Sherrill
- Faculty Manual: Bhuvnesh Goswami
- University Union Board: Nancy Morgan
- Media Advisory Board: John Ryan
- Facilities Planning & Master Plan Committees: Martin Davis
- Administrative Disciplinary Committee: MaryAnn Reichenbach
Administrative Disciplinary Committee alternate:  
Edwin Coulter  
Bookstore Committee: Elizabeth Carney

5. Reports from University Commissions and Committees. 
The Commission on Undergraduate Studies. Senator Kosinski reported that the commission met May 14 and has acted upon the Continuing Enrollment Policy. This action was reported on under Old Business (see below). In addition, the commission is studying credit by examination and normal progress towards degrees.

6. President's Report (Attachment B). Oral Remarks: Gifts and pledges to fund the Centennial Professorship total $36,602, an increase of approximately 20% within the last month. It is expected that a bridge loan from the University Foundation will be approved in the immediate future. Senator Dunn has been appointed chair of an ad_hoc Committee to contact each faculty member on behalf of the financial campaign, and former Senator Nowaczyk has been appointed chair of an ad_hoc committee to target possible large contributors.

Senator Dunn was appointed chair of an ad_hoc committee to study faculty senates at other universities in an effort to strengthen the Senate at Clemson.

President Halfacre called attention to the report of the Committee on Institutional Purpose (mission Statement) circulated with today's agenda. Suggestions regarding the statement should be given to Halfacre immediately. The statement was referred to the Policy Committee for study.

7. Old Business.

Continuing Enrollment Policy. Senator Kosinski reported that on April 14 the Commission on Undergraduate Studies unanimously approved a revision of the Continuing Enrollment Policy incorporating most of the major features of the Faculty Senate Resolution on Continuing Enrollment (FS87-12-3 P). The Council of Deans has also approved the proposal. The revised Continuing Enrollment Policy will be presented to the Academic Council for approval.
8. New Business

a. Report of the Faculty Manual Committee. President Halfacre turned the meeting over to Senator Murr, Chair of the Committee on the Faculty Manual. Murr presented changes to update the Faculty Manual for forwarding to the Provost.

The Faculty Manual Committee recommended the following wording for Chapter VI, Article II, Section 5, p.9:

"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. Board members shall all be from different colleges. 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."

The motion passed unanimously.

The committee recommended deleting the sentence, "An alternate Grievance Board member shall be assigned to each Hearing Board" on Page II:31, Paragraph 5. The motion passed without dissent.

Under K. Patent Policy, Page III:18, the committee recommended inserting the following: "4) It is recognized that certain intellectual properties created by faculty while using University time and/or property may exist. These properties, while not eligible for patent or copyright, may produce income. Rights to these properties should be assigned on an individual basis by the Patent Committee and the parties involved." Furthermore, paragraph 4, Page III:18, is renumbered 5. The reference to paragraph 4 in item 2, III:17, is changed to refer to paragraph 5.

Senator Coulter introduced a friendly amendment to read, "Rights to these properties shall be assigned on an individual basis...," which was accepted by Senator Murr.

The motion passed unanimously.
The committee recommended an insert on Page III:10 as follows: "Subsequent sabbatical leave may not be granted until the completion of at least six years of full-time service since the sabbatical leave."

Senator Ryan urged flexibility in granting sabbaticals. Senator Coulter introduced a friendly amendment to read "...since the previous sabbatical leave." There followed discussion on the wording of the proposed change. The question was called. The committee's recommendation failed.

The committee recommended the creation of Section Q, III:22, as follows: "Clemson University has established a policy and protocol for the use of animals in research, instruction, and public service activities. Use of vertebrate animals is reviewed and approved by the Animal Research Committee (VI.C). Faculty contemplating such activities must submit a form requesting approval to the Committee. For further information, faculty should contact the Office of University Research." The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Murr stated that Part VII, Support Services and Facilities for Faculty, contains informational items given to the Faculty Manual Committee by the various entities on campus (the University Libraries, the University Bookstore, the Division of Computing and Information Technology, etc.). Chairman Murr accepted a friendly amendment from Senator Halfacre to update Section K by changing "Physical Plant" to "Facilities Maintenance and Operations."

Senator Coulter moved that the Part VII be approved. The motion was seconded and passed without dissent.

President Halfacre resumed the chair.

b) Consideration of Abbreviated Minutes. President Halfacre stated the Executive/Advisory Committee recommends the Faculty Senate consider that Minutes should include summaries of major points of discussions, but the Minutes should be concise to conform with Robert's Rules of Order. A motion was made to discuss the issue, was seconded and passed.

There followed discussion regarding the length of the minutes. Comments included the following: 1) personal opinions should not be a part of the Minutes, and 2) any Senator may
request that an item be included in the minutes that might not normally be included.

After discussion, it was moved and seconded that Minutes of the Faculty Senate record actions of the Senate, the names of Senators making motions and presenting resolutions, and major points of discussion.

The motion passed unanimously.

c. Designated Seats and Name Blocks at Faculty Senate meetings. A motion to consider the issue was seconded and passed. Senator Luedeman made a friendly amendment to delete designated seats. Discussion followed. The motion to provide name blocks for Senators and Alternates passed unanimously.

9. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Kenneth Murr, Secretary

Margaret Cannon, Staff Secretary


Approved June 13, 1989

Margaret Cannon
FACULTY SENATE BALLOT
1989-90

FACULTY SENATE REPRESENTATION

A. University Commissions

Undergraduate Studies (elect one):
  John M. Harris
  Ed Coulter
  Henry Pate
  Paula Heusinkveld
  Doyce Graham
  Elizabeth Carney
  Alan W. Madison

Graduate Studies and Research (elect one):
  Eldon Zehr
  Henry Pate
  Carl E. Thompson
  Alan W. Madison
  Parr Rosson
  Doyce Graham

B. University Committees

Scholarship and Awards (elect one):
  Paula Heusinkveld
  Carl E. Thompson
  Jeri Milsted

Cooperative Education (elect one):
  Paula Heusinkveld
  Parr Rosson
  Gerald Christenbury
Traffic and Parking (elect one):
   Eldon Zehr
   Henry Pate

Honors (elect one):
   Doyce Graham
   Joseph Louderback

Admissions and Continuing Enrollment (one from Scholastic Policies Committee)
   Joseph Louderback

Safety & Fire Prevention (elect one)
   Eldon Zehr

Computer Advisory (elect one):
   John M. Harris
   Robert Schalkoff
   Alan W. Madison
   Doyce Graham

Fine Arts (elect one):
   Paula Heusinkveld
   W. C. Stringer
   John Ryan
   John Zanes
   Leo Gaddis

Committee on the Handicapped (elect one):
   Jeri Milsted

Academic Advising (elect one)
   Alston Steiner
   Robert Hogan
Open Forum (elect two):
  John M. Harris

FACULTY_REPRESENTATION_SELECTED_BY_SENATE_(OPEN_TO_ALL_FACULTY)

Recreation Advisory (elect one - 3 yr. term):
  Ben Sill (Engineering)

Alcohol & Drug Awareness (elect two):
  Richard Conover (Forestry & Rec. Resources)
  Eldon Zehr (Agricultural Sciences)
  Jan Williams (Liberal Arts)

Greek Affairs (elect 1 - 2 yr. term):

Financial Aid, Student Employment & Placement (elect one):

Patent & Copyright (elect one):
  Max Sherrill (Sciences)

Faculty Manual (elect one - 3 yr. term):
  Bhuvenesh Goswami (C & I)

University Union Board (elect one)
  Nancy Morgan (Library)
  Elaine Richardson (Agricultural Sciences)
Media Advisory Board (elect one):
  John Ryan (Liberal Arts)
  John Zanes (Liberal Arts)
  Alan W. Madison (Sciences)

Facilities Planning & Master Plan Committees (elect one)
  Martin Davis (Architecture)

Administrative Disciplinary Committee (elect one - 3 yr. term)
  MaryAnn Reichenbach (Nursing)
  Chris Sieverdes (Liberal Arts)

Alternate (elect one - 1 yr. term):

Bookstore Committee (elect one - 3 yr. term)
  Eldon Zehr (Agricultural Sciences)
  Doyce Graham (Agricultural Sciences)
  Elizabeth Carney (Liberal Arts)
1. During the past two weeks I have met with President Lennon, Provost Maxwell, and Vice President Larson to initiate discussions about the Faculty Senate programs for 1989-90. As we set priorities for this year, I will continue this type of direct discussion with our administration.

2. Dr. Stassen Thompson met with the Executive Advisory Committee this past week regarding Strategic Planning. Dr. Thompson explained that Strategic Planning is part of the next phase of the Second Century planning process. Stassen and I met concerning membership on the Strategic Planning Committee, a majority of which will be faculty. Committee members will be announced soon.

3. Dr. Gary Ransdell met with the Executive/Advisory Committee on April 27. Dr. Ransdell reviewed details of the bridge loan President Nowaczyk discussed at the last Senate meeting. It was suggested that we have an ad hoc committee to target large contributors and to make certain each faculty member has been given detailed information about the Centennial Professorship. To date we have received $33,052 in contributions.

4. The Faculty Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee, chaired by Professor Harold Albert, will submit recommendations to the Provost this week. The committee has allocated $800,000 this year. Based on the Oklahoma Study of 21 peer institutions, at present Clemson University Professors are 9% below the average, Associate Professors 6%, and Assistant Professors 2%. This is the second year of the administration's commitment to raise faculty salaries at Clemson to at least the average of our 21 peer institutions. It is estimated that it will take five years of adjustments to achieve this goal.

5. Senator Dunn is appointed to chair an ad hoc committee to study faculty senates at other universities in an effort to strengthen our program at Clemson University.

6. At the Academic Council on May 1, President Lennon emphasized the importance of the Institutional Purpose (Mission Statement) that is presently being reviewed by various groups at our University. He also indicated that it appears we will receive 93% formula funding from the Legislature, the same as last year.

7. Attached is a listing of the Senate Standing Committees.
1. Call to Order. President Halfacre called the meeting to order at 3:39 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The Minutes of the Faculty Senate for May 9, 1989, were approved as distributed.

   The Minutes of the General Faculty for May 11, 1989, were approved as corrected.

3. Committee Reports

   a. Senate Committees

   Policy Committee. Chairman Luedeman reported the committee will formulate a policy on visiting faculty and also study the selling of complimentary textbooks.

   The committee submitted for the Senate's approval an Institutional Mission statement (Attachment A). Senator Milstead made a friendly amendment to the last sentence in the first paragraph to read as follows: "...Clemson serves the state, the nation, and the international community through teaching, research, and public service activities." The amendment was accepted by Chairman Luedeman. The statement on Institutional Mission as amended was unanimously approved.

   Scholastic Policies Committee. In the absence of Chairman Kosinski, Senator Heusinkveld submitted the report of the committee (Attachment B).
Welfare Committee. Senator Kennedy said the committee's agenda for the year has been organized into the following areas: 1) salaries, 2) paycheck-related benefits issues, and 3) non-paycheck-related benefits issues. The committee will meet regularly on the last Wednesday of each month.

Senator Kennedy reported the administration has indicated a willingness to open the gate to the fence around the practice fields during specified hours. The issue was considered under New Business.

Senator Kennedy further reported the fee of $50 for use of uniforms in Fike Recreation Center covers purchase of uniforms ($35) and labor and washing ($15). Regular fees to Fike cover the cost of maintaining facilities of the Recreation Center.

4. Report of the Faculty Senate President (Attachment C). Oral remarks: Faculty Senate President Halfacre reported that President Lennon is optimistic about securing funds for upgrading computer facilities at Clemson. A committee chaired by Dick Greer, Chair of the Development Board, will study the issue of the supercomputer. Clemson's representative on the committee will be Vice President Gogue. To maintain Clemson's position of leadership in the state, it was necessary to move toward the supercomputer as competition in the state was moving in that direction. There is a window in the area of computers in environmental work that could offer special opportunities for some of the colleges at Clemson.

The Academic Council on June 5 approved the new Continuing Enrollment Policy which had originated with the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate.

The fund for the Centennial Professorship totaled $41,299 as of May 26. The Clemson University Foundation has approved a bridge loan for the Professorship, thus allowing the Senate to move ahead this fall in the selection of the first recipient.

5. Remarks of the President of the University. President Lennon responded to questions regarding concerns of the Faculty.
Dr. Bhuvanesh Goswami asked if there is any policy as to the role of faculty in deciding the mechanism by which block grants will be allocated.

President Lennon replied that moving to block grants was one of the most fundamental changes in Clemson's history. Associated with the block grants is a set of incentives. If a department makes a change that will increase or decrease the formula, it will influence the block grant for next year. The President added, "Our assumption is that we are maturing as a university; and we are now ready within the colleges to begin to debate quality, what is it, how to achieve it, and the importance of quality of undergraduate programs in association with quality graduate programs."

Dr. Lennon said the faculty is in the best position to make decisions on certain matters, including class size. The change to block grants is an attempt to move decision making into the departments. Faculty should push for input within the decision-making systems of the various departments. Dr. Lennon added, "If you don't have a system, I would encourage you to develop one." Over a period of time appropriate monitoring devices will be developed for the block grants.

6. Old Business

Election of Faculty Senate's Representative on the Student Insurance Committee. Senator Milstead nominated Dr. MaryAnn Reichenbach, Assistant Professor of Nursing. The nomination was seconded. Dr. Reichenbach was unanimously elected to the Student Insurance Committee.

7. New Business

a. Reform and Renewal of Undergraduate Education.
President Halfacre called attention to an address, "Reform and Renewal of Undergraduate Education," by the President Emeritus of Ohio State University. There followed discussion regarding the responsibility of the departments in curriculum reform as well as the role of the Faculty Senate in guiding reform and focusing the University on the quality of undergraduate education. The issue of curriculum reform was referred to the Scholastic Policies Committee.
b. Proposals to Improve Effectiveness of Instructional Graduate Assistants. President Halfacre called attention to the proposals presented to the Academic Council and included in today’s agenda packet. Any comments must be forwarded through Dr. Halfacre to Provost Maxwell by June 19. Senator Kennedy spoke to the need for a course in English as a second language.

c. Report from the ad hoc Committee to Study Faculty Senates at Other Universities. Senator Dunn said that the committee will consist of Senators Roy Young, Alan Madison, and one additional Senator. The committee will identify major outstanding faculty senates in the country, send questionnaires regarding their work, and make a report to the Faculty Senate. Members who have suggestions regarding the study are urged to contact the committee.

d. Other. Senator Harris moved that President Lennon’s remarks regarding block grants be included in the minutes of this meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

e. Resolution on Closure of Old Seneca River Lagoon and Bottom Land. Senator Rosson presented the resolution and moved acceptance. The motion was seconded by Senator Coulter. There followed discussion on reasons for the fence and preferred hours of availability of the track.

Senator Coulter moved that the Resolved read as follows: "That the Faculty Senate of Clemson University strongly urges the Administration and the Athletic Department to negotiate with a representative or representatives of the faculty a mutually agreeable solution..." Senator Rosson accepted the change as a friendly amendment.

Senator Murr moved to delete "and totally restricted use" in the first Whereas. Senator Rosson accepted the change as a friendly amendment.

Faculty Senate Resolution on Closure of Old Seneca River Lagoon and Bottom Land (FS89-6-1 P) (Attachment D) was unanimously approved as amended.

It was moved and seconded to delete the word "others" in the sixth Whereas to read, "...This action would restrict outside groups such as YMCA, Special Olympics, High Schools, and does not foster good University-Community relations..." The President
ruled this was a change in style, and the resolution was subsequently approved in that manner.

President Halfacre appointed the Chair of the Welfare Committee, Senator W. J. Kennedy, to serve as the Senate's representative to negotiate with the Administration and the Athletic Department.

8. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Kenneth R. Murr, Secretary

Margaret Cannon, Staff Secretary

INSTITUTIONAL MISSION

The original philosophy guiding Clemson University's mission appeared in the enabling legislation of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, the will of Thomas Green Clemson which calls for the establishment of a "high seminary of learning" devoted to the "agricultural and mechanical industries," and the Act of Acceptance by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina. Subsequent broadening of the general mission occurred with the passage by Congress of the Hatch Act of 1887, the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, and the National Sea Grant Act of 1966. Further refinement came from the South Carolina Master Plan for Higher Education set forth in 1979 by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. As a publicly assisted, comprehensive, land-grant institution, Clemson serves the state, the nation, and the international community through its teaching, research, and public service activities.

To fulfill its historic, expanded, and evolving mission, Clemson offers undergraduate and graduate programs through nine colleges, a graduate school, and continuing education programs. The responsibility for implementing the mission rests, in large measure, with teachers and researchers who gather, interpret, and disseminate knowledge; foster critical thought and expression; stimulate creativity; generate new knowledge, and initiate change. In addition, faculty/researchers prepare students to cope with life, to contribute to the development of a better world, and to advance the common good by devising solutions for intellectual, social, technical, and scientific problems.

Public service is provided through extension and regulatory programs, media programs, bulletins, forums, speeches, leadership in professional organizations, and assistance to state agencies and other outlets. In these ways, Clemson reaches out to the larger community from which the University draws its support.

Clemson monitors its own integrity and growth by managing its resources, engaging in strategic planning, reviewing and evaluating authorized programs, modifying goals and operations as appropriate, and assessing student, faculty, and administrative performance regularly and in accordance with norms upheld by university procedures and those of appropriate professional societies.
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Scholastic Policies Committee

Report of the June Meeting

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on 6 June at 3:30 PM in the Jordan Room. The major item of business was deciding on which issues we would study this year. After consideration of a list of nine possible issues supplied by the chairman and three others suggested by members, we decided that we would devote our attention to the following problems:

Tracking the implementation of the Senate's continuing enrollment proposal (recently approved by the Academic Council, and on its way to being signed by President Lennon);

Concluding our study, begun last year, of methods for rewarding innovative teaching and advising;

Determining the extent to which other comparable universities employ core curricula, and considering whether Clemson should attempt to implement a core curriculum;

The possibility of moving the first drop date to or before the last add date. This would prevent students who know they are going to drop a class from taking places from students who need the class;

Plus/minus grading.

After the members were assigned to subcommittees, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.

Robert Kosinski
Chairman
PRESIDENT'S REPORT
JUNE 1989

1. Provost Maxwell has released the report of the Faculty Salary Committee. He has approved allocations of the salary enhancement funds to each college according to the report (see attached report). Provost Maxwell is trying to get approval from Columbia to make these salary adjustments on July 1 for 12-month employees and August 16 for 9-month employees. In addition to $800,000 from University funds, Clemson will receive 4% faculty salary adjustments October 1 from the Legislature to be allocated by the administration to faculty on the basis of merit.

2. President Lennon is optimistic about Clemson getting a supercomputer. He announced at the Academic Council on June 5 that Dick Greer, Chair of the Development Board, will chair a committee to study the supercomputer issue. The Governor will appoint two members of the committee. The Commission on Higher Education, Clemson, USC, the Medical University, the House, and the Senate will appoint one member each to serve on the study committee.

3. At the meeting of the General Faculty in May, Dr. Lennon announced that Clemson ranks seventh in the nation with peer institutions (land-grant institutions without medical schools) in research expenditure per faculty per year.

4. The Continuing Enrollment Policy was passed by the Academic Council on June 5. (see attached report). We appreciate the work of Senator Kosinski and the Scholastic Policy Committee.

5. The chairs of the Centennial Professorship funding effort, Professor Nowaczyk and Senator Dunn, report a significant increase in contributions. As of May 26, contributions to the Professorship totaled $41,229. Vice President Ransdell informed us that the Clemson University Foundation has agreed to provide a bridge loan until we reach the $100,000 goal.

6. Members appointed to the Strategic Planning Committee are Stassen Thompson, Chair; Bruce Yandle; Joseph Dickey; Christopher Sieverdes; Larry Dyck; Christine Jarvis; Joel Brawley; James Barker; Chris Przirembel; Ed Clark; Almeda Jacks; John Clemmens; and Trey Blackwood. The ex officio members are David Larson, David Maxwell, Jay Gogue, and Sandra Underwood.

7. The Faculty Senate office will move to Room B-2 of the Library. Thanks to Director Boykin and his Space Committee for providing this larger office space.
Continuing Enrollment Policy

At the end of any enrollment period, a notice of academic probation shall be placed on the grade report of an undergraduate student if his/her cumulative grade-point ratio is below 2.0, which is the minimum necessary for graduation.

In the event that a student is placed on academic probation, notification to that effect will be placed on the grade report for that session in which the student's academic deficiency occurred and for each session the student remains on probation. The student who clears probation by returning to the graduating academic requirement (2.0) will have notice to that effect placed on the grade report for that session. No notation concerning probation is placed on the student's permanent record.

A student on academic probation will be suspended or dismissed at the end of either fall semester or spring semester if his/her cumulative grade-point ratio is below the minimum cumulative grade-point ratio (MCGPR). The minimum cumulative grade-point ratio is 2.00 for students with credit levels greater than or equal to 95 hours. For students with credit levels less than 95 hours, the MCGPR is given in the table below.
in the table is the student's credit level, based on all credits taken at Clemson, plus any advanced standing received from transfer credits and credits based on approved examination programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CL</th>
<th>MCGPR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>MCGPR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>MCGPR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>MCGPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36+</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>56+</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>76+</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values in this table are based on the following formula:

\[ \text{MCGPR} = 2.25 \times \left( \frac{\text{CL}}{\text{CL} + 12} \right) \]

A student on probation who passes at least 12 semester credit hours and earns a 2.2 semester grade-point ratio on all hours attempted in the most recent semester (fall or spring) is permitted to continue enrollment on probation even though his/her cumulative grade-point ratio is below the required minimum grade point ratio, defined above.
A student's first failure to qualify for continued enrollment will subject him/her to suspension from the University for the next fall or spring semester. Notice of academic suspension will appear on the permanent record.

Students subject to suspension or dismissal may appeal to the Appeals Committee on Continuing Enrollment at the end of any term of enrollment. An appeal must include a frank explanation for the student's poor academic performance. To the extent possible, verifiable documentation should also be included. Appeals will be granted only in the most exceptional cases, and a student will be allowed to continue due to appeal only once prior to dismissal.

Students subject to suspension will be permitted to enroll in summer school and may have their regular enrollment reinstated immediately if the summer school work brings their cumulative grade-point ratio above the minimum cumulative grade point ratio.

Upon enrolling after suspension, a subsequent failure to meet the requirements for continued enrollment before clearing probation will result in dismissal from the University, and notice of dismissal will appear on the permanent record.
A student who has been dismissed may file a petition for readmission with the Appeals Committee on Continuing Enrollment after one calendar year. If this petition is denied, the student may file subsequent petitions for readmission after any intervening term of enrollment. Dismissed students who are readmitted and then again fail to meet the requirements for continuing enrollment will be dismissed and may not appeal to continue.
FACULTY SENATE

RESOLUTION ON CLOSURE OF OLD SENeca RIVER LAGOON AND BOTTOM LAND
FS89-6-1 P

Whereas, The Athletic Department and the University Administration announced the closure of the athletic fields and track to the public, including University employees and others, because of alleged vandalism and unauthorized use;

Whereas, Clemson University is a public institution supported by state and federal funds and the area in question has been a multiple-use recreation area for over 20 years;

Whereas, Alleged vandalism does not appear to exceed that which occurs in any other public-use area of the campus or city;

Whereas, "Swing gates" or other devices could be installed to prevent overuse of inside lanes on the track and ensure wear of entire track surface;

Whereas, Other land-grant institutions rarely restrict public use of track facilities;

Whereas, This action would restrict outside groups such as YMCA, Special Olympics, and High Schools, and does not foster good University-Community relations and is totally out of line with practices at peer institutions;

Whereas, This action contradicts the University wellness challenge by denying access to an area used daily by many University employees;

Whereas, This area is used extensively by women and the elderly and is one of the few open, safe areas available for exercise and recreation;

Whereas, The University Administration and the Athletic Department attempted to undertake this action at a time when opposition would be minimal and without any input from students, faculty, or staff;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate of Clemson University strongly urges the Administration and the Athletic Department to negotiate with a representative or representatives of the faculty a mutually agreeable solution to assure public access to these properties and facilities.
THE FACULTY SENATE
DID NOT MEET
JULY 1989
1. **Call to Order.** President Halfacre called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The minutes of June 13, 1989, were approved as distributed.

3. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      - **Policy Committee.** On behalf of Senator Milstead, Senator Wetsel presented the goals of the committee for the current year (Attachment A).
      - **Research Committee.** Senator Christenbury presented the report of the committee in the absence of Chairman Young (Attachment B).
      - **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Kosinski presented the committee's goals for the current year (Attachment C). The committee will vote on whether or not the issue of plus/minus grading will be studied.
      - **Welfare Committee.** Senator Kennedy presented the goals for the committee for 1989-90 (Attachment D). Additional items that may be considered by the committee include allowing unused sick leave to be rolled over into retirement and monitoring faculty/administration salary increases.
   b. **University Commissions and Committees.**
      - **Traffic Accident Review Board.** Senator Zehr reported that if a University employee is at fault in damage to a University vehicle, the cost of repair up to $200 may be passed on to the department. The department head has the option of passing the charges on to the employee.
For departments that have vehicles under their own jurisdiction, if an employee has an accident with one of those vehicles, then the department must bear the cost of repair and the department head may be encouraged to assess the employee involved a sum up to $200.

Any faculty using motor pool vehicles should check the car each time prior to use as charges may be made for dents.

4. President's Report (Attachment E). Oral Remarks: President Halfacre pointed out the amounts for compensation as stated in the President's Report are preliminary. A final report is expected within a month. The amount for faculty salary adjustments is $800,000, and for Classified staff $572,000.

President Lennon plans to schedule discussion groups with faculty during the year. He has called a meeting on August 25 with present and former Faculty Senate Presidents.

Changes in the Faculty Manual, approved by the Faculty Senate in June, have been forwarded to the Provost.

5. Old Business

a. Discussion on Allocation of Salary Adjustments. President Halfacre reported that the recommendations of the University Committee on Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits with regard to salary adjustments were not followed in some colleges. He called for comments and questions.

Senator Zehr said that, since there were only two departments of Plant Pathology in the survey on which the allocation formula was based, the sample was misleading and had a negative impact in that department. President Halfacre requested that individual faculty members or department heads work with the committee on problems arising from misleading samples in the survey.

Senator Louderback asked for clarification on how the funds should have been allocated within the colleges.

President Halfacre will write Professor Albert, Chair of the Committee on Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits, and request the committee to follow up on the salary allocations process.
b. **Update on Core Curriculum Study.** Senator Louderback reported that core curricula in approximately 20 peer institutions have less constrained choices than Clemson. The Scholastic Policies Committee will continue to study the issue of the core curriculum.

c. **Resolution II on the Closure of Old Seneca Lagoon and Bottom Land.** Senator Kennedy withdrew the resolution on behalf of the Welfare Committee because of additional hours of availability of the track. He reported the area currently is open from 6:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., except on weekends and during football practice. Beginning in the spring, the area will be open during the week until 8:00 p.m. and on four or five Saturdays mornings to be announced in advance.

Senator McGuire raised questions with regard to reasons for closing the area, the authority of the Athletic Department in closing the area, and the extent of the alleged vandalism. He pointed out that the track and the bottom land are two distinct areas in terms of potential for vandalism.

d. **Name Blocks for Faculty Senators.** President Halfacre called attention to the sample name block prepared by Senator Hogan. There followed discussion regarding alternatives in the wording. Final decision was left to the discretion of the Faculty Senate President.

6. **New Business**

a. **Initiation of study of administrative leadership at the department level.** President Halfacre said that some faculty have requested a study of administrative leadership at the department level at Clemson and peer universities (i.e., Department Head versus Chair). Following a brief discussion, President Halfacre requested the Policy Committee to proceed with the study.

b. **Breakfast meeting with the Board of Trustees.** President Halfacre reported that the Executive/Advisory Committee approved a breakfast meeting with the Trustees on September 23 at 9:00 a.m. at the Clemson House. The purpose is to initiate communication between the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate.

c. **Review of draft of smoking policy.** President Halfacre presented a draft of the smoking policy submitted by May
Thompson, Personnel Director (Attachment F). The Executive/Advisory Committee requested the following addition under III. A: "Common areas (except in designated smoking-permitted areas) such as lobbies... ."

Senator Kosinski requested the following addition under II. A: "In enclosed offices only when occupied by one employee and that employee permits smoking and confines smoking to the area."

President Halfacre will request the Director of Personnel to make these additions to the policy.

d. Other.

Senator Murr reported that the heating and air conditioning system in the Cooper Library remains inefficient. The Provost has been requested to allocate funds to upgrade the facilities.

President Halfacre said that Senator Parr Rosson is leaving the University to take a position in Texas.

Faculty Senate President Halfacre will meet with President Lennon on August 18 to discuss issues of importance to the faculty. Senators having matters to be called to the attention of the President or other members of the Administration are requested to notify President Halfacre.

7. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

Kenneth R. Murr, Secretary

Margaret Cannon, Staff Secretary

REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
AUGUST 8, 1989

The goals of the Policy Committee for this year are:

1. Develop a policy for treatment of visiting faculty vis-a-vis housing assistance, etc.

2. Develop a policy on selling of complimentary copies of textbooks.

Currently the number of textbook authors who are faculty is being determined. Examination of the proposed policy of the Textbook Authors' Association and the Association of American Publishers is taking place.

3. Follow up on the Faculty Evaluation of Administrators resolution passed in last year's Senate and its implementation.

The Senate's proposed policy was discussed, and a response was sent to Provost Maxwell. The response seems to be on the Provost's desk, and he has been on leave for the last several days. When he returns, the Chair of the Policy Committee will contact the Provost regarding the issue and report to the Senate at the next meeting.

4. Follow up on the implementation of the $50.00 per faculty member for professional development, i.e., payment for journals, etc.

5. Formulate a policy on the Department Head versus Chair system.
The Research Committee of the Faculty Senate will address the following issues for 1989-90:

* Review the objectives and selection criteria for the Provost and URGC Awards with VP for Research Gogue.

* Study allocation of funds from graduate student enrollments with reference to at least two concerns:
  - Dispersal of CHE funds allocated per graduate student to each appropriate department;
  - Allocation of additional funds generated from the minimum 12 semester hours of credits.

* Finalize survey of various Colleges on policies for return of indirect costs generated by research grants.

* Assess the post-doctoral (research associate) program of Clemson University.

* Reassess recommendation to survey other universities to determine Clemson's competitive position on indirect cost rates/determination.

* Work with the Library to identify types, levels of needs and alternatives for services during holiday periods.
Scholastic Policies Committee

Report of the June Meeting

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on 6 June at 3:30 PM in the Jordan Room. The major item of business was deciding on which issues we would study this year. After consideration of a list of nine possible issues supplied by the chairman and three others suggested by members, we decided that we would devote our attention to the following problems:

Tracking the implementation of the Senate's continuing enrollment proposal (recently approved by the Academic Council, and on its way to being signed by President Lennon);

Concluding our study, begun last year, of methods for rewarding innovative teaching and advising;

Determining the extent to which other comparable universities employ core curricula, and considering whether Clemson should attempt to implement a core curriculum;

The possibility of moving the first drop date to or before the last add date. This would prevent students who know they are going to drop a class from taking places from students who need the class;

Plus/minus grading.

After the members were assigned to subcommittees, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.

Robert Kosinski
Chairman
WELFARE COMMITTEE

Goals for 1989-90

1. Equity pay raises
2. Health Insurance
3. Tuition aid for dependents

Other items recommended for consideration

1. Summer salaries
2. Day care
3. Merit raises for classified staff
PRESIDENT'S REPORT
AUGUST 1989

1. The State budget for higher education (1989-90) reflects 91.3% formula funding. Despite requests from Clemson and other State institutions for special funding to bring faculty salaries up to Southeastern averages, no new State funds were appropriated for this purpose. The Clemson University administration, however, reallocated funds to provide an average pay increase of 6.8% for the faculty as a group. I have asked Vice President Larson for information on salary adjustment averages for administrators and classified employees of the University. This information is forthcoming.

2. It was indicated at the Dean's Council by Provost Maxwell that the administration is working on a response to the study on administrative growth prepared by the Faculty Senate this past year. According to input from faculty, administrative growth is a primary concern at both college and division levels.

3. President Lennon has scheduled an open discussion with myself and former Faculty Senate Presidents on August 25.

4. Mr. Louis P. Batson, Jr., was re-elected Chairman of the Board of Trustees at the meeting on July 15.

5. The Clemson Interactive Video Institute (CIVI), a private company in partnership with the University, will bring interactive video to classrooms at Clemson. Interactive video technology, created by AT&T, allows a student to interact with computer software through touch-sensitive screens. AT&T has transferred exclusive license for developing, maintaining, and marketing interactive video systems to CIVI through the Clemson University Research Foundation.

6. Appreciation is expressed to Provost Maxwell for allocating funds for new furnishings in the Faculty Senate office.

7. Appreciation is also expressed to Senator Hogan, who designed and produced the new name blocks for Faculty Senators.
RESOLUTION CALLING FOR AN IMMEDIATE INCREASE IN SUMMER SCHOOL SALARIES

Based on projected income from this summer school tuition and fees, an increase in summer school compensation of approximately 17% was requested. The Provost announced to the Deans' Council that the administration is considering an increase of 2.75% to 3.0% per lecture hour.

RESOLUTION ON RESTORING FUNDS TO STATE HEALTH CARE PLAN

The Faculty Senate calls for the restoration of funds withdrawn from the State Health Care Plan, plus accrued interest, prior to any changes in the premiums or benefits being implemented in the Plan. Resolution forwarded to the Governor and the appropriate members of the Legislature.

RESOLUTION ON CLOSURE OF OLD SENECA RIVER LAGOON AND BOTTOM LAND

The Faculty Senate urged the Administration and the Athletic Department to negotiate with the Chair of the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee a mutually agreeable solution to assure public access to these properties and facilities. The Athletic Department agreed to open the facilities through August 23 from 7:30 a.m. to 6 p.m., except Saturdays & Sundays and during varsity practice. A subsequent schedule will be announced in the fall.
STATUS OF FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

FS87-12-3 P  RESOLUTION ON CONTINUING ENROLLMENT POLICY
Major items call for checking students' academic progress in December and May and replacing GPR step-function for continuing enrollment with a continuous curve. Approved by Academic Council.

FS89-1-2 P  SUMMER SCHOOL SALARIES: A STATEMENT AND PROPOSAL
JANUARY 1989
The Welfare Committee recommended a phased-in increase in summer school compensation. The Provost responded that the pay rate could not be altered this Summer, but would consider the plan for subsequent summers. He pointed out, however, that these increases may impact on other programs within the institution. Senator Baron and President Nowaczek met with Vice Provost Reel and Budget Director Roberts to discuss the development of a plan to increase the rate for summer school compensation.

FS89-3-1 P  SENATE REPORT ON PRIORITY LIST FOR FRINGE BENEFITS
The Welfare Committee presented a prioritized list of fringe benefit requests of the faculty. Based on a survey of the faculty, the list included changes to the state retirement plan along with increases in life insurance and tuition waivers for faculty dependents. The Provost and Administration have received the report.

FS89-3-2 P  RESOLUTION ON FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS
Adding to current policy on evaluation of academic administrators, the resolution calls for administrator responsible for evaluation to identify the number and distribution of faculty for review of an academic administrator and to then allow the faculty to elect their representatives and for a summary report to be provided to the faculty. The Provost will use faculty input in evaluating deans. With regard to the Provost's evaluation.
SMOKING POLICY

It is the responsibility of Clemson University to provide a safe and healthy environment as possible for its students, faculty, staff, and visitors. In an effort to achieve this goal, the following policy is adopted:

I. It will be the responsibility of the Deans of the various colleges or the senior administrative official in the area to designate in each building specific areas and/or offices as smoking areas.

II. Smoking is permitted:
   A. In enclosed offices only when occupied by one employee and that employee permits smoking.
   B. In specific designated areas. Signs shall be conspicuously placed to identify the area as a "Smoking Permitted" area.

III. Smoking will be prohibited in:
   A. Common areas such as lobbies, classrooms, auditoriums, conference rooms, labs, open office space, hallways, and general enclosed areas.
   B. All areas where flammable liquids, gasses, oxygen, or other flammable materials are present.
1. Call to Order. President Halfacre called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

2. Special Order of the Day. President Halfacre introduced Mr. Nick Lomax, Vice President for Student Affairs, who responded to questions provided him prior to the meeting and questions from the floor.

What is being done to avoid the regularly recurring "surprise" of unexpectedly large enrollment, and what can be done to minimize the impact of large enrollment on our facilities?

Mr. Lomax: The goal for this year's freshman class was 2600-2800, and 2900 students enrolled. This is approximately 15 more students than enrolled last year. As early as April it became apparent that some new factors would influence the size of the freshman class; for example, the Clemson Scholars Program brought in approximately 50 more students, and offering on-campus housing to more freshmen generated an increase in enrollment. There was also an increase in applications.

It is possible to reduce the size of the freshman class. If the freshman class is decreased by 300 students, it must be determined which colleges will be decreased accordingly. Mr. Lomax added, "Someone else will have to give us that decision. We will handle the mechanics."

Has any consideration been given to starting activities for freshman a few days before the arrival of the rest of the students?

Mr. Lomax: We can see some desirability from a programming standpoint to bring in students early. There are problems in opening up residence halls and monitoring which students can come in earlier than others. The summer school session ends one week before the start of the fall session, and it would be very difficult to get housing ready in time for students arriving early.
Has any consideration been given to prohibiting freshmen from pledging fraternities and sororities during their first semester?

Mr. Lomax: We recognize there are some negative aspects of the Rush Season, but we still feel the Greek system is an asset to the University. The staff in Student Development is monitoring problems related to sororities and fraternities, and utilizing student leaders and faculty advisors to prevent students in these organizations from becoming involved in undesirable activities.

Has any consideration been given to making regular class attendance a condition for participation in athletic events?

Mr. Lomax: If a student athlete has less than a 2.0 GPR or that athlete is a freshman, he is required to be involved in a tutoring program. The academic advisors to the athletic program check with faculty, and many faculty are very cooperative in letting those individuals know whether or not the students are attending classes.

At the present time, the psychological counseling services may refuse to counsel a foreign student because they disclaim knowledge of the student's culture. What is being done to provide foreign students with the same psychological services as native students?

Mr. Lomax: Clemson does not have a policy that gives the counseling staff in Redfern or in the Counseling Center an option as to the counseling of international students. Occasionally assistance is needed in counseling students from different cultures. At the Counseling Center there is a staff member who concentrates in this area. Anyone knowing of an international student being refused counseling is requested to contact Mr. Lomax.

The recent Resolution on Fike Center uniform service called for fair and equitable costs. A report assessed these costs as approximately $15 per year, based on data from the operation of the center. The Recreation Director, without resource to data, developed an ad hoc estimate of $50 for the costs of uniform service. It seems that the adoption of the ad hoc, unsupported estimate was done arbitrarily by the Vice President for Student Affairs. Please comment.
Mr. Lomax replied, "I would defend my decision. . . . I think Dr. Pope is an outstanding Director of Intramural Programs. He did a study; he made a recommendation to our office." The recommendation was carefully considered, and the $50.00 fee for uniform service was approved.

Mr. Lomax said the Recreation Advisory Committee should review the issue through the year. The first year's experience should provide some good data to be evaluated at the conclusion of the year. If at any time during the current year the Recreation Advisory Committee wants to make a recommendation to the Office of Student Affairs, it will be given careful consideration.

The Vice President for Student Affairs makes some appropriations which have impact on the "education of the whole person." For example, the University's support for the Concert Series comes through the Office of Student Affairs. Since virtually no one on the staff of Student Affairs has any direct educational background for such evaluations, do you seek counsel for such evaluations?

Mr. Lomax: The Office of Student Affairs has not been involved in allocations for the Concert Series for the past three years. When the Department of Performing Arts was formed, the Concert Series were put under that department.

Please summarize the responsibilities of your position.

Mr. Lomax: The responsibilities of the Office of Student Affairs covers three major offices: Admissions and Registration, the Dean of Students, and the Director of Athletics. Mr. Lomax said, "Our mission is to support in every way we possibly can the academic programs of the University and to assist the students and assure their success through all the services and programs you heard me describe."

Mr. Lomax provided the Faculty Senate with the organizational chart of the Division of Student Affairs (Attachment A).

Why was the Rugby field changed from general parking to IPTAY parking for football games and did the change in designation go before the Traffic and Parking Committee?
Mr. Lomax: To my knowledge the use of any athletic field for parking has not gone before the Traffic and Parking Committee. I acknowledge that the change in designation had created concern by the University community and others attending football games.

You mentioned that the Greek system is an asset to the University. How do you justify that in terms of segregation within the Greek system? Do you have a problem with that?

Mr. Lomax: I have problems with any group on the campus that is not open to all races. While the University has strong black sorority and fraternity groups, there are organizations on the campus that by composition are not mixed. The staff in Student Development is addressing the problem. There have been black members in predominately white Greek organizations, but the number has been small.

Universities "walk a very delicate line" with Greek organizations, and sometimes it is difficult to see the benefits of these organizations to the institution. At Clemson, I believe that the leadership of the Greek organizations strives toward making a contribution to the University and the community. Any student organization that does not abide by the rules of the governing boards or those of the administration could incur penalties that would include withdrawal of their charter.

How much has your staff grown in the last several years?

Mr. Lomax: "I cannot tell you if you want to know a percentage. I believe if you made a comparison of Clemson with similar institutions, you would find that the Student Affairs staff at Clemson has not grown as much as it has at other Universities." He added, "We want to continue to provide the personalized treatment and support services and programs that I think Clemson students demand. We have increased the numbers, but hopefully retained the high quality of student services and programs."

When decisions are made about increasing enrollment, are you working with the city on the effect of that increase on the infrastructure?

Mr. Lomax: The joint City-University Task Force was developed about three years ago, and the lines of communication
are open. The city is aware that the University has been growing. Like the University, sometimes the city has to adjust to growth rather than plan for growth.

**Why has there been so much interest in off-campus housing?**

Mr. Lomax: While I believe in on-campus housing, a decision had to be made to solve a problem and something had to be sacrificed. The living/learning environment in Johnstone Hall has been a problem for many years. The time has come to bring Johnstone Hall up to the quality that is expected at the University. If the program continues to work and juniors and seniors continue to live off campus, the project can be accomplished.

3. **Approval of Minutes.** The Minutes of August 8, 1989, were approved as distributed.

4. **Committee Reports**

   **Policy Committee.** Senator Luedeman reported the Association of Department Heads has suggested changes in the policy proposed last year by the Faculty Senate on the evaluation of department heads. At the next meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Policy Committee will submit a revised policy on the evaluation of Department Heads.

   The committee has considered the merits of the department head versus the chair. It would appear that the department head system works well in some departments, but is not satisfactory in others.

   The Policy Committee will meet at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, September 26, Room E-202, Martin Hall, to hear concerns related to this issue. Senators and other Faculty are encouraged to participate in the meeting.

   The treatment of visiting faculty and the problems of administrative growth continue under consideration by the Policy Committee. The committee will also consider whether all decisions with regard to parking should go through the Traffic and Parking Committee.

   **Research Committee.** Chairman Young presented the report of the committee (Attachment B).
Scholastic Policies Committee. Chairman Kosinski discussed the report of the committee included with the agenda packet. (Attachment C).

Welfare Committee. Senator Harris, on behalf Chairman Kennedy, presented the report of the Welfare Committee (Attachment D)

b. University Commissions and Committees.

Senator Kosinski reported the Commission on Undergraduate Studies is considering changes in the exams schedule and received a progress report on the publication of the exam schedule with the registration booklet. The commission discussed the implementation of the Continuing Enrollment Policy, which has been signed by President Lennon.

Senator Kosinski said Dr. George Carter reported to the commission on the success of the Scientific and Technology Enrichment Program (STEP). In the first year there was an increase over the predicted GPR's and a satisfactory retention rate of students in the program.

Senator Kosinski reviewed "Tentative Problem List Associated with Increased Enrollment, 1989" (Attachment E). The report was submitted to the Academic Council on September 4.

5. President's Report (Attachment F). Oral Remarks: President Halfacre said a final report on funds for salary adjustments will be received in October. It appears the average pay increase for faculty will be approximately 7%. It is expected the Classified Staff will receive an average increase of 6.2%. Deans, directors, department heads, executives, and other unclassified employees will average 6.5%. Bonuses approved by the State Legislature will be received December 8.

President Halfacre expressed appreciation to Senator Hogan, of the College of Architecture, for the loan to the Faculty Senate Office of a print of a submission for the Academia Bridge portion of the Bienalle Competition in Venice, Italy.

Senator McGuire expressed concern that, due to the STEP program, it would appear the University has had a dramatic increase of students making below 800 on the SAT. President Halfacre will requested Dr. Skelton, Vice President for
Admissions and Registration, to identify the number of STEP students and Clemson Scholars in the various colleges.

6. Old Business

a. Resolution on Selling of Complimentary Textbooks. Senator Luedeman, Chair of the Policy Committee, presented the resolution from the Committee.

There followed discussion on the definition of "unprofessional conduct" and problems related to the sale of complimentary textbooks.

Resolution on Selling of Complimentary Textbooks (FS87-9-1 P) (Attachment G) was approved.

b. Resolution on Compensation Beginning Date. Senator Luedeman presented the resolution from the committee. He removed from both Resolves the phrase, "be allowed to." President Halfacre accepted the deletions as editorial changes.

Senator Kosinski moved to delete the third Whereas as follows: "Whereas, The failure to honor this commitment has caused morale problems within the faculty;" Senator Ryan seconded. The motion carried.

The Resolution, as amended, on Compensation Beginning Date (FS89-9-2 P) (Attachment H) was approved.

c. Report from ad_hoc Committee to Study Faculty Senates at Other Universities. Senator Dunn said the committee is receiving input from past Faculty Senate Presidents and Standing Committee Chairs regarding a questionnaire to be mailed to various universities. Any Senators having items for the questionnaire are requested to contact Senator Dunn.

d. Report on gifts to the Centennial Professorship. Senator Dunn reported gifts in the amount of $44,647 to the Fund for the Centennial Professorship.

7. New Business

a. Report on the Progress of Investigation of Possible Violations of NCAA Rules. President Halfacre introduced former Faculty Senate President Joe Mullins, Chair of the Clemson
University Panel. Dr. Mullins said his remarks would not be in the form of a progress report. Cooperation with the NCAA means keeping all findings confidential. Therefore, the panel will make no progress reports or give out any information.

He expressed appreciation for the excellent work of the other members of the panel, Ben Anderson, Almeda Jacks and Cecil Huey, and for the complete cooperation of the administration in providing all information requested by the panel.

Dr. Mullins asked Faculty Senators for help by reporting any violations of NCAA as many violations occur in academics.

b. Faculty_Rights_and_Tenure_Teleconference.
President Halfacre said that the Clemson Chapter of the American Association of University Professors has asked the Faculty Senate to join in sponsoring and publicizing the teleconference to be broadcast on October 11. Discussion followed regarding the Senate's need for more information before agreeing to cosponsor the teleconference.

Senator LeBlanc moved that the Senate help to publicize the teleconference but not cosponsor the program because full information is not available at this time. Senator Dunn seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Other

Senator Murr requested that parking problems related to the closing off of the Rugby field before football games be referred to the Welfare Committee. Senator Luedeman suggested the issue be referred to the Policy Committee to enable a possible University policy requiring that all matters related to parking and traffic go through the Traffic and Parking Committee. The Senate agreed to refer the issue to the Policy Committee.

President Halfacre requested members of the Faculty Senate to submit nominations for the Selection Committee of the Centennial Professorship not later than September 25 (Attachment I).

President Halfacre announced that Provost Maxwell and Vice President Larson will participate in the meeting of the Faculty Senate on October 10 under the Special Order of the Day. Questions for Dr. Maxwell and Mr. Larson should be sent to the Faculty Senate office or to any member of the Executive/Advisory
Committee of the Faculty Senate not later than September 28. Senator Ryan requested that follow up questions be allowed under the Special Order of the Day. The Senate was in agreement, provided time limits are observed.

Senator Gaddis expressed concern regarding the two-hour mandatory meeting on the insurance program for persons being reenrolled. He asked that a representative of the Senate contact the insurance representative and request that the representative have two hours of information before requiring Faculty to sign up for two hours of mandatory attendance.

8. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 5:19 p.m.

Members absent: W. J. Kennedy, A. Madison (E. Hare attended), R. Meiners, W. Stringer (Thomas attended).
RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT

September, 1989

Research Committee issues for the 1989-90 year were assessed and agreed upon during the month of August. The list of these issues has been published in the Clemson Senate Special, 7 September 1989.

Faculty senators Ken Murr, Eldon Zehr, Bill Stringer, Ed Pivorun and Roy Young visited the Clemson Apparel Plant in Pendleton, SC on Friday, 25 August 1989. Dr. Chris Jarvis hosted us for a very interesting tour. This facility is unique in that it brings the University into a strong partnership with government and industry, both the textile producer and the manufacturer of state-of-the-art textile machinery. By consignment and purchase, the facility offers demonstration and training on the latest automated equipment for the textile industry. Several workshops and training programs are being offered in addition to tours of a functional, automated plant that is fully operative on Fridays. Although, originally designated $3 million by the Department of Defense, the Plant has already been allocated nearly $5 million for a 3-year period. In addition, several research grants have been received in the College of Commerce and Industry through the existence of this facility and its programs. Approximately 200 guests per month are touring the plant at this time.
September Report of the 
Scholastic Policies Committee

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on 29 August. The major items discussed were curriculum reform, measures which might ameliorate the recurring student overload of our classrooms and other facilities, and plus/minus grading.

On curriculum reform, Senator Louderback presented the results of his survey of the "core" curricula (or absence thereof) in 28 other institutions (these data were presented to the August meeting of the Senate). There was general agreement that Clemson's General Education Requirements need work, and the way the Committee should approach this thorny problem was the subject of a long discussion. Finally we agreed that every committee member should submit a list of his/her misgivings about the present system at the next meeting.

At the Academic Council meeting on 28 August, the President expressed concern about the number of students who were being closed out of needed courses. That afternoon, Dr. Jerry Reel convened an ad hoc committee of registration personnel, student leaders and Senator Kosinski to recommend ways to avoid this problem and the general overcrowding of campus facilities. Senator Kosinski reported their conclusions so far to the committee, and the committee recommended the additional suggestions on the attached memo.

After a short discussion, the committee voted unanimously that we will not pursue adoption of plus/minus grading this year.

Robert Kosinski
Chairman
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE WELFARE COMMITTEE
AUGUST 30, 1989

Meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. Present were Senators: Thompson; Carney; Christenbury; Harris; LeBlanc; and Kennedy, chair.

Main discussion items were the equity raise, health insurance, tuition benefits for dependents, and the conversion of some sick leave to annual leave upon retirement.

The next meeting date was set for September 27, at 3:30 p.m. in the Conference Room (LL3), Cooper Library.

Action items:

Health Care: LeBlanc, Christenbury, and Carney: Look at benefits offered by insurers other than Blue Cross, determine the health benefits offered by schools comparable to Clemson or by neighboring states, and determine what items are not covered by our Blue Cross but generally covered by other insurers.

Harris: Consider what new policy options might be practical to reduce the maximum amount that a family might pay, such as through the use of larger deductibles but no co-payment.

Leave options: Carney: Determine the present legislative state of the 25-year retirement option and of the option to convert some sick leave to annual leave upon retirement.

Tuition relief: Thompson: Develop a questionnaire or letter to send to other states or schools to determine the costs and benefits associated with faculty/staff dependent tuition reductions as applied in other schools.

Kennedy: Discuss above matters with Ron Herrin and Dick Simmons and invite them to our next meeting. Disseminate information on comparative benefits. Note: This material is attached.
TENTATIVE PROBLEM LIST ASSOCIATED WITH INCREASED ENROLLMENT 1989

1. There is a distinct feeling in several colleges that the budgeting process does not adequately address the cost of teaching; or that the priorities of the colleges and/or the upper administration may not put undergraduate education first.

2. The overlarge freshman classes over the past three years have carried the seriously impacted colleges, (i.e., Commerce and Industry, Liberal Arts, and Sciences,) beyond the margin, and to a lesser extent, Education and Engineering have also been impacted.
1. A smaller freshman class, recognizing the goals of increasing minority enrollment and the needs of the colleges that are presently under enrolled.

2. Since these enrollment problems seem to have a regularly recurring feature of Clemson life, rather than routinely using emergency money to hire temporary instructors, the University should hire additional tenure-track faculty. These faculty will build programs rather than merely solving short-term enrollment crises.

3. If forecasting is indicating a larger freshman class than expected, additional money should be available as early as possible, at least in June.

4. Consider releasing the schedule of those students who are deficient but who have not appealed or enrolled in summer sessions by mid July.

5. Print drop-add procedures in registration booklet and orient all new students to the process at orientation sessions.

6. Centralize add-drop through on-line process. It would be necessary to develop software that accommodates a waiting list. Preference should be given to students with incomplete schedules.
7. Amend sophomore literature/humanities requirements to make plain the fact that these can alternate with each other.

8. A method must be found to discourage deliberate enrollment of students in more courses than they intend to take, and to encourage early drops by students who do over enroll.

9. Examine summer schedule to see if it can be tightened allowing an extra day.
MAJOR AREAS KNOWN TO HAVE BEEN OVERCROWDED

I. Commerce and Industry
   1. Management upper division
   2. Accounting - teaching over large classes

II. Education
   1. Education 103 - 6 sections short

III. Engineering
   1. E Graphics - 100 unscheduled
   2. Engr 180 - tight

IV. Liberal Arts
   1. English 102 - 33 unscheduled
   2. Sophomore literature now full but there were plenty of seats at registration unknown because of deletion list. (There is a policy matter concerning choice from amongst the series).
   3. Advanced Communication - a large number (60-100) in each field unscheduled
   4. Philosophy 344 - 60 unscheduled

V. Sciences
   1. Chemistry - 100 unscheduled
      Most shifted to 2nd choice
   2. Math Science - teaching 106 in classes of 100 or more
      301 - 3 sections short
   3. Zoology - very crowded
   4. Astronomy - 100 unscheduled
1. The Wage and Salary Administration Office has provided the following preliminary update on compensation for 1989-90. A final report will be available in October.

Average pay increase of approximately 7% was allocated to the faculty as a group. This required $800,000 of E&G funds and $472,212 of PSA funds in addition to funds provided by the legislature for salary increases effective October 1.

Staff (classified employees) will average pay increases of approximately 6.2% as a group. In addition to State increases of 4%, the 6.2% includes $575,000 allocated by the University for E&G reclassifications and reallocations. Additional funds from PSA and auxiliaries will be used to reclassify personnel in these areas.

Deans, directors, department heads, executive compensation, and other unclassified employees will average approximately 6.5% as a group. In addition to State increases, the University allocated $387,394 for these pay adjustments.

All employees will receive a bonus December 8th, $286 for employees making $20,000 or less annually and $143 for employees making $20,000 or more annually. This is not included in the above averages, and will cost the University approximately $800,000.

2. At the Cabinet meeting on August 28, President Lennon expressed concern about the number of students who were being closed out of courses they needed. Vice Provost Reel has appointed an ad hoc committee of registration personnel, student leaders, and Senator Kosinski to recommend ways to correct this problem. The results of this committee's findings will be presented by Senator Kosinski at the Faculty Senate meeting.

3. The attached admissions update was presented by Dean Skelton at the Academic Council meeting on September 4 (Attachments A,B,C). President Lennon stated that enrollment management will be studied in detail over the next month to provide guidance for the Admissions Office for the upcoming year.
4. The Council of Presidents of S. C. Universities, chaired by President Lennon, has been considering the possibility of adding quality incentive components to the CHE appropriations formula. This initiative is an effort to make our funding from the State not only enrollment driven, but also reflect quality of the educational services that the University provides. The CHE is working with the Council on this approach.

5. Attached are the sub-committees of the Strategic Planning Committee (Attachment D).

6. Dean Waller was reelected at the Council of Deans meeting August 21 to represent the Deans on the Faculty Manual Revision Committee.

7. The Vending Machine Committee approved funds for the Faculty Senate breakfast with the Board of Trustees on Saturday, September 23 at the Clemson House.
RESOLUTION ON SELLING OF COMPLIMENTARY TEXTBOOKS
FS89-9-1 P

Whereas, The selling of complimentary copies of text materials adversely affects the academic community by increasing the upward pressure on prices that students must pay for books, whether new or used;

Whereas, Such sale of free copies deprives publishers and authors of rightful revenue;

Whereas, Such sale of free copies reduces the incentive for writing and producing quality texts;

Whereas, Such sale of free copies is beneath the standard of decorum expected of faculty members in higher education; and

Whereas, Faculty members should be aware that book buyers on the Clemson Campus are required to obtain University permission in order to do business on campus;

Resolved, That the selling of complimentary copies of text materials by any employee of Clemson University is unprofessional conduct.
RESOLUTION ON COMPENSATION BEGINNING DATE
FS89-9-2 P

Whereas, The payment of salary adjustment monies for unclassified faculty will not be effective until October 1, 1989;

Whereas, This delay forces the University to break its promise to adjust faculty salaries upward effective July 1, 1989, for 12-month faculty and August 15, 1989, for 9-month faculty;

Whereas, This delay has left the faculty of Clemson University further behind their peers in salary;

Whereas, This delay further compounds the difficulties we already have in recruiting and retaining well qualified faculty;

Resolved, That the University pay the salary adjustment monies to unclassified faculty effective July 1, 1989, for 12-month faculty and August 15, 1989, for 9-month faculty; and

Resolved, That in the future the University pay all salary increases to unclassified faculty effective July 1 for 12-month faculty and August 15 for 9-month faculty.
NOMINATIONS
SELECTION COMMITTEE
CENTENNIAL PROFESSORSHIP

1. One member of the committee selected from the list of named professorship faculty.

2. One member selected from a list of faculty having some administrative responsibility.

3. Two members will be selected to assure that the complete committee contains a representative from each of the teaching, research, and service functions of Clemson University.

Please return to Margaret Cannon, Faculty Senate Office, Room B-2, Cooper Library, not later than Tuesday, September 19, 1989.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
OCTOBER 10, 1989

1. **Call to Order.** President Halfacre called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

2. **Special Order of the Day.** President Halfacre introduced Provost David Maxwell, who responded to questions provided him prior to the meeting and questions from the floor.

   **Explain the "Performance Incentive" program presently being considered for use in the formula funding of Higher Education in South Carolina.**

   Provost Maxwell: "I do not consider this imminent." In some states it was felt by presidents of the institutions that perhaps performance incentive was a way of securing additional funding from the legislatures. In addition, the legislatures wanted more information to show that the colleges and universities are doing what they are supposed to do. This year the Council of Presidents in this state has become interested in the topic, and there is also some interest in the Legislature.

   The State already has a form of performance funding. Clemson receives from the legislature a certain amount of money for each student with an SAT of over 1200. In some states there are devices which provide increased funding to the institution, based on a number of "performance" measures. Points for accredited programs, alumni surveys, effectiveness of majors, etc., result in additional funding.

   It would appear that performance funding is not imminent in this state because by its design the program would permit comparisons between the institutions. There is opposition to that occurrence. At the present time the Commission on Higher Education is opposed to performance funding.

   **Who decides how many freshmen are admitted each year, and how large the University will be allowed to grow? What are the roles of the Administration and the Colleges in this determination?**
Provost Maxwell: The President and the Vice Presidents set a target for the size of the incoming freshman class. The Admissions Office, with input from others in the Administration, sets a cut off for projected GPR's that would presumably bring a freshman class about the size that has been targeted. The projected cut offs are submitted to each dean for consideration. The deans and the Admissions Office arrive at the projected GPR's. There is a band beneath the projected GPR's into which the colleges may dip later if projected enrollment is not being met. There is also an Admissions Committee with representation from each college.

Admissions is not an exact science. One of its most volatile elements is the yield rate. That generally runs about 50%. The yield rate, however, has increased by as much as 10% in one year.

**How many special admissions are there?**

Provost Maxwell referred the inquirer to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

**How can you control transfers (from one college to another)?**

Provost Maxwell: Deans control transfers from one college to another college. Transfer students from other institutions historically have been in a residual category. In the future transfers may be more important to the University than they have been in the past. There is an obligation to some transfer students. Some students apply here, are denied admission, but are given the possibility of transfer if they do well in specified courses elsewhere.

**How large will the University be allowed to grow?**

Provost Maxwell: A firm policy has not been adopted. If the University becomes too large, the undergraduate experience will become diluted. On the other hand, the mission of Clemson University as a land-grant, service-oriented institution is serving all the people in this state.

The Strategic Planning Committee has as one of its thrusts the quality of the undergraduate experience. A second committee, comprised largely of students but also including members of the administration, will pursue that subject and report by the end of the academic year.
What steps are being taken to give departments the extra faculty they need to cope with larger enrollments?

Provost Maxwell: The question would have been answered differently several years ago. Under block funding the college deans have great latitude in the use of funds, and they are responsible for hiring their faculty. The colleges get credit for the additional student credit hours produced. Therefore, the block grant does not stay the same from year to year.

Does the University have any plans to eliminate the weak programs and redistribute their budgets to more productive programs?

Provost Maxwell: Several years ago a study indicated a number of programs that should have been eliminated. There was, however, tremendous opposition to eliminating or consolidating certain Ph.D. programs. There has been very little progress in eliminating the weak programs and shifting those resources to the stronger programs.

Have any programs been eliminated in the last five years?

Provost Maxwell: "Not that I recall."

Would the Engineering Technology Program fall under that category?

Provost Maxwell: Yes. That was a decision within the college and was desired by the college.

Are there restrictions on academic freedom with respect to academic research topics?

Provost Maxwell: "The only ones that I know of, and of which I would approve, are those that have to do with national security." There is a time limit within which certain dissertations cannot be published. That is defensible.

Are Deans and/or department heads permitted to discourage research into controversial policy areas?

Provost Maxwell: "They should not be. We do not agree with that...If anybody is doing it, I would like to know about it."
What can be done if such discouragement is suspected or can be documented?

Provost Maxwell: "If it can be documented... I would like to know about it."

What can administrators do if particular faculty publications or statements may interfere with fund raising efforts?

Provost Maxwell: "We are not here to raise money, and we have this happen all the time. We always have somebody whose view of a leading industry is such that it does not make us friends with that industry, but I think that is part of the price we pay. I do think the person involved ought to be aware of this."

In your opinion what are the advantages of a core curriculum for the undergraduate program at Clemson? Do you know of any disadvantages?

Provost Maxwell: The core curriculum is difficult to define. There are a number of mechanical as well as philosophical difficulties. It is an excellent idea for all students to have certain things in common before they graduate, but the problem lies in our agreeing on what the common core should be.

What do you see as the role of the department head at Clemson University?

Provost Maxwell: "That's the fellow who is straddling an ever-widening ditch." In many ways that is the most difficult position in the University because the department head is sometimes a colleague, sometimes an administrator. "Ideally he is one who involves the Faculty in making decisions, but is firm enough to make a decision that he is authorized to make."

In small departments should the department head conduct a teaching and/or research program?

Provost Maxwell: It would seem he is conducting a teaching program as head of the department. Ideally the department head should be one of the leading researchers in the department.
In your opinion, what is the most effective role of a faculty senate at a university?

Provost Maxwell: The role of a faculty senate is to try to be as representative as possible of the faculty. "I regard (the Faculty Senate) as a very valuable institution."

President Halfacre introduced Vice President David Larson, who responded to questions provided him prior to the meeting and questions from the floor.

Have administrative salaries at Clemson University been compared to the 21 peer universities in the Oklahoma Study as faculty salaries have been analyzed? If so, how do Clemson administrative salaries compare to our peer institutions' administrative salaries?

Vice President Larson: Yes and no. Administrative salaries mean different things to different people. Mr. Larson said, "If you are talking to me, it means department heads and above, both academic and administrative..." For academic department heads, each year there is a review conducted by the Provost to determine salary adjustments. Whatever the justification, the average raise for the academic department heads and deans cannot exceed the average raise for the faculty.

The executive compensation program is different; there are specific salary ranges set. There are approximately 35 individuals in executive comp, 8 of those are the President and the Vice Presidents. This year the average raise for the executive comp category was set at 6 1/2%. A full-blown study was blocked this year because of that limitation.

The Chronicle of Higher Education publishes average salaries of department heads and deans in colleges across the United States. A comparison with the Faculty Senate salary survey shows a discrepancy. If you have the data available, could that be made available to the Senate?

Vice President Larson: Very little published data is available on academic department head salaries. Usually such salaries are compared to other faculty salaries after removing any compensation received for the individual's duties as a department head.
Do you have that data on the non-academic administrators?

Vice President Larson: The data is in a report Mr. Larson received some weeks ago published by the University of Arkansas. The faculty committee should have a copy of the report. If not, Mr. Larson would be happy to provide one.

Who is responsible for keeping records of college and departmental operating budgets?

Vice President Larson: There is an accounting printout that comes out once a month, but it always requires backup records from the departments.

What types of budget information, if any, do you think should not be made available to SACS committees?

Vice President Larson: "I do not know any that should not be made available."

It is correct that as of July 1, 1989, the Athletic Department turned over the maintenance and repairs of Littlejohn Coliseum to the University Facilities, Maintenance, and Operations (FMO) Division, which is funded by the Education and General Budget? If this is correct, which budget will pay for repairs to the Coliseum?

Vice President Larson: Yes, responsibility for cleaning floors, etc., was transferred to the FMO Division. It seemed reasonable that, since the physical plant was getting money for routine maintenance through the funding formula, they should have the responsibility for maintenance in Littlejohn. The Coliseum was built and is funded as a joint-use facility.

It has not yet been determined how repairs to the Coliseum will be paid. Mr. Larson added, "When I get all the facts in, I will make a recommendation to the Vice Presidents."

Would you express your thoughts on the impact of Hurricane Hugo on the funding of Higher Education in South Carolina for the next two years?

Vice President Larson: Shortly after the incident, the State Budget office made a survey of other states that have had hurricanes and found that in the year of the hurricanes there had been no loss of revenue. They also found that the year following
hurricanes, the revenue loss was not particularly large. The State Budget Director says it is not clear how Hurricane Hugo will impact funding for higher education in South Carolina. It does not appear there will be a budget cut in the current year. Mr. Larson said, "We need to be cautious, but let's not get paranoid."

What is the average faculty salary for Clemson University?
What is the average classified staff salary for Clemson University?

Vice President Larson: Prior to increases the average salary for full professors was $50,433; associate professors, $37,712; assistant professors, $33,245. The average classified staff salary is $19,312.

How much of the budgets awarded under block budgeting are determined by student credit hours?

Vice President Larson: Probably one half.

Does block budgeting put more or less emphasis than the old budgeting system on enrollment numbers?

Vice President Larson: Less. Block funding is only part of the total budget package. The University created 25 budget centers. The funding for those 25 budget centers is approximately $80 million, which comes from student fees and State appropriations. Another $33 million comes from other revenue Clemson generates. Credit hours is not the only item in the funding. A college gets additional money for Honor Students, and Ph.D. students, for example.

What is the possibility of returning at least a portion of lab fees to departments teaching the lab courses?

Vice President Larson: This is up to the Deans. Some of the Deans keep the fees; some pass them along.

Explain the current administrative setup for the University Bookstore and relate it to the proposed changes in the management of the Bookstore at the University of South Carolina.

Vice President Larson: "In some sense that is a moot point. USC has made a decision to abolish that new foundation they created."
The Clemson University Bookstore until July 1 reported to the Vice President for Student Affairs. Now it reports to the Vice President for Business and Finance. Last year the Bookstore had revenues of $4.3 million. It made a profit of $62,970. In recent years, after retaining some funds for the use of the Bookstore, profits have been used to fund $50,000 a year for the Centennial Celebration and to make funds available for Clemson's capital campaign.

3. Approval of Minutes. The Minutes of the Faculty Senate for September 12, 1989, were approved as corrected.

The Minutes of the General Faculty for August 23, 1989, were approved as distributed.

4. Committee Reports

Policy Committee. Senator Luedeman reported that only one faculty member attended a special meeting of the committee to discuss the issue of the department head/department chair. Low attendance at the meeting leads the committee to believe that difficulties about departmental leadership are not as widespread as might have been indicated.

On the issue of the treatment of visiting faculty, the Policy Committee is awaiting a report from a subcommittee set up by the Office of International Programs and Services.

The Policy Committee has surveyed deans and department heads regarding the use of the $50 per faculty member for development. Use of the funds vary from college to college. A complete report will be made at a later date.

Research Committee. Senator Young presented the report of the Research Committee (Attachment A).

Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Kosinski called attention to the committee report included with the agenda (Attachment B).

Welfare Committee. The Welfare Committee is studying summer pay restrictions and expects to present a resolution to the Faculty Senate in a subsequent meeting. The committee has withdrawn a proposed resolution on parking for athletic events in favor of a resolution to be presented under new business by the Policy Committee.
Senator Harris presented an analysis of faculty benefits (Attachment C). He added the State has a policy of paying only for single coverage. Family coverage is paid exclusively by the employee. This puts State employees at a disadvantage. The only other area in which South Carolina deviates from other states has to do with what constitutes customary charges. The State contract holds Blue Cross and Blue Shield to the Health Insurance Association of America (HIAA) compensation schedule, which is basically a survey of physicians' costs on fees and services. This information is one year out of date in medical costs increase by approximately 15% a year. Hence, employees will often be required to pay both the 15% co-insurance and a 15% price increase (30% of the bill). This policy is mandated by the Legislature not Blue Cross/Blue Shield, which only administers the plan according to the State contract.

Senator Kennedy called attention to "South Carolina State Employees Association 1990-91 Legislative Program Proposed" (Attachment D). Senator Carner reported that a committee of the Senate is expected to reintroduce to the State Legislature a bill with regard to a 25-year retirement benefit for state employees.

5. President's Report. President Halfacre called attention to the President's Report included in the agenda. (Attachment E).

6. Old Business

a. Update on contributions to the fund for the Centennial Professorship. Senator Dunn reported an anonymous gift of $10,000 in the name of the Board of Trustees to the fund for the Centennial Professorship. The fund now has $54,647 toward the goal of $100,000.

b. Approval of Selection Committee for Centennial Professorship. President Halfacre reported the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate has nominated the following Faculty for membership on the Selection Committee for the Centennial Professorship: Professor Larry Bauer, Professor Elizabeth Galloway, Dean Robert Waller, Professor MaryAnn Reichenbach, and Professor James Goree.

Senator Young moved approval of the Selection Committee for the Centennial Professorship. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.
C. **Recommended Procedures for the Evaluation of Department Heads.** On behalf of the Policy Committee, Senator Luedeman presented and moved adoption of "Recommended Procedures for the Evaluation of Department Heads" (Attachment F). Senator Luedeman stated the major change from current procedure is contained in Item 3, "The Dean shall summarize these views in reports to the Department Head, the departmental advisory committee, and the Provost."

On inquiry from Senator Murr, Senator Luedeman stated the proposed recommended procedures would be forwarded to the Provost and the Faculty Manual Committee.

There followed full discussion of concerns regarding the release of Dean's summary to the departmental faculty.

President Halfacre asked if the Senate had objection to comments from guests. There being no objections, President Halfacre recognized Professor Jerry Trapnell, Chair of the Executive Committee of the Organization of Academic Department Heads (OADH). Professor Trapnell said that in a letter last year to Faculty Senate President Ron Nowaczyk, the Organization of Academic Department Heads recommended that reporting to the faculty advisory committee be deleted. The current recommendation of the OADH is the same. The organization does not believe the department heads deserve different treatment than other personnel at the University with regard to evaluations.

Senator LeBlanc moved to amend Item 3 to include only the first statement and in Item 4 to delete the last statement to read only, "The results of this evaluation should be made available to the Department Head." The motion was seconded.

Senator Young asked if Senator LeBlanc would be willing to restore a portion of the second statement in Item 3 to read as follows: "The Dean shall summarize these views in reports to the Department Head and the Provost." Senator LeBlanc and the seconder accepted the reinstatement.

The amendment to the Recommended Procedures for the Evaluation of Department Heads was approved.

Senator Hare moved to change Item 1 to read, "...beginning with the fifth year of his or her administrative service to the University, and continuing every third year thereafter." The motion was seconded. The amendment passed.
The amended Resolution on Recommended Procedures for the Evaluation of Department Heads (FS89-10-3 P) (Attachment G) was approved.


a. Resolution on Pay Raises for Classified Employees. Senator Kennedy submitted a substitute resolution (Attachment H), stating the substitute makes a stronger statement than the resolution included with the agenda. Senator Luedeman seconded. There followed full discussion regarding the issue of a cost-of-living increase equal to inflation; the matter of morale among classified staff; and the fact that, while the proposed resolution is intended to benefit classified staff, it speaks of State employees.

Senator Christenbury moved to amend the substitute resolution to comply with the Resolution on Pay Raises for Classified Employees as circulated with the agenda. The motion was seconded and after discussion was passed. The Resolution on Pay Raises for Classified Employees as amended (FS89-10-1B P) (Attachment I) was approved.

b. Resolution on Parking for Athletic Events. Senator Luedeman presented the resolution on behalf of the Policy Committee and moved adoption. The Resolution on Parking for Athletic Events (FS90-10-2 P) (Attachment J) was approved.

8. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

Kenneth R. Murr, Secretary

Margaret K. Cannon, Staff Secretary

Members absent: Carney (Bryant attended), D. Graham, A. Madison (Hare attended), R. Marion (R. Hefley attended), W. Stringer, T. Tisue.
The Faculty Senate Research Committee met on Friday, October 6, 1989 in 104 McAdams Hall. Attendees were Joe Hammond, Russ Marion, Ed Pivorun and Roy Young. Visitors were Jay Gogue, Vice-President for Research, and Bob Gilliland, Director of Emerging Technologies Development and Marketing and Special Assistant to the President.

Dr. Gogue discussed administration of the URGC (formerly OUR) and Provost Awards with the committee. About $80,000 annually are available for these awards from a grant made to Clemson in the 1940's. The only stipulation for these funds is that they be spent to support research. Currently, approximately 20 awards of about $2,000 each are being given twice a year to beginning faculty or to faculty trying to redirect their research. A non-peer review selection procedure is being followed. The selection committee consists of one representative from each College. Twenty recipients are chosen from approximately 125 applications each semester. Because of the large number of small awards, half time of one employee is required to account for expenditures. Dr. Gogue is concerned that an inordinate amount of time is being required for preparation, review, selection and administration of these internal awards under present procedures. He has requested the Faculty Research Committee to study alternatives and to give him counsel. Ideas discussed included the following:

* Divide funds equally among new faculty only;
* Divide funds among Colleges proportional to research FTE's to be spent for research as agreed upon by the College's faculty;
* Give to underdeveloped research Colleges to be used to build their research programs;
* Allocate to graduate students as supplements to their research projects;
* Combine URGC and Provost Awards into awards of about $4,000 each.

On behalf of Bill Geer who was unable to attend, Dr. Gogue informed the committee that more federal grants are "requiring applicant organizations to establish an administrative process for reviewing reports of scientific fraud and to report ... any investigation of alleged scientific fraud that appears substantial..." Last year's Faculty Research Committee studied this issue and concluded that it is not necessary to have a standing committee on research misconduct, but rather that appropriate ad hoc committees could be formed as needed for each particular case.

Dr. Gogue also told us that he is teaching a 1 credit course on a pass-fail basis this semester under the title Research Grantsmanship. The course was requested and arranged by a group of interested graduate students. It is being offered through the Liberal Arts College at the 800 level. He also passed out copies
of an attractive new brochure from his office entitled "Research for the Second Century - Clemson University."

Bob Gilliland discussed ongoing efforts through his Office of Emerging Technology to establish links with private research and technology development companies for technology transfer and demonstration. It is hoped that this kind of linkage might enhance Clemson University's potential for attracting major government funding in other projects similar to the Clemson Apparel Plant in Pendleton.

Joe Hammond reported that responses from a survey by Colleges concerning allocation of indirect costs from grants have been received from all except two colleges. These should be received before our next meeting.

John Ryan submitted a written report concerning his visit with Joe Boykin, Libraries Director, relative to holiday services. Do-it-yourself searching is now available 4 days of every week this year with the exception of 3 days during the week of December 24-30, 1989. During inter-session periods, the library will be open until 8:00 pm on at least 2 weekday nights and on Saturday and Sunday. Do-it-yourself searching will be available on these weekday nights after 6:00 pm and on Saturday and Sunday. The addition of a second computer for on-line searching will cost about $75,000 a year, which is probably cost prohibitive at this time.

Russ Marion handed out procedures for accessing an on-line database of information about grants offered through the University Research Electronic Bulletin Board. This service includes general research news, a listing of grant opportunities, update of campus events, a list of recent awards and sample conferences.

The next meeting of the Research Committee is scheduled for 2:00 pm, November 3, 1989 in 104 McAdams Hall.

Roy Young, Chair
Scholastic Policies Committee
Report of the October Meeting
Robert Kosinski, Chair

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on September 26. The main items discussed were the General Education Requirements (GER) and changing the first drop date.

It was agreed that the (very worthwhile) purpose of the General Education Requirements is to ensure that a student receives a general education in addition to training in a specialty. Many of the courses in the current Requirements seem to be highly inappropriate for this mission, and have apparently been included to satisfy various departmental agendas rather than a General Education agenda. After much discussion, we decided to recommend:

a) that rather than being a detailed listing of courses, the GER should be simplified to a listing of major areas (humanities, sciences, etc.) with a set of rules determining which courses could be included in each area;

b) that the GER be limited to courses which:
   1. are designed as an overview of a subject rather than a specialized course for majors;
   2. are 300-level or below;
   3. are open to a wide variety of students because they do not have extensive prerequisites or corequisites;
   4. are not restricted to students from a particular major and required for that same major.

Senator Kosinski will present these ideas to Dr. William Steirer, the chairman of the University Curriculum Committee subcommittee which is dealing with the GER issue, and we will proceed with our consideration of this issue after his input has been received.

Senator Steiner presented the attached suggestions on moving the first drop date to one day before the last add date. This would allow students to add courses after spaces had been freed up by students who had dropped them. Senator Steiner will prepare a formal resolution and we will debate it at our next meeting.
MEMORANDUM

TO: SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

FROM: P. ALSTON STEINER

DATE: SEPTEMBER 26, 1989

SUBJECT: MOVING DROP DATE FORWARD

The sub committee proposes the following considerations for the scholastic policies committee to consider.

1. Leave the second drop date as it is currently placed, namely at a time that is the beginning of the last five weeks of a full semester (excluding summer school).

2. Change the first drop date from the current time of four weeks into the semester to an earlier date of one week into the start of the semester. This would have to also allow adding classes one day after this drop day. The reason for this change is so as to allow students who eventually drop classes that are completely filled to not prevent other students from getting into those filled classes. In particular, this fall semester there were lots of classes completely filled for incoming freshmen that are now not at all filled since we are past the first drop date.

3. Discuss the handling of the allowed limit of 14 hours maximum of W. Report has it that they will count a full course as a W if say 13 hours of the 14 have been used. It should be interpreted just as worded in the catalog.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Only Coverage</td>
<td>Employee and Family Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td>HOSP. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$177.50</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Basic at 100%</td>
<td>$100 $100</td>
<td>$500 $1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>plus Maj. Med. at 80%</td>
<td>per all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$113.50 (proposed)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Comprehensive Ded. plus 80%</td>
<td>$75 $150</td>
<td>$525 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>per all Adm. other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$98.40 (proposed)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Comprehensive Ded. plus 80%</td>
<td>$100 $150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>per all Adm. other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$97.79</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>Comprehensive Ded. plus 80%</td>
<td>$200 $200</td>
<td>$1,500 $3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>per all Adm. other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$94.49</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Comprehensive Ded. plus 80%</td>
<td>$50 $200</td>
<td>$1,000 $4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>per all Adm. other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$92.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Basic at 100%</td>
<td>$100 $200</td>
<td>$1,000 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>plus Maj. Med. at 80%</td>
<td>per all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Maximum Out-of-Pocket Employee Expenses Do Not Include Any Hospital or Major Medical Deductibles. Hospital And Major Medical Deductibles Are In Addition To The Maximum Out-Of-Pocket Expenses For Insured Employees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$4,000 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>Ded. plus 80%</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$89.64</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 16.84 proposed</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>Ded. plus 80%</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$89.07</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Ded. plus 80%</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>$85.83</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Basic at 100%</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>Plan A--No Max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>plus Maj. Med. at 80%</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>Plan B--$1,000 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ded. plus 80%</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$75.10</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>Ded. plus 80%</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$60.87</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>Basic at 100%</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>$1,000 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>plus Maj. Med. at 80%</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code Key Abbreviations

Hospital -- Hosp.  Room and Board -- R & B  Admission -- Adm.  Maximum -- Max.
South Carolina State Employees Association
1990-91 Legislative Program
Proposed

Pay Program

SCSEA supports the state employee pay plan proposed by the General Assembly/Governor's Pay Committee, which includes:
1. a cost-of-living increase equal to inflation
2. fixed performance pay increases of 2% (meets expectations), 3% (exceeds expectations), and 4% (substantially exceeds expectations)
3. 1/2% of state payroll as bonuses for employees who provide exceptional service

Also, SCSEA requests establishment of an oversight committee to ensure uniform implementation of the pay plan.

Health Insurance

1. change the shared cost ratio from 85/15 to 90/10
2. reduce out-of-pocket maximum cost from $1,500 to $750
3. request the state to pay more toward the health insurance program, particularly for family coverage
4. reinstate the drug card program
5. review the Medi-call program

25-year Retirement

Request that a retirement benefit be available to state employees after 25 years of service

Mileage Reimbursement

Request an increase in mileage reimbursement to 24 cents a mile

Insurance

Request that vision care and hearing aid benefits be added to the state health insurance plan

Dependent Care

Request that the state support a child and elder care program for state workers

Sick Leave for Retirement Time

Request that the state provide additional service time upon retirement for unused sick leave

Dental Insurance

Request that adult orthodontic care be included in the state's dental insurance program

Request that dental insurance funds be used for dental benefits

Laid-Off Workers

Request that the state provide greater assistance to employees laid-off from their jobs

SCSEA retiree Board members will meet prior to the Board meeting to outline their requests to be added to the Legislative Program.
1. Provost Maxwell has approved an increase in summer school compensation from 2.75% to 3.0% of the 9-month salary for each lecture credit hour taught. This recommendation is subject to approval by the Budget and Control Board.

2. Admission information for 1989 and an enrollment comparison for undergraduate and graduate students for 1988 and 1989 are attached for your information (Attachment A). Clemson made significant progress in recruiting minority students this year. The freshman class includes 1,947 South Carolinians.

3. A special thanks is expressed to the Board of Trustees for the $10,000 contribution to the Centennial Professorship Fund. This brings the fund to $154,647 of the $200,000 necessary to endow the Professorship.

4. The Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee elected the following to serve on the Selection Committee for the Centennial Professorship: Professor Larry Bauer, Dean Robert Waller, Professor Mary Ann Reichenbach, Professor James Goree, and Professor Elizabeth Galloway.

   This is subject to approval of the Faculty Senate.

5. At the Academic Council meeting on October 2, President Lennon encouraged the faculty and staff to work through existing organizations in providing assistance to victims of the Hurricane Hugo. He expressed appreciation to the faculty who have provided information concerning the economic impact and physical damage to our State.

6. The attached "Mission Statement" was adopted by the Board of Trustees at their meeting on September 21, 1989 (Attachment B). The attached Faculty Manual Revisions were approved at the same meeting (Attachment C).

7. The attached resolution submitted by the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs on "Staff Participation in Graduation" was approved at the Academic Council meeting on October 2 (Attachment D).

8. Dean Ryan Amacher was elected by the Council of Deans to serve on the University Salary and Fringe Benefit Committee.
Admissions Highlights, 1989

1. **Freshman Class:** A total of 2899 freshmen enrolled in 1989. This was the largest freshman class in Clemson history and represented a 1% increase over 1988.

2. **State Residence:** A total of 1947 South Carolinians enrolled in 1989—the largest number of state residents to ever enroll at Clemson. These students comprised 67% of the freshman class.

3. **Mean SAT:** The mean SAT for this year's class was 1025 (476 V. and 549 M.). The mean SAT for South Carolinians was 1013 and the mean for non-residents was 1050.

4. **Decile Rank:** 34.5% of the freshmen graduated in the top 10% of their high school class. 60% graduated in the top 20% and 94% graduated in the top 50%.

5. **Minority Enrollment:** A record 277 black freshmen enrolled in 1989 compared to 161 in 1988—a 72% increase. These students made up 9.5% of the freshman class. Twenty-five black transfers also enrolled in 1989, as compared to 23 in 1988.

6. **Clemson Scholars:** A total of 151 Clemson Scholars enrolled in 1989. Ninety-eight or 65% of these were black. Seventy-six (50%) of the Clemson Scholars graduated either first or second in their high school class, and 130 (86%) graduated in the top 10%.

7. **Advanced Placement:** Clemson experienced another record-setting year in terms of the number of students presenting AP scores, the number of students receiving credit, and the total number of credit hours awarded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1989*</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Submitting One or More AP Score</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Scores Reported</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2127</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Scores that were 3 or Higher</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen Receiving Credit</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Credit Hours Awarded</td>
<td>6286</td>
<td>7362</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures as of September 18, 1989.

8. **Transfer Students:** 625 transfers enrolled this fall. This figure represents an 11% increase over 1988.
## ENROLLMENT COMPARISON
### 1988-89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>14,794</td>
<td>15,673*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collegiate Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Agriculture</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Architecture</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Education</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>2,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Engineering</td>
<td>3,544</td>
<td>3,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Commerce and Industry</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>3,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Liberal Arts</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Nursing</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Sciences</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Forest and Recreation Resources</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Non-Degree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Off-Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) Off-Campus (Institutes, Greenville Tec, MBA at Furman)</td>
<td>829**</td>
<td>834**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Undergraduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4) Undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>11,774</td>
<td>12,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>8,351</td>
<td>8,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>6,443</td>
<td>6,854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minority Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) Minority Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Internationals</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Blacks (5.3%)</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Alaskan Native/American Indian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Hispanic</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In-State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6) In-State (66%)</td>
<td>9,826</td>
<td>10,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State (34%)</td>
<td>4,968</td>
<td>5,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes 22 international visitors, as well as, incomplete off-campus enrollment data
**Included in other totals
### Enrollment in Graduate School, First Semester 1989-90 as of 10/2/89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Agricultural Sciences</th>
<th>Non-Degree</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>Mast</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>EdD</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (undeclared)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Economics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agronomy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal &amp; Food Industries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Physiology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Economics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture Fisheries Wildlife</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Technology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Physiology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>260   (- 2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Architecture</th>
<th>Non-Degree</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>Mast</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>EdD</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture (undeclared)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Science and Mgt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Architecture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>156   (+ 3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Education</th>
<th>Non-Degree</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>Mast</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>EdD</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education (undeclared)</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Guidance Serv</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (English)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (History)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (Math)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (Nat Sci)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational &amp; Technical Educ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Education</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1311  (+ 13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Engineering</th>
<th>Non-Degree</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>Mast</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>EdD</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (undeclared)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio-Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Mechanics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envir Systems Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Engineering</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>540   (even)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Enrollment in Graduate School, First Semester 1989-90 as of 10/2/89

### College of Commerce and Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Non-Degree</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>M.A./M.S.</th>
<th>EdD</th>
<th>EDD/PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Ind (Undeclared)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile &amp; Polymer Science</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Chemistry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Science</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Commerce and Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>471 (+21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Liberal Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Non-Degree</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>M.A./M.S.</th>
<th>EdD</th>
<th>EDD/PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts (Undeclared)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Psychology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liberal Arts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>107 (+14%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Nursing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Non-Degree</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>M.A./M.S.</th>
<th>EdD</th>
<th>EDD/PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Undeclared)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nursing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75 (+34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Non-Degree</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>M.A./M.S.</th>
<th>EdD</th>
<th>EDD/PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sciences (Undeclared)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>432 (+5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of For & Rec Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Non-Degree</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>M.A./M.S.</th>
<th>EdD</th>
<th>EDD/PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For &amp; Rec Res (Undeclared)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Recreation, and Tourism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total For &amp; Rec Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77 (even)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grand Total

|                     | 888 | 1044 | 975 | 20  | 502 | 3429 (+9%) |

Legend:
- Non-Degree: Number of students without a degree
- Prof: Number of students with a professional degree
- M.A./M.S.: Number of students with a master's degree
- EdD: Number of students with an EdD degree
- EDD/PhD: Number of students with an EDD or PhD degree
- Total: Total number of students in each category
September 21, 1989

INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSE

Clemson University is the scientifically oriented institution of higher education established by the citizens of South Carolina to preserve, enhance, interpret, and disseminate the body of human knowledge. As a publicly assisted, comprehensive land-grant institution, Clemson serves the state, the nation as a whole, and the international community through teaching, research, and public service activities.

The original philosophy guiding the university’s mission appeared in the enabling legislation of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, the will of Thomas Green Clemson which calls for the establishment of a "high seminary of learning," and the Act of Acceptance by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina. Subsequent broadening of the general mission occurred with the passage by Congress of the Hatch Act of 1887, the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, and National Sea Grant Act of 1966. Further refinements are elaborated in the South Carolina Master Plan for Higher Education set forth in 1979 by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education and through the focus of the Second Century Plan initiated by the University in 1986.

To fulfill its historic, expanded, and evolving mission, Clemson offers undergraduate and graduate programs within nine colleges and a graduate school to a diversified on-campus student body and to a variety of audiences through continuing education courses on and off campus. The institution’s role within the State of South Carolina is fulfilled through its mandated thrusts in agriculture and natural resources, architecture, engineering, textiles, basic sciences and technologies, and through an expanded role which also addresses the State’s cultural and economic needs through emphases in health sciences, business, education, and the liberal arts. Clemson University’s response to public service is dynamic and unique. It is reflected through the expertise of each of its colleges, the S.C. Experiment Station, the Clemson University Cooperative Extension Service, and numerous regulatory programs which provide technical assistance, continuing education, technology transfer, and extension activities commensurate with life in a changing world and a global society.

The fulfillment of Clemson’s mission rests, with its faculty, who, individually, collectively, and in cooperation with all University personnel gather, interpret, and disseminate knowledge; generate new knowledge independently and in conjunction with colleagues and students; stimulate creative thought and expression; foster speculative and critical thought; groom leaders; initiate progressive change; prepare students to cope with the world as it is, contribute to developing a better world, and appreciate the interconnectedness of modern life; and advance the common good by anticipating and devising new solutions for intellectual, scientific, social, and technical problems.

As stewards to taxpayers, alumni, donors, and students, Clemson University will husband its resources; engage in strategic planning; implement, direct, and review authorized programs, modifying goals and operations as deemed necessary; and assess student, faculty, and administrative performance regularly and in accordance with norms upheld by both the university’s evaluative procedures and those of appropriate professional societies.

This statement will be reviewed annually and may be altered as the mission of the university evolves.
Faculty Manual Revisions

Faculty Manual Revisions were approved by the Educational Policy Committee on August 24, 1989 and are submitted to the Board for approval. These changes are minor and are briefly explained below.

-- Expansion of the number of members on the Grievance Board from five (including two alternates) to seven (with no alternates).

-- Expansion of the patent policy so as to include "certain intellectual properties" -- an attempt to cover such things as computer software created by faculty members in instances in which such creations are not eligible for patents or copyrights.

-- An animal subject policy -- necessary in securing grant funds from some sources in instances in which animals are used in research.

-- An updating of general information on the Library, Bookstore, Computer Center, et al.

9/14/89
Commission on Classified Staff Affairs  
Resolution CSA2-9-89

"Staff Participation in Graduation"

Whereas,  
All staff holding Masters or Doctoral degrees are invited to march in graduation exercises; and

Whereas,  
Staff participation in recent graduation exercises has been sparse; and

Whereas,  
Participation by eligible classified staff in graduation would increase staff visibility and credibility and would reflect staff contributions to academic excellence at Clemson University; and

Whereas,  
Some degree of participation in graduation exercises is expected of Faculty;

Be It Resolved  
That the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs recommends that the President of Clemson University request the Vice Presidents to direct their respective Deans, Directors and Department Heads to encourage participation in graduation ceremonies by eligible classified staff employees.

Passed 9-19-89
SENATE REPORT ON PRIORITY LIST FOR FRINGE BENEFITS

The Welfare Committee presented a prioritized list of fringe benefit requests of the faculty. Based on a survey of the faculty, the list included changes to the state retirement plan along with increases in life insurance and tuition waivers for faculty dependents. The Provost and Administration have received the report.

RESOLUTION ON FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

Adding to current policy on evaluation of academic administrators, the resolution calls for administrator responsible for evaluation to identify the number and distribution of faculty for review of an academic administrator and to then allow the faculty to elect their representatives and for a summary report to be provided to the faculty. Approved by the President and the Provost for the faculty to have input into the evaluation process.

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR AN IMMEDIATE INCREASE IN SUMMER SCHOOL SALARIES

Based on projected income from this summer school tuition and fees, an increase in summer school compensation of approximately 17% was requested. Approved by Provost Maxwell.

RESOLUTION ON RESTORING FUNDS TO STATE HEALTH CARE PLAN

The Faculty Senate calls for the restoration of funds withdrawn from the State Health Care Plan, plus accrued interest, prior to any changes in the premiums or benefits being implemented in the Plan. Resolution forwarded to the Governor and the appropriate members of the Legislature.

RESOLUTION ON CLOSURE OF OLD SENeca RIVER LAGOON
AND BOTTOM LAND
The Faculty Senate urged the Administration and the Athletic Department to negotiate with the Chair of the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee a mutually agreeable solution to assure public access to these properties and facilities. The Athletic Department agreed to open the facilities from 6:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., except on weekends and during football practice. Beginning in the spring, the area will be open during the week until 8:00 p.m. and on four or five Saturday mornings to be announced in advance.

RESOLUTION ON SELLING OF COMPLIMENTARY TEXTBOOKS
The Faculty Senate established that the selling of complimentary copies of text materials by any employee of Clemson University is unprofessional conduct. Approved by President's Cabinet.

RESOLUTION ON COMPENSATION BEGINNING DATE
The Faculty Senate requested that the University pay the salary adjustment monies to unclassified faculty effective July 1, 1989, for 12-month faculty and August 15, 1989, for 9-month faculty; and that in the future the University pay all salary increases to unclassified faculty effective July 1 for 12-month faculty and August 15 for 9-month faculty. The Provost approved making all faculty salary increases effective July 1 for 12-month faculty and August 15 for 9-month faculty in all instances in which doing so is permitted by applicable State laws, rules, and regulations.

October 3, 1989
Each Department Head shall be formally evaluated by the Dean every five years, beginning with the fifth year of his or her administrative service to the university, and continuing every fifth year thereafter.

2. During the evaluation, the Dean shall personally conduct a review of the Department Head's performance in the following areas of concern:

   a. Quality of administration
   b. Faculty relationships
   c. Scholarly activities
   d. Professional visibility
   e. Teaching and curricular development
   f. Progress of the department
   g. Faculty development

   The Department Head shall be asked to prepare and submit to the Dean a written report on his or her performance in these areas of concern. The Dean shall issue a report on his or her findings and distribute the report to the Department Head.

3. During the evaluation process, the Dean shall solicit the opinions of all tenured, and tenure-track (permanent) faculty and a representative of classified employees in the department regarding the areas of concern and any other criteria defined by the Dean. The Dean shall summarize these views in reports to the Department Head, the departmental advisory committee, and the Provost. The departmental faculty and classified employees shall be provided a summary of the general outcome of the evaluation.

4. New Department Heads should receive an informal evaluation within the first two years of service. This evaluation, by the Dean, should involve a representative sampling of faculty opinions. The results of this evaluation should be made available to the Department Head and the departmental advisory committee.

Submitted by Policy Committee
October 1989
John Luedeman, Chair
RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

FS89-10-3 P

1. Each Department Head shall be formally evaluated by the Dean beginning with the fifth year of his or her administrative service to the university, and continuing every third year thereafter.

2. During the evaluation, the Dean shall personally conduct a review of the Department Head’s performance in the following areas of concern.

   a. Quality of administration
   b. Faculty relationships
   c. Scholarly activities
   d. Professional visibility
   e. Teaching and curricular development
   f. Progress of the department
   g. Faculty development

The Department Head shall be asked to prepare and submit to the Dean a written report on his or her performance in these areas of concern. The Dean shall issue a report on his or her findings and distribute the report to the Department Head.

3. During the evaluation process, the Dean shall solicit the opinions of all tenured, and tenure-track (permanent) faculty and a representative of classified employees in the department regarding the areas of concern and any other criteria defined by the Dean. The Dean shall summarize these views in reports to the Department Head and the Provost.

4. New Department Heads should receive an informal evaluation within the first two years of service. This evaluation, by the Dean should involve a representative sampling of faculty opinions. The results of this evaluation should be made available to the Department Head.
Whereas the retention and motivation of classified staff are necessary to the continued function of Clemson University, and

whereas the pay raises for classified personnel at Clemson University have not, during the past two years, included provisions for merit pay adjustments, and

Whereas the only way remaining to reward classified staff for outstanding performance is through job reclassification, which is often not deemed appropriate and which can in any case be done infrequently for a given position, and

Whereas a cost of living raise for state employees has also been deemed desirable by past legislatures,

Be it hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate encourages the South Carolina legislature to divide pay raises to the classified employees of Clemson University equally between cost-of-living and merit. adopt the state employee pay plan proposed by the General Assembly/Governor's Pay Committee, which includes:

1. a cost-of-living increase equal to inflation
2. fixed performance pay increases of 2% (meets expectations), 3% (exceeds expectations), and 4% (substantially exceeds expectations)
3. 1/2% of state payroll as bonuses for employees who provide exceptional service
RESOLUTION ON PAY RAISES FOR CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES
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Whereas, The retention and motivation of classified staff are necessary to the continued function of Clemson University;

Whereas, The pay raises for classified personnel at Clemson University have not, during the past two years, included provisions for merit pay adjustments;

Whereas, The only way remaining to reward classified staff for outstanding performance is through job reclassification, which is often not deemed appropriate and which can in any case be done infrequently for a given position;

Whereas, A cost of living raise for state employees has also been deemed desirable by past legislatures;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate encourages the South Carolina legislature to divide pay raises to the classified employees of Clemson University equally between cost of living and merit.
RESOLUTION ON PAY RAISES FOR CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES
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Whereas, The retention and motivation of classified staff are necessary to the continued function of Clemson University;

Whereas, The pay raises for classified personnel at Clemson University have not, during the past two years, included provisions for merit pay adjustments;

Whereas, The only way remaining to reward classified staff for outstanding performance is through job reclassification, which is often not deemed appropriate and which can in any case be done infrequently for a given position;

Whereas, A cost of living raise for state employees has also been deemed desirable by past legislatures;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate encourages the South Carolina legislature to divide pay raises to the classified employees of Clemson University equally between cost of living and merit.
RESOLUTION ON PARKING FOR ATHLETIC EVENTS
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Whereas, The Faculty Manual states that the Traffic and Parking Committee advises the Vice President for Administration to the President's Office on all matters pertaining to traffic and parking:

Whereas, In the past the Athletic Department has consulted with the Traffic and Parking Committee for approval to dedicate parking lots for special audiences at athletic events, most recently for the change in the use of parking on the grass area behind Earle Hall from public parking to dedicated parking; and

Whereas, The Athletic Department did not consult with the Traffic and Parking Committee on the change in use of parking on the practice Rugby field from public parking to IPTAY parking;

Resolved, That the Athletic Department conform to the Faculty Manual and secure approval of the University Traffic and Parking Committee before making any changes in parking for athletic events; and

Resolved, That the Athletic Department restore public parking on the Rugby practice field for football games.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
NOVEMBER 14, 1989

1. Call to Order. President Halfacre called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

2. Special Order of the Day. President Halfacre introduced Colonel Edward Hamilton, Assistant Director, the Strom Thurmond Institute, who outlined the work of the Institute and answered questions provided him prior to the meeting.

What are the activities of the Strom Thurmond Institute, and how do they benefit Clemson University?

Colonel Hamilton: The Strom Thurmond Institute is a public policy research institute associated with Clemson University. It is non-profit and non-partisan. The mission is to help government serve its people better. This involves identifying important public policy issues and assembling a multidisciplinary team from the faculty at Clemson as well as faculty from other educational institutions in the State in addressing the problems and presenting policy options. The Institute has two components, public policy research and public programs.

The Institute is a part of a larger concept called the Strom Thurmond Center, which will include the Performing Arts Center and the Continuing Education Center.

At the local level the Institute has worked for Pickens County in developing a land-use plan and Anderson County in a needs assessment survey. At the State level the Institute has worked with the State Water Resources Commission to develop a State water-use policy, for the Governor’s office on a computerized system of rural bus routes, and with the State Energy Office in updating the energy emergency preparedness plan. The Institute also is working with the State Development Board to develop a geographic information system, which will help the Development Board to attract industry into the State. At the Federal level the Institute has worked with the Department of Energy.
The benefits to Clemson include complementing classroom instruction by bringing outstanding speakers to the campus, and bringing research to the University in which the faculty can become involved.

If and when Senator Thurmond retires, will he plan to be personally active with the Institute in Clemson?

Colonel Hamilton: We certainly hope so. Senator Thurmond has announced that he is going to run for reelection in 1990. Therefore, it would be another six years at least before the Senator would join the Institute at Clemson.

What do you feel about the restriction on the Strom Thurmond Institute of not being involved in academic programs? Should the Strom Thurmond Institute be allowed to participate in or develop specialized academic programs?

Colonel Hamilton: We do not have a problem with the fact that we are not a degree-granting institute. The Thurmond Institute was set up to be a public policy research institute and a public programs institute. That does not mean that we would be averse to changing our role if the University so desired. We feel that the Institute complements the academic portion of the University very well, but the academic program is not our primary mission.

In the lobby of the Thurmond Institute are some of Senator Thurmond's papers espousing segregation. While certainly this is a part of Strom Thurmond's political history, it seems inappropriate to display these items in the lobby at the same time Clemson is trying to increase black enrollment. Please comment.

Colonel Hamilton: The Special Collections, located on the first floor of the Strom Thurmond Institute building, are not part of the Strom Thurmond Institute but the Cooper Library. Mr. Joe Boykin, Director of the Library, would probably answer the question by saying that the Southern Manifesto and the 1948 Presidential Campaign stand out most clearly in Strom Thurmond's political history. To eliminate such material would be obvious by its omission.
What is the funding base for operating monies for the Strom Thurmond Institute?

Colonel Hamilton: The funding base is three fold. 1) Private donations in the amount of $6.5 million were raised to erect the building. 2) State-appropriated monies are allocated through the University to the Institute for salaries. 3) The Institute receives funding through research grants and contracts.

In addition, the Institute is included in the overall fund-raising effort of the University for an endowment fund of $3.7 million, which eventually will allow us to be somewhat self-supporting.

Colonel Hamilton made a video presentation regarding the work and accomplishments of the Strom Thurmond Institute.

Colonel Hamilton presented Dr. James C. Hite, Alumni Professor of Agricultural Economics. Dr. Hite, one of six Senior Fellows in the Institute, serves as interim coordinator for the Community and Economic Development Program.

Dr. Hite: The Community and Economic Development Program was established to combine the Extension Service, the Agricultural Experiment Station, and the programs of the Thurmond Institute in support of community and economic development. The program is in an experimental mode, but has the potential in the next 10 to 15 years to increase significantly in size and scope. The coordinating council consists of the directors of the Cooperative Extension Service, the Agricultural Experiment Station, and the Thurmond Institute.

The public service mission of the land-grant institution must be seen in terms of trying to take practical knowledge to people who can make use of it in an everyday environment. Increasingly it is clear that this knowledge must be more broadly based than what is represented in the Clemson Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. That is the purpose of the Community and Economic Development Program.

3. Approval of Minutes. The Minutes of October 10, 1989, were approved as distributed.

4. Committee Reports
a. Senate Committees

Welfare Committee. Senator Carner presented the committee report for Chairman Kennedy (Attachment A).

Scholastic Policies Committee. Chairman Kosinski reviewed the report of the committee (Attachment B).

Senator McGuire asked what constitutes a minor and who makes decisions regarding the minor. There followed discussion on unclear policies related to the minor. President Halfacre referred the matter to the Policy Committee.

Research Committee. Chairman Young presented the report of the Research Committee (Attachment C).

Policy Committee. Chairman Luedeman reviewed the report of the committee included with the agenda (Attachment D).

With regard to Professional Development Funds of $50 per faculty member, President Halfacre pointed out that the Faculty Senate had originally asked for $200, and that former Senate President Nowaczyk announced at the General Faculty meeting in May 1989 that Professional Development Funds would be increased to $100 for this year.

With regard to Item 5 in the Policy Committee's Report, Chairman Luedeman said the Oklahoma Study does not compare the salaries of department heads of peer institutions. Some information on salaries of department heads may be available through a Southern regional group.

President Halfacre reported in the Oklahoma Study this year the department heads' salaries will be listed as full professors. If there is a wide difference between the three highest faculty members and the department head, it will affect the compensation coming to faculty in that particular department.

b. University Commissions and Committees

Commission on Undergraduate Studies. Senator Kosinski reported that the commission approved the Continuing Enrollment Implementation Plan. In addition, the commission voted to change the Faculty Advisor's Handbook to state that a
student dropping a course need only inform his advisor of the drop and need not secure his advisor's approval of the drop.

Senator Kosinski further reported that Richard DeWolf, a Student Senator, outlined to the commission the Student Senate's proposal that student evaluations of faculty be publicized to the students. Mr. DeWolf was apprised of possible problems; such as, the Faculty Manual being restrictive on the audiences with which evaluations need be shared and the fact that not everyone uses the same evaluation. DeWolf said he would work with the Student Senate and the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness to resolve some of these problems.

5. President's Report. President Halfacre called attention to the President's Report included in the agenda packet (Attachment E). Regarding the Commission on Higher Education's approval of associate degrees at the technical colleges in South Carolina (Item 3), President Halfacre said the Scholastic Policies Committee may need to study carefully the academic standards of students transferring from other institutions.

6. Old Business

a. Update on the fund for the Centennial Professorship. Senator Dunn reported that letters have been sent to deans, vice presidents, and department heads requesting support of the fund for the Centennial Professorship. He requested that Senators ask for support in meetings with deans and department heads. Dr. Dunn stressed the continuing importance of Faculty Senators' making contacts with colleagues on behalf of the fund.

b. Approval of Centennial Professorship procedures. President Halfacre called attention to the document for the Centennial Professorship (Attachment F). Senator Louderback moved acceptance of the document. The motion was seconded.

Senator Gaddis called attention to his statement circulated to the Faculty Senate regarding the criteria for the award of the Centennial Professorship (Attachment G). He moved that the Selection Criteria for the Centennial Professorship be amended as follows: "The Centennial Professorship Selection Committee shall be guided by scholarship and professional achievement," thereby deleting Items 1 and 2. The motion was seconded.
After discussion regarding various wordings and meanings of the criteria, the amendment was approved unanimously.

Senator Milstead requested "scholarship and professional achievement" be highlighted in any forthcoming materials related to the Centennial Professorship.

Senator McGuire moved the criteria be amended to read, "The Centennial Professorship Selection Committee shall be guided by 

excellence in scholarship and professional achievement." The motion was seconded and passed.

Senator Gaddis moved deleting the following sentence in the fourth paragraph in the Call for Nominations: "The Professorship will rotate among the various University Colleges and the Library." The motion was seconded.

There followed full discussion on the issue of rotating the Professorship among the various Colleges and the Library. Senator Louderback pointed out that the early solicitation materials stated the Professorship will rotate. The amendment failed.

The Centennial Professorship was approved as amended (Attachment H).

c. Nomination to replace Dr. George Carter on the Administrative Hearing Board. President Halfacre presented the name of Dr. Virgil Quisenberry for the Administrative Hearing Board. Senator Young moved to elect Professor Quisenberry by acclamation. The motion was seconded. The nomination of Dr. Quisenberry to the Administrative Hearing Board was approved.

7. New Business

a. President Halfacre requested that nominations for the Class of '39 Faculty Award for Excellence be forwarded immediately to the Faculty Senate office. The staff secretary reported eight nominees.

b. Other. Responding to a question from Senator Christenbury, President Halfacre said that, according to the latest information from Vice President Larson, the lost faculty salary adjustment monies would be added to the salary checks at
the end of the time period for nine-month Faculty. Mr. Larson has received verbal approval to this effect from the Budget and Control Board.

8. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Kenneth R. Murr, Secretary

Margaret K. Cannon, Staff Secretary

Members absent: W. J. Kennedy, A. Madison (Hare attended), H. Pate, E. Pivorun, J. Ryan, W. Stringer, E. Zehr, J. Zanes.
WELFARE COMMITTEE
REPORT OF THE NOVEMBER MEETING

The Welfare Committee met on October 25, 1989, and discussed the following items:

1. Resolution on summer compensation for teaching: The resolution was not acted upon because it appears that the changes requested in the resolution will be made in the near future. It appears that the maximum compensation for summer teaching will be raised to 18% per session or 36% for both sessions.

2. Pregnancy leave: The committee is looking into how benefits compare between nine-month and twelve-month employees and how this compares to those for classified employees.

3. Tuition waiver or reduction for dependents: A questionnaire was sent to other schools to determine the costs and benefits associated with faculty/staff dependent tuition reductions as applied in other schools. The information in the questionnaire will be used to determine the feasibility of having a similar program at Clemson.

4. 25-year early retirement: Last year two bills were introduced - one in the House and one in the Senate. One became part of the Appropriations Bill and was removed from it by the conference committee. The other made it to the Senate Finance Committee, where it remains. This year there does not seem to be as much support for a similar bill.

5. Fence Issue: The committee is maintaining an active file on the fence controversy. An item which was brought to the attention of the committee was that the Intramurals Department was not able to hold its annual intramural track meet because it was denied access to the track by the Athletic Department.

Senator Gerald Carner for
Senator W. J. Kennedy, Chair
Welfare Committee
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Judith A. Nicks, Chair
       Commission on Classified Staff Affairs

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Endorsement of Classified Staff Compensation Pay Plan

DATE: November 13, 1989

On behalf of the members of the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, this memorandum is written to thankfully acknowledge the support of the classified staff compensation package expressed recently in a Faculty Senate resolution.

The issue of merit pay is painfully near to the hearts and pocketbooks of over 2,300 classified employees who go largely unrecognized and have felt devalued for a number of years. The Commission on Classified Staff Affairs is currently debating the Governor's Blue Ribbon Panel recommended compensation package for classified employees with a resulting resolution soon to be published.

Again, the expression of support by the Faculty Senate is appreciated.

xc: President's Cabinet
    Dr. R. Gordon Halfacre
    Dr. William J. Kennedy
Scholastic Policies Committee
Report of the November Meeting

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on November 7. The main items discussed were implementation of the new continuing enrollment policy, revision of the General Education Requirements (GER), changing the first drop date, admissions exceptions and GS 800, a course without a sponsoring department.

The original plan for implementing the new continuing enrollment policy was that the old policy would remain in place for students admitted prior to May 15, 1990 while students admitted after May 15, 1990 would be governed by the new policy. After September 1, 1993, the new policy would apply to all undergraduate students. At the Commission on Undergraduate Studies meeting on 11 October, the Registrar suggested an altered plan: the old policy would disappear on May 15, 1990, and students admitted prior to that date would be governed by the new policy with the exception of December checks. The new policy (including December checks) would apply to new students admitted after May 15, as described above. The Committee discussed this proposal and was in overall agreement with it. However, we will urge the Registrar to perform December checks on all students after May 15, 1990 for data-gathering purposes, but to send December notices of probation and suspension only to students who entered under the new policy.

The group discussed the personal reaction of Dr. William Steirer of the University Curriculum Committee to our GER proposal. But we are still awaiting the official response of Dr. Steirer's GER subcommittee to our suggestions.

Senator Steiner presented a resolution on moving the first drop date to one day before the last add date. This would allow students to add courses after spaces had been freed up by students who had dropped them. After much discussion, the group voted in favor of the idea, but decided that the resolution's wording should be further revised. Because of the lateness of the hour, we decided to take up this matter at our next meeting.

The committee voted to ask the Admissions Office to supply us with a) a frequency distribution of the SAT scores of freshmen who entered in Fall of 1989; b) the number of these students who failed to meet normal admissions requirements, and c) the reason that each of these "admissions exception" students were admitted.

Finally, we decided to recommend to Dr. Farrell Brown that GS 800 seek a sponsoring department. We may invite Dr. Brown to our next meeting.

Robert Kosinski
Chairman
The Faculty Senate Research Committee met on Friday, November 3, 1989 in 104 McAdams Hall. Attendees were Joe Hammond, John Ryan and Roy Young.

Joe Hammond reported that survey returns on allocation of indirect costs have been received from all Colleges except Architecture. The primary conclusion drawn from a discussion of returns to date was that there is considerable variability among colleges as to how indirect costs are allocated. This variability, however, appears to result from varying budgetary procedures that are often unique to the individual college and based on generally sound reasons. It appears more prudent to handle modifications in indirect costs allocations at the individual college levels rather than at the university level. This survey will be completed by the December meeting and a report of information will be submitted to the Faculty Senate.

Among the three of us we discussed the procedures for the URCG and Provost Grants. Discussion will continue at our next meeting when more of the members can be present. John Ryan felt that the current $2000 or less per grant was very positive in the College of Liberal Arts because it serves as valuable seed money. He also questioned if having fewer, larger awards wouldn’t actually increase the number of applications rather than reduce them? There would be a greater monetary incentive to apply even though the competition would be greater. We really wondered if the clerical time required for accounting procedures on these grants couldn’t be integrated into the recipient’s college in order to reduce the demands on the Vice President of Research Office. The major problem appears to be the massive review effort required twice annually by 5 non-peer reviewers to read 125+ proposals! The proper solution to this problem is not readily apparent yet.

Based on responses to questions asked of Vice President David Larson at the last Faculty Senate meeting, it is assumed that appropriate allocations of CHE monies designated for MS and PhD candidates are being made through the "block funding" formulas to the college deans. Apparently it is up to the department heads to assure that these funds are being fully appropriated to their respective departments.

Efforts are underway to identify institutions who have already addressed the issue of position classifications and descriptions for post doctoral employees. Roy Young solicits input from anyone familiar with any institutions who might be helpful on this issue.

The committee confirmed its earlier view that scientific misconduct matters should be handled by ad hoc committees appointed as needed rather than by a standing committee.

The next meeting is scheduled for 2 pm, Friday, December 1, 1989 in Room 104 McAdams Hall.

Roy Young, Chair
November Report of Policy Committee

The Policy Committee met on October 24, 1989. We discussed the following items and actions:

1. Professional Development Funds of $50 per faculty member. A survey was sent and returned from all deans. Some colleges put the money in travel funds while some increased the funds to $100 per faculty member. Several of the deans regarded the funds as too small to be worth all the bother. Discussion showed that many faculty are not aware of these funds. The Policy Committee recommended that an article in the Senate Special (i) explain how these funds were made available and the proper uses of these funds, (ii) that faculty be asked to contact their Senator to tell how they used the funds, and (iii) that Dean Waller be mentioned in the article as the dean who increased the funds to $100 per faculty member. After the publication of the article and receiving of responses by Senators, the Committee will ask for an increase in funds. It seems that VP Larson supports the increase of these funds.

2. The Committee decided to await the Administration's response to the report on Administrative Growth published by last year's Senate before proceeding with further study of this issue.

3. A subcommittee chaired by Senator Coulter will formulate a draft of a policy on evaluation of Deans.

4. A subcommittee chaired by Senator McGuire will investigate the relationship of the Athletic Department to the rest of the university. E.g. Can the Athletic Department change parking lots, sets fees, etc. without responding to the proper committees.

5. The Chair of the committee is attempting to obtain the Oklahoma Study listing the salaries of deans and department heads of our peer institutions. Provost Maxwell referred him to Harold Albert who is trying to obtain this information for us.

John Luedeman, Chair
November 7, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Gordon Halfacre, President
    Faculty Senate

    John Luedeman, Chairman
    Faculty Senate Policy Committee

FROM: Jerry E. Trapnell, Chairman
      Executive Committee
      Organization of Academic Department Heads

On the behalf of the Executive Committee and the entire OADH, we want to extend our appreciation to the Faculty Senate Policy Committee and the entire Faculty Senate for their efforts in the developing the proposed revisions on the Evaluation of Department Heads. As always, policy development is a give-and-take process and we appreciate the opportunity to express our views on this important subject.

The Executive Committee is most appreciative of the open lines of communication between the OADH and the Faculty Senate. This is a healthy and important link that we pledge to maintain. We look forward to working with the Faculty Senate in the future.
SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT
NOVEMBER 1989

1. We thank the Class of '39 for establishing the Faculty Award for Excellence. The Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee elected the following Senators to serve on the Review Committee: Professor Bhuvnesh Goswami (Commerce and Industry), Professor Eldon Zehr (Agricultural Sciences), Assistant Librarian Marsha McCurley (Library), Professor Leo Gaddis (Engineering), Professor Robert Hogan (Architecture). Professor Paula Heusinkveld (Liberal Arts) will serve as alternate. The Review Committee will screen the nominations and determine four nominees to be presented to the Faculty Senate for final selection.

Since this is the first time that we have used our selection process, the faculty are encouraged to offer constructive changes. In January we will be meeting with representatives from the Class of '39 to discuss the selection procedure and criteria.

2. Provost Maxwell has approved an increase in the annual supplement for Alumni Professors from $3,000 to $3,500. We presently have 19 professorships funded by the Alumni Association to recognize excellence in undergraduate teaching.

3. Provost Maxwell announced at the Academic Council that the CHE has approved the offering of associate of arts and associate of science degrees at all technical colleges in South Carolina. Presently 7 of the 16 technical colleges offer these degrees. This means that students can complete 2 years at a technical college at less tuition cost and then transfer to a four-year institution of higher education for their junior and senior years.

4. Dean Farrell Brown prepared the attached information on graduate student enrollment for Fall 1989 (Attachment A).

5. On October 26 through 28, I attended with the Institutional Research staff and Vice Provost Reel the second annual South Carolina Higher Education Assessment (SCHEA) Conference. The conference theme was Strategies for Assessing General Education Objectives.

SCHEA was formed in 1988 to assist colleges and universities in South Carolina to get the most out of the "higher education assessment movement." The SCHEA Network is a national support and information sharing consortium of 30 South Carolina colleges and universities.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Academic Council

FROM: Farrell B. Brown
Associate Dean of the Graduate School

DATE: October 26, 1989

SUBJECT: Graduate Students: FTE and Headcount, Fall 1989

Attached is a summary of the number of students in each academic unit and the corresponding FTE students generated for the Fall Semester. Doctorate and specialists degree candidates constitute those in Level II (9 graduate credits per 1 FTE) while masters degree candidates and all others constitute Level I (12 graduate credits per 1 FTE). Each zero entry should actually be considered as a dash, meaning "not applicable". This is not the official report sent to the Commission on Higher Education and it is for information only.

[Signature]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>LEVEL I</th>
<th>LEVEL II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEADCOUNT</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE (UNDECLARED)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRONOMY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL &amp; FOOD INDUSTRIES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL PHYSIOLOGY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLIED ECONOMICS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUACULTURE FISHERIES WILDLIFE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORTICULTURE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTRITION</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANT PATHOLOGY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANT PHYSIOLOGY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>112.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE (UNDECLARED)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING SCIENCE AND MGT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY &amp; REGIONAL PLANNING</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISUAL ARTS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>152.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION (UNDECLARED)</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>246.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM &amp; SUPERVISION</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE SERV</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENTARY EDUCATION</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY EDUCATION (ENGLISH)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY EDUCATION (HISTORY)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY EDUCATION (MATH)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY EDUCATION (NAT SCI)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCATIONAL &amp; TECHNICAL EDUC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>454.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING (UNDECLARED)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-ENGINEERING</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERAMIC ENGINEERING</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEMICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER ENGINEERING</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING MECHANICS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECHANICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>295.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>LEVEL I</td>
<td>LEVEL II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEADCOUNT</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCE &amp; IND (UNDECLARED)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTING</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>108.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT SCIENCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXTILE &amp; POLYMER SCIENCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXTILE CHEMISTRY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXTILE SCIENCE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>187.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS (UNDECLARED)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF NURSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING (UNDECLARED)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NURSING</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCES (UNDECLARED)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOCHEMISTRY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTANY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEMISTRY</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SCIENCE</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOLOGY</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>198.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF FOR &amp; REC RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR &amp; REC RES (UNDECLARED)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORESTRY</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKS, RECREATION, AND TOURISM</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FOR &amp; REC RESOURCES</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>2929</td>
<td>1543.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes 53 graduate students who dropped all credits as of October 16 and 36 graduate students enrolled in undergraduate courses only.
STATUS OF FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

RSN89-3-1 P SENATE REPORT ON PRIORITY LIST FOR FRINGE BENEFITS
The Welfare Committee presented a prioritized list of fringe benefit requests of the faculty. Based on a survey of the faculty, the list included changes to the state retirement plan along with increases in life insurance and tuition waivers for faculty dependents. TheProvost and Administra-tration have received the report.

FS89-9-2 P RESOLUTION ON COMPENSATION BEGINNING DATE
The Faculty Senate requested that the University pay the salary adjustment monies to unclassified faculty effective July 1, 1989, for 12-month faculty and August 15, 1989, for 9-month faculty; and that in the future the University pay all salary increases to unclassified faculty effective July 1 for 12-month faculty and August 15 for 9-month faculty. The Provost approved making all faculty salary increases effective July 1 for 12-month faculty and August 15 for 9-month faculty in all instances in which doing so is permitted by applicable State laws, rulings, and regulations.

FSFS89-10-1B P RESOLUTION ON PAY RAISES FOR CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES
The Faculty Senate encourages the South Carolina legislature to divide pay raises to the classified employees of Clemson University equally between the cost of living and merit. The Provost has requested the reaction of the Classified Staff Committee.

FS89-10-2 P RESOLUTION ON PARKING FOR ATHLETIC EVENTS
The Faculty Senate requested that the Athletic Department conform to the Faculty Manual and secure approval of the University Traffic and Parking Committee before making any changes in parking for athletic events and that the Department restore public parking on the Rugby practice field for football games. The Provost has requested the reaction of the Athletic Department.
### College of Agricultural Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (undeclared)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Economics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Engineering</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agronomy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal &amp; Food Industries</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Physiology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Economics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture Fisheries Wildlife</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Physiology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Agricultural Sciences</strong></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>112.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Architecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture (undeclared)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Science and Mgt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Architecture</strong></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>152.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (undeclared)</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>246.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Guidance Serv</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Education</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (English)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (History)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (Math)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (Nat Sci)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational &amp; Technical Educ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Education</strong></td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>454.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (undeclared)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio-Engineering</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Engineering</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Mechanics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envir Systems Engineering</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Engineering</strong></td>
<td>387</td>
<td>295.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**College of Commerce and Industry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Ind (undeclared)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Management</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile &amp; Polymer Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Chemistry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Commerce and Industry</strong></td>
<td>412</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College of Liberal Arts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts (undeclared)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Psychology</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liberal Arts</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College of Nursing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (undeclared)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Nursing</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College of Sciences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sciences (undeclared)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sciences</strong></td>
<td>268</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College of For & Rec Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For &amp; Rec Res (undeclared)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Recreation, and Tourism</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total For &amp; Rec Resources</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2929</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3445*</td>
<td>543.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes 53 graduate students who dropped all credits as of October 16 and 36 graduate students enrolled in undergraduate courses only.
STATUS OF FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

FS89-3-1 P SENATE REPORT ON PRIORITY LIST FOR FRINGE BENEFITS
The Welfare Committee presented a prioritized list of fringe benefit requests of the faculty. Based on a survey of the faculty, the list included changes to the state retirement plan along with increases in life insurance and tuition waivers for faculty dependents. The Provost and Administration have received the report.

FS89-9-2 P RESOLUTION ON COMPENSATION BEGINNING DATE
The Faculty Senate requested that the University pay the salary adjustment monies to unclassified faculty effective July 1, 1989, for 12-month faculty and August 15, 1989, for 9-month faculty; and that in the future the University pay all salary increases to unclassified faculty effective July 1 for 12-month faculty and August 15 for 9-month faculty. The Provost approved making all faculty salary increases effective July 1 for 12-month faculty and August 15 for 9-month faculty in all instances in which doing so is permitted by applicable State laws, rulings, and regulations.

FSFS89-10-1B P RESOLUTION ON PAY RAISES FOR CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES
The Faculty Senate encourages the South Carolina legislature to divide pay raises to the classified employees of Clemson University equally between cost of living and merit. The Provost has requested the reaction of the Classified Staff Committee.

FS89-10-2 P RESOLUTION ON PARKING FOR ATHLETIC EVENTS
The Faculty Senate requested that the Athletic Department conform to the Faculty Manual and secure approval of the University Traffic and Parking Committee before making any changes in parking for athletic events and that the Department restore public parking on the Rugby practice field for football games. The Provost has requested the reaction of the Athletic Department.
RESOLUTION ON THE EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT HEADS
The Faculty Senate requests that each Department Head be evaluated by the Dean beginning with fifth year of his or her administrative service and continuing every third year thereafter. The Dean shall solicit the opinions of all permanent faculty and a representative of classified employees regarding areas of concern. The Dean shall summarize these views in reports to the Department Head and the Provost. New Department Heads should receive an informal evaluation within the first two years of service. The Provost has requested the reaction of the Organization of Academic Department Heads.

November 7, 1989
Centennial Professorship
Selection Criteria

The Centennial Professorship Selection committee shall be guided by the following criteria:

1. Demonstrated excellence of scholarship in one or more of the following:
   -- Undergraduate and/or graduate teaching
   -- Basic and/or applied research
   -- Public service
   -- Librarianship

2. Evidence of substantial contribution to intellectual atmosphere and quality of life in the state and nation.
Centennial Professorship

Call for Nominations

You are invited to submit nominations for the first awarding of the Centennial Professorship at Clemson University.

The Centennial Professorship is a two-year rotating award supported by an endowment funded jointly by the Clemson University Faculty and the Council for Higher Education.

All members of the Clemson Faculty headquartered on Campus and in other locations in the State are eligible for Nomination, and faculty members may nominate themselves. Nominees will be considered on the basis of demonstrated excellence of scholarship in one or more of the following: undergraduate and/or graduate teaching; applied and/or basic research; public service and librarianship. The intent of the Centennial Professorship is to reward effective faculty scholars who are making substantial contributions to the intellectual life of the state and nation.

The term for each appointment will be for two years and will be non-renewable. The Professorship will rotate among the various University Colleges and the Library. The Award will provide a salary supplement and expenses for the Centennial Professor; the actual allocation will be determined by the Provost and the recipient.

Nominees will be asked to submit curriculum vitae and supporting materials to the office of the Faculty Senate President. These materials will be reviewed by a Selection Committee consisting of the most recent ex-President of the Faculty Senate and four faculty members selected by the Advisory committee of the Faculty Senate.
Centennial Professorship
Composition of Selection Committee

The Centennial Professorship Selection Committee will be composed of five current Clemson University faculty members. One member of this Committee will be the most recent ex-President of the Faculty Senate. The remaining four members will be selected by the Faculty Senate Advisory committee. One will be selected from the list of named professorship faculty. A second will be selected from a list of faculty having some administrative responsibility. The remaining two members will be selected to assure that the complete committee contains a representative from each of the teaching, research and service functions of Clemson University.
The criteria for award of the Centennial Professor began simply along the lines of scholarship. The attitude of the steering body was to eliminate administrative accomplishment, student advising, community service, etc— all of which have other forms of reward. A feeling seemed to exist that the faculty would wish to identify scholarship as the trait most worthy of merit for a faculty-supported award.

Upon review there were added modifiers teaching and research and public service because these are the predominant categories of our activities. Some editorialist, probably in hopes of clarifying the need for breadth, added the redundant adjectives basic and/or applied to research and undergraduate and/or graduate to teaching. Librarianship was added.

The committee charged with defining the goals added another item: Evidence of substantial contribution to intellectual atmosphere and quality of life in the state and nation.

A description of the award was included in the package of announcement and solicitation for contributions. The criteria only say "demonstrated excellence in..." The word scholarship has been removed!

A recent letter to the Senate was received which indicated that the performing arts faculty feel ineligible because of the nature of the criteria.

In view of this difficulty, I am making the following motion: In all references to the awarding of the Centennial Professorship, the criteria be listed simply as scholarship and professional achievement.

[Signature]
Centennial Professorship
Selection Criteria

The Centennial Professorship Selection Committee shall be guided by excellence in scholarship and professional achievement.
Centennial Professorship

Call for Nominations

You are invited to submit nominations for the first awarding of the Centennial Professorship at Clemson University.

The Centennial Professorship is a two year rotating award supported by an endowment funded jointly by Clemson Faculty and the Council for Higher Education.

All members of the Clemson Faculty headquartered on Campus and in other locations in the State are eligible for Nomination, and faculty members may nominate themselves. Nominees will be considered on the basis of demonstrated excellence of scholarship in one or more of the following: undergraduate and/or graduate teaching; applied and/or basic research; and Extension education. The intent of the Centennial Professorship is to reward effective faculty scholars who are making substantial contributions to the intellectual life of the state and nation.

The term for each appointment will be for two years and will be non-renewable. The Professorship will rotate among the various Colleges in the University. The Award will provide a salary supplement and expenses for the Centennial Professor; the actual allocation will be determined by the Provost and the recipient.

Nominees will be asked to submit curriculum vitae and supporting materials to the office of the Faculty Senate President. These materials will be reviewed by a Selection Committee consisting of the most recent ex-President of the Faculty Senate and four faculty members selected by the Advisory committee of the Faculty Senate.
Centennial Professorship

Composition of Selection Committee

The Centennial Professorship Selection Committee will be composed of five current Clemson University faculty members. One member of this Committee will be the most recent ex-President of the Faculty Senate. The remaining four members will be selected by the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee. One will be selected from the list of named professorship faculty. A second will be selected from a list of faculty having some administrative responsibility. The remaining two members will be selected to assure that the complete committee contains a representative from each of the teaching, research and service functions of Clemson University.