I. CALL TO ORDER
President Dyck called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY
President Dyck introduced special guest Verne A. Stadtman, Vice President-General Services of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The regular agenda of the Senate was suspended in order to allow Stadtman to review the Foundation's report *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America* (summarized in Attachment A) of which he was managing editor. President Dyck noted that, despite the University's increased emphasis on research, through such programs as the Second Century Plan and the Research Investment Act, the quality of education still needs to be considered. Faculty and administrators are concerned by the implications of this report and eight committees have been formed on campus to study the eight tensions outlined therein.

Mr. Stadtman delivered his remarks (Attachment B) and then responded to questions from faculty and students. He feels that undergraduate education has probably become poorer in
the last few decades and that four years may not be the magic length for an education. More and more students are taking five years. Senator Nowaczyk cited the trend toward quantifying education using such systems as the instructional productivity formula and asked if there was a way to include a measure of quality, too. Stadtman responded that ideally content and quality should be considered, but that, realistically, public institutions are answerable to the demands of those who do not understand the goals described in the report.

When asked if accrediting agencies are still performing a valuable function or if institutions should rely more on themselves to define quality, Stadtman relied that institutions should be very involved in measuring their own quality, even though accrediting agencies have not outgrown their usefulness. However, these agencies do not operate with any minimum standards and can co-opt institutional prerogatives, such as determining the number of faculty and their quality.

A student commented on the changes brought about by raising the drinking age. Stadtman stressed the need to combine student and academic activities, as outlined in the report, in order to lessen the separation between the two areas.
When asked about how faculty should begin to cope with the increased emphasis on research, Stadtman noted that this was just a manifestation of a natural tendency to reach for higher levels. Sometimes, however, it is good to look at what the university is and be best at that. When faced with the pressure to change, a response will depend on how firmly the university believes in what it is currently doing and whether it can survive in the future.

Stadtman responded to a question about athletics by saying that change must and will come from within the institution, not from external sources. At this time, athletic decisions are often made by only one segment of the university—one reason why the Carnegie Report describes the need for improved governance and participation by all campus constituencies.

Professor Schaffer asked about the methodology used to compile the report. Stadtman described the three different methods: 1) national surveys, 2) study of higher education literature, and 3) site visits. The site visits were not the core of the research effort and the visitors were given guidelines but left to their own devices otherwise. These visits were conducted just to see if the institutions actually resembled the results found by the other two research methods.
Stadtman did not see any fundamental differences between the undergraduate experience at public and private institutions. The size certainly varies and a smaller school produces a more intense experience, but the undergraduate experience appears to be much the same everywhere.

A professor asked about the applicability of the report to first level professional degrees which should meet certain requirements. Stadtman is worried about the tendency of some majors to monopolize all of a student's undergraduate experience. A professional degree program should still be able to satisfy a breadth of other needs.

Stadtman was asked if the Carnegie Report's requirement for senior theses and colloquia was unrealistic because of both the lack of resources and the general caliber of today's student. Are universities trying to educate too many people at the university level? He stated that the admissions process was faulty and that many students showed the need for prior remediation. The need for additional resources is the central question, if something is worth doing a faculty member can figure out how to do it.

President Dyck thanked Mr. Stadtman for being the Senate's guest and invited the audience to the reception following the program.
III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margery N. Sly
Secretary

No attendance was taken.
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Study Finds Colleges Torn by Divisions, Confused over Roles

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

By MALCOLM G. SCULLY

WASHINGTON

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

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

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

Findings of the faculty survey were published in The Chronicle, December 18, 1985. Those of the college-student survey were published in the issue of February 5, 1986. Mr. Boyer's report will be published in book form early next year by Harper & Row.

"During our study we found deep divisions on the campus, conflicting priorities and competing interests that diminish the intellectual and social quality of the undergraduate experience," continuation on Page 16, Column 1

But It's Only 1986

Education Already Big Issue for '88 Presidential Aspirants

By STACY E. PALMER

WASHINGTON

Last spring Sen. Gary Hart proposed a $17-billion education, research, and training program designed to bolster the nation's industrial competitiveness.

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

Getting the amendment added to the budget plan wasn't entirely the point, however. With an eye to the 1988 Presidential elections, Mr. Boyer was using the opportunity to get across the details of his agenda for education before he leaves the Senate at the end of the year to work full time on his possible run for the Democratic nomination.

His speech in support of the education measure was sprinkled with references to his "vision" of the future and jobs at the other major political party—both staples of Presidential campaign speeches.

Like many other prospective candidates for the 1988 Presidential race, Mr. Hart has already begun developing the themes he will use to court voters. He is one of a handful of politicians who are saying they would emphasize education if they decide to make a formal attempt to occupy the White House.

The only person who has officially discussed higher education to date is Delaware Gov. Pierre S. du Pont, IV, said in the speech announcing his candidacy for the Republican nomination that one of his major goals would be the establishment of a "national school and leverage of such deep knowledge of other fields that they have unusually broad contacts in the Soviet Union, said the official, John Zimmerman.

Nevertheless, the Russians appreciate— as does the United States—that great gains can be made "from the combined efforts to learn together and the knowledge of what each side is doing," he said. So against their suspicions and fears of security leaks, the Russians are constantly weighing the potential value of scientific information to be gleaned.

Mr. Zimmerman said in an interview

Continued on Page 44, Column 1

Moscow

By PATRICIA WALKER and HONOR WILSON

According to a scientific attaché at the American Embassy here, the Soviet government's basic assumption about American scholars and other Western visitors to their country is that they are all spies.

The Russians are particularly suspicious of visitors with expertise in the Russian language or in the fields of nuclear or space, who have unusually broad contacts in the Soviet Union, said the official, John Zimmerman.

Nevertheless, the Russians appreciate— as does the United States—that great gains can be made "from the combined efforts to learn together and the knowledge of what each side is doing," he said. So against their suspicions and fears of security leaks, the Russians are constantly weighing the potential value of scientific information to be gleaned.

Mr. Zimmerman said in an interview

Continued on Page 41, Column 2

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

U.S. View

By COLLEEN CORDES

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

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

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

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

Indeed, officials who administer exchange programs generally discount the notion that the latest strains in U.S.-Soviet relations—including the stalemate at the Iceland minisummit and the recent tit-for-tat expulsions of diplomats and cutbacks in embassy staffs—will affect the quantity or quality of continued on Page 42, Column 1

Russia Seen Reforming Higher Education

By VERA RICH

BRUSSELS

The Soviet Union has embarked on a drive for excellence in higher education. Western analysts told a recent conference sponsored by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The Russians' plans were said to include a general tightening of academic standards and a closing of weaker institutions.

New procedures for university admissions, introduced during the summer, give priority to applicants with good records in work or military service. In addition to examinations, the procedures call for interview.

Continued on Page 44, Column 1
Prologue and Major Recommendations of Carnegie Foundation's Report on Colleges

Our system of higher education, with its openness, diversity, and scholarly achievement, is the envy of the world. And yet, while preparing this report we found that the undergraduate college, the very heart of higher learning, is a troubled institution.

We and ask: Is it possible for educators...and stressed the importance of...the centerpiece of the report.

The first problem we encountered is the discrepancy between schools that consider themselves to be the undergraduate college, the very heart of higher learning, and the many undergraduates who have lost their sense of mission. They are concerned about the uncertain outcomes and values on which the vitality of both higher education and society depend.

The separation we found between school and college has led to a mismatch, a disturbing one, between faculty expectations and the academic preparation of entering students. We cannot claim to have fragmented ourselves into smaller and smaller departments; we cannot even see into the experiences of their students, and to what extent they have learned to live. And we know that the nation's education structure should be a seamless web. Carnegie Study Finds Colleges Are Torn by Divisions and Confused Over Purposes

"The undergraduate college,...the very heart of higher learning, is a troubled institution."
The American college is ready for renewal, and there is an urgency for the task.

Common Sense Approaches to Life Insurance Needs

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

Based on TIAA's experience in counseling thousands of individuals over the years, it's realistic for someone with a family to protect own life insurance and other death benefits equal to at least six times current salary. This simple rule of thumb determines with reasonable precision the amount of insurance money your survivors would need to help maintain today's income level during the most critical dependency years ahead. It doesn't take into account, however, tomorrow's salary increases which would also be lost if you should die prematurely, increases that are critical to maintaining and improving the quality of life your dependents look forward to as the years go by. Ten times salary is a good measure of an amount of insurance money needed today to equal your lifetime earnings potential, because it's the present value of your total future earnings with assumed increases... increases that would be denied to your survivors if you were to die tomorrow.

A professional TIAA counselor will be glad to talk with you about your individual needs. The important thing to realize is that it's very inexpensive to own large amounts of new family protection these days. If you're employed by a college, university or other nonprofit educational institution and are curious about the exact cost of bringing your total coverage up to six times salary, ten times salary, or some amount in between, just call the TIAA Life Insurance Advisory Center toll free at 1-800-223-1200. No one will call on you as a result of your inquiry.
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Command from Proceeding Paper and the schools, by its willingness to smooth the transition between high school and college, a high educational purpose. The way students are recruited, their college experiences, and the way colleges use their recruitment and selection to serve the best interests of students is not strong. We found during our study that the patch from school to college is poorly made. Students and their parents urgently need to be better informed about the full range of colleges in America and they should be given better advice about the alternatives they have. Such information is essential if the undergraduate experience is to be strengthened.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

When scores are required, the use of college placement tests is described fully to prospective students, and college officials should not use only the average S.A.T. scores, but also the scores of admitted students by quartile.

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

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

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

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

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

Above all, prospective students and their parents should not be intimidated by the process. It is wrong to believe that there is one type of college that is right for all. A handful of colleges are highly selective, and if attending one of these institutions is a student’s goal, some degree of comparison must be accepted as a fact of life.

But many lesser-known colleges also offer a solid, challenging undergraduate experience.

II

Goals

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

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

While responding to students’ diverse goals, the college has an obligation to give students a sense of passage toward a more integrated, more comprehensive undergraduate education.
A successful freshman year pro-
gram will convince students that they
are part of an intellectual Vital, car-
ing community.

IV

The First Requirement

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

We urge the reading and
writing capability of all students to
carefully assessed when they enroll.
These skills, well prepared in written
and spoken English should be placed
in an intensive, noncredit, remedial
course that meets daily during the
adolescent term. And good English us-
age must be rewarded by every
professor in every class.

While the need for remedial
programs is a fact of life, we are con-
vinced that the long-term answer is
better preparation in education. Every
college and university should work
with the surrounding districts to
improve the teaching of English in
the schools.

We also recommend that all col-
lege freshmen, not just those with
special problems, begin their under-
graduate experience with a year-long
course in English, with emphasis on
writing. While stressing writing, we also
believe oral communication be-
come important part of the fresh-
man language course.

Language and thought are insecri-
dably connected, and as undergradu-
ates develop their language skills,
they hone the quality of their thinking
and become intellectually and social-
lly empowered. The goal must be to
extend, through language study, the
common knowledge of its students
and, in our view, sustain the heritage
of our culture.

V

General Education

The weak and ineffective approach
to general education—through dis-
tribution requirements—should be
strengthened. To achieve this essen-
tial goal, we propose an approach
called an unspread core. By the in-
tegrated core we mean a program of
study that introduces a student to es-
ential knowledge, in connections
across the disciplines, and, in the
end, to the application of knowledge
in life beyond the campus.

To translate the purpose of the
integrated core into practice, we sug-
gest seven areas of inquiry that touch
disciplines and relate knowledge
to experiences common to all people.
The following academic framework
for general education is suggested:

- Language: The Crucial Connection
  - Art: The Ethic Experience
  - Heritage: The Living Past
  - The Social Web
  - Nature: Ecologies of the Planet
  - Work: The Value of Vocational
  - Identity: The Quest for Meaning

It seems clear to us that an explo-
ratory of these universal experi-
ences—through courses, seminars,
all-college convocations, and the
like—is indispensable if students are
better to understand themselves,
their society, and the world of which
they are a part. Ideally, general edu-
cation, the integrated core, is not
something to "get out of the way,"
but should extend vertically from
freshman to senior year. And in a
properly designed baccalaureate pro-
gram, general education and special-
ized education will be joined.

VI

The Enriched Major

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

The major, as it is enriched,
would respond to these essential
questions: What is the history and
Continued on Following Page
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Comment from President Pay: the scope of the field to be examined? Are the social and economic implications to be understood and resolved?

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

As the major begins to intersect with the themes of common learning seamless, faculty members in the humanities, sciences, and social sciences, and the rest. At a college of quality when a major is so enriched it leads the student from breadth to sustained discourse, not mere training, but on liberal education at its best.

VII Faculty Priorities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VIII Creativity in the Classroom

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

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

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

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

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

> All members of the faculty should work continuously to improve the content of their courses, and their methods of instruction and teacher preparation should be in graduate school as graduate assistants work with mentors who carefully critique their work. The undergraduate college, at its
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Compared from Proceeding Past where the curricular and cocurricular are viewed as having no relationship to each other. At a time when social bonds are tenuous, college students should discover and value the reality of their dependence on each other. They must understand what it takes to share and sustain traditions. Community must be built.

XI
Residential Living

Administrators, we found, are confused about their obligations to students in nonacademic matters and in the context of student living; the challenge of creating an enthusiastic community of learners must be carefully considered. Are living arrangements simply a convenience or do they contribute to college goals? We find it troubling that students who serve as resident assistants in the dorms are given weighty assignments, when key college administrators, and especially members of the faculty, are far removed from the day to day responsibilities.

We urge that college presidents become directly involved in the planning and administration of college residence halls and the living and the quality of campus life. The president and key members of the administration should report on both problems and creative programs in the residence halls.

We strongly urge that colleges and universities provide intensive workshops to help members of the dorm staffs to serve as resident assistants. We recommend further that the president have resident assistants who meet with them regularly and supervise their work and that the college be reimbursed adequately.

It is our position, too, that all colleges need standards—a code of conduct—not just in academic matters, but in nonacademic matters, too. Such a code clarifies the expectations of the university and makes regulation unnecessary.

In a community of learning, as in any community, we need a sense of order to guide the requirements of all, while still respecting the dignity and needs of individuals.

Specifically we urge that private space should be respected and honored by all. Loud noise should not be allowed. Sexism, racism, and religious bigotry are offenses to the dignity of other human beings.

We also recommend that campus codes of conduct be enforced. We have known too many college students who have violated these codes and been let off lightly.

Educational programs should be developed in the residence halls to foster a sense of community, and provide an enriching influence.

Bringing commuter students into the life of the college is an important and growing challenge. There should be a special office where commuter students can go to get help, file complaints and learn about special programs and services available to them.

A college concerned about community cannot be unmindful of deep divisions on campus. And it is a residence hall arrangements, in private clubs, and the way faculty members and part-time students treated, that some of the most fundamental values of the college are conditioned—or avoided.

XII
Governing the College

Formal decision-making mechanisms on most campuses are not working very well.

While faculty feel a deep sense of loyalty to their professions, they are less committed to the institutions where they work. We found that, almost without exception, the role of students in campus decision-making is not taken seriously in higher education.

If the college is to be an effective community, effective governance is essential. At every college and university, forums are needed to address common educational questions and to consider campus-wide matters that cannot be handled in any other way.

Undergraduates should be encouraged not only to understand how decisions are made at the college where they are enrolled, but also should be asked, indeed, expected, to participate as campus citizens as well.

We urge that the faculty support vigorously a representative campus-wide senate capable of handling all matters relating to the institution's academic goals. We further recommend that administrators and board members work with faculty senate to create more inclusive forums to discuss concerns identified in this report—tenure, recruitment, orientation and advising, the quality of campus life, student work where they work. We found that, almost without exception, the role of students in campus decision-making is not taken seriously in higher education.

We especially urge that undergraduates be more fully consulted in the full range of campus life. They should be represented on all standing campus committees that affect the education and social life of the institution.

In addition to the traditional functions of setting policy, selecting presidents, and approving budgets and key personnel appointments, trustees must participate in shaping institutional priorities. They should involve themselves especially in the reviewing of the quality of the undergraduate experience.

In the end, good governance is to be measured not by the formality of the structure, but by the integrity of the participants, by the quality of communications and above all, by the willingness of individuals to bind together in support of larger purposes.

XIII
Measuring the Outcomes

In the measuring of college outcomes we reject paper and pencil tests that focus on simple recall and measure that which matters least. Rather, a quality undergraduate college is concerned about outcomes that transcend what students derive from separate courses.

Students need to think clearly, be well informed, be able to integrate their knowledge, and know how to apply what they have learned.

Specifically, we recommend that, beyond the evaluation they receive in their separate courses, all students complete a senior thesis before they graduate.

This thesis should be devoted to a project of the student's own choosing, on the historical, social, and ethical perspectives of the major.

We suggest that students participate in a senior seminar to present orally their thesis and participate in the critique of the work of others.

We also recommend that every college sponsor each year a senior colloquium series in which selected students present their senior papers and respond to questions as a public forum. Such a series would demonstrate to all students the true meaning of a college education.

Colleges might also ask students to prepare a portfolio that records the activities in which they have engaged as campus citizens—student government, clubs, cultural events, and most importantly, voluntary services.

To gain perspective on how the college experience is perceived retrospectively, colleges also may wish to survey alumni. College officials may interview graduates to determine not only the pattern of former students' further careers education and careers but also how well alumni fulfill their civic and social obligations.

In measuring outcomes, the task is to strike a balance between the progress of each student—as measured by the courses completed, the grades assigned, and the credits earned—and the overall impact of the undergraduate experience, not just in academic matters but in community to community as well.

XIV
Values—From Competence to Commitment

Today's students have been lauded the "generation" concerned only about private ends. We found, however, that undergraduates at this generation have hopes and aspirations that reach beyond themselves.

Undergraduates often are torn by idealism on one hand, and the temptation to pursue narrow career interests on the other. They find themselves politically and socially disenchanted.

We recommend that all students complete a service project—volunteer work in the community or at the colleges—as an integral part of their undergraduate experience.

We further urge colleges to offer selected admission to high school graduates who devote a year to voluntary service before coming to college.

We also recommend that colleges consider composition of a new "Carnegie Unit"—a term (100 hours of voluntary service as recommended in our report on high schools)—an important criterion in their admissions process.

Finally, campus life would be enriched if faculty service became more than a catchword.

If service is to become a vital part of the educational experience of every student, faculty must lead the way.

The aim of the undergraduate experience is not only to prepare the young to be productive, but also to enable them to live with dignity and purpose; not only to generate new knowledge, but to channel that knowledge to human ends; not merely to study government, but to shape a citizenship that can promote the public good.
UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AT CLEMSON

Remarks of Verne A. Stadtman
Vice-President, General Services
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement
of Teaching, January 13, 1987

It's a pleasure for me to meet with you this afternoon. I welcome the opportunity see for myself one of the 29 institutions our observers visited in preparation for our recently completed report on undergraduate education. I'm also grateful for the chance to express in person our appreciation for Clemson's participation in that project.

We found much to be proud of in our study, and high on our list would be the seriousness and dedication with which the men and women who are professionally engaged in teaching and research in American colleges and universities approach their work. I find your presence here today to be evidence of that kind of commitment.

I want to reassure any of you who was interviewed by Ms. Fabriszak during her site visit here, that her original manuscript was put under lock and key almost as soon as it was received. In drafting our report, staff members had access only to a manuscript in which all names—even those of the
institution—were changed. Nothing I say today, therefore, will incriminate anyone present.

You have all, however, contributed to our report College: The Undergraduate Experience in America, which will be off the press next week. And we are grateful for your help.

In the prologue to our report, our Foundation's president, Ernest Boyer, finds the nation's colleges and universities to be troubled. In the time available to me this afternoon, I want to discuss these "troubles" briefly, drawing, when it is appropriate, on information we obtained in the Clemson site visit report.

Please understand that as I speak to you today I understand my limitations. Almost everything I know about Clemson is second-hand, coming from the site-visit report and a few standard reference sources. I will react as candidly and honestly as I can to my understanding of Clemson, as a means of illustrating general concepts and principles, but I ask for your tolerance when you find my information wrong or misinterpreted.
The first reason why our report finds undergraduate education in America to be troubled may be traced to the discontinuity between what happens in the nation's secondary schools and what happens later on college campuses.

The two education sectors tend to work in isolation from each other. College entrance requirements have only a rough relationship to high school graduation requirements—even for students on a pre-college track.
With student-to-counsellor ratios in high schools running one to to 300 or more, high school students turn to others for advice. Most often, they turn to their parents, friends, college recruiters and commercial guide books. Some of these sources are poorly informed about colleges; others know the colleg landscape but cannot know much about the individual interests and abilities of prospective prospective students. When good matches are made, the occur more often by accident than by careful planning. As a partial answer to this problem, our report recommends that regional centers be established to provide better information to both high school counsellors and students.

We also found that the admissions process on many college campuses is shrowded in myth and mystery. As a simple example, few high school seniors are aware that less than 50 colleges and universities in the country admit less than half of
the students who apply to them for admission. Inordinate attention is focussed on standardized tests, such as the SAT and ACT as keys to college admission despite the fact that most colleges place little or no importance on test scores in making the final decisions about who gets in and who doesn't.

On arrival at college, students often find orientation programs perfunctory or nonexistent. In this regard, Clemson seems better than most.

Your two-day freshman orientation program and the freshman "buddy system," are not as ambitious as some of the other orientations programs described in our report, but, frankly, they represent efforts that too many colleges in the country skip all together.

Academic advising is poor almost everywhere. Too often, we found these procedures reduced to logistics: getting hundreds, maybe thousands of course selections and class schedules examined, approved, and recorded within as little time as possible. From some of the testimony given to our site visitor, this is apparently a problem in the major advising procedure here at Clemson. Faculty members complain about having too little time for the task. Students agree, and claim their
advisors know little or nothing about courses outside their own fields.

Another problem with orientations programs—particularly on campuses that are near population centers—is that part-time and older students (a growing segment of the national student body) are all but ignored. The problem, of course, is that their campus routines are difficult to anticipate. Moreover, campus orientation tends to emphasize collegiate traditions and may seem off-target to students whose college-going days often are shared with jobs and, perhaps, with families.

The second problem we found is confusion over goals. That is not to say that we did not see any formal goal statements. Most colleges we visited have them, but they are not always taken very seriously. I gather from our site visit report on Clemson, however, that this university not only takes its mission seriously, but frequently takes it under formal review.
According to statements made to our site visitor, it is the land-grant tradition that dominates thinking about the mission here. For example, one administrator told her that "the arts, sciences, education, and architecture," are regarded as "strong supporting areas" bolstering agriculture and engineering. And the testimony of other faculty members and administrators echoed that sentiment.

Research, we are told—again in the land-grant tradition—"serves the common good by anticipating and devising new solutions for the social and technical problems of tomorrow's world as well as by enriching the intellectual and cultural environment."

I suspect that in research universities there would be a subtle difference. The concern for an enriched intellectual environment good would have higher priority than the application of knowledge for the common good.

Public service, another land-grant emphasis, entails, our observer was told, making the facilities and faculty of the university "available to the state and the region."

Students talk about Clemson's mission with a liberal arts twist. I'm certainly not
talking here about the student who told us the administration's mission was to put academics "parallel with sports," although I think I understand that perspective. What I have in mind is the statement of a student who said "The goal of Clemson University is to make its students more whole people; to graduate people who can go beyond just doing engineering or just being an accountant—to make its students well-rounded individuals."

In contrast, when faculty members and administrators are asked about goals, they subtly blend the rhetoric of the land grant colleges with that of the research university, summing it up in the familiar triad of teaching, research and public service.

These sentiments may sound like promotion-brochure rhetoric, but I sense there is something more. In our site visitor's discussion of goals, and in her reports of other conversations on the campus, we sense Clemson's urge, perhaps even its confident expectation, to become a research university of national stature. I would not be surprised to find the striving for this goal—now realized by less
than 10 percent of the institutions of higher learning in the country, to be a characterizing influence at Clemson in the next decade.

The third problem area in undergraduate education involves the divided loyalties and competing career concerns within the faculty.

People who are not involved in higher education do not understand that the college or university campus may not define the academic's total professional world. The challenge and rewards that come through identification with a discipline, and the recognition and collegiality available through a professional society, often have more to do with a professor's satisfaction than a promotion and a raise in pay (though, of course, he or she would be glad to accept both).

Under such conditions, an institution's hold on its academic staff may be less firm than one might expect.

In this regard, I was disappointed to find that the role of research at Clemson was not discussed in much depth by our campus visitor. In her defense,
course, I remind you that she understood our interest to be focussed on the undergraduate experience in America. In that context, she may have considered what she saw in the classrooms more relevant than what faculty members told her about their scholarship.

In our report, however, we address teaching vs. research at some length. We recognize the importance of both activities, but still urge that:

Wherever undergraduates are taught, teaching excellence must be an essential expectation.

Although every faculty member need not be a great teacher and a great researcher, in every discipline there should be some faculty members who can do research and are outstanding teachers and some who can teach but are outstanding researchers. In short, great teachers and great researchers can function side by side. We reject the notion, incidentally, that being a good researcher automatically makes one a good teacher.
On first reading, this view seems to conflict with Clemson's recently adopted policy requiring that faculty members give evidence of research achievement in order to obtain tenure. But we would have to know more about Clemson's minimally acceptable level of research to know for sure. One of our own recommendations approaches the issue in a slightly different way. We say that:

While all professors need not be publishing researchers, those who teach should be first-rate scholars. This means staying abreast of the profession, knowing the literature in one's field, and skillfully communicating such information to students.

This scholarship, like research, we maintain, should be available for examination and judgement.

We also believe that all institutions should give more attention to faculty development, and that good teaching should be recognized.
universities that have the rank of distinguished research professor in place, for example, should consider establishing the rank of distinguished teaching professor as well.

Finally, the balance between full-time and part-time faculty needs to be reexamined on many campuses. Specifically, we propose that no more than 20 percent of the undergraduate faculty be part-time, and that when part-time faculty are used, their employment should be educationally justified.

A fourth problem is that, in all too many classrooms, we found an absence of vigorous intellectual exchange.

Our site visit reports gave us a remarkably consistent depiction of the typical college class. "With few exceptions...the teacher stood in front of rows of chairs and talked for most of the forty-five or fifty minutes. There was little opportunity for positions to be clarified or ideas challenged."
At Clemson, we found the classes to average about 35 students, although there were anywhere from 50 to 200 students in introductory courses at the freshman and sophomore levels. These larger classes are supplemented by smaller sections and laboratories. Although students were able to identify at least a few professors who seem to take an interest in them, we were given few examples, even in small classes, of interactive teaching.

Our observer was impressed, incidentally, that when one professor gives a supplemental reading assignment, he refuses to take up class time on questions that are answered in the assigned books. In contrast, at another college in our study, an English professor lectured in detail about the contents of a reading assignment and then apologized for spoiling the ending for those who hadn't reached it yet. He was forgiven, however, when he indicated the material would be on the next test.

The fifth problem is the separation between the academic and social life of students on the campus. Colleges like to speak of the campus as a coherent community. Yet, what is being learned in most residence halls across the country today has little
connection to the classrooms. In fact, it may undermine the educational purposes of the college. The idea that a college stands in loco parentis is today a faded memory and nothing has come along to take its place.

We were told by our site visitor that 60 percent of Clemson's students live in university housing. Although they complain about crowding, or having to carry things up four flights of stairs, or other minor inconveniences, they appear to appreciate the convenience and conviviality of living on campus. A senior told our observer, "I have lived in the tin cans for four years. They are noisy, they are old, the showers are a mess and it's hard to study there, but I wouldn't want to move for anything in the world."

Clemson, we are told, is considered a "fun" campus, and drinking is reported to be "one of the most popular unofficial activities." Drugs are reportedly used by 10 to 30 percent of the students here.

On almost all of the campuses we visited, there is an enormous difference in the life and times of students as described by their own testimony and the assessment of student life.
given to us by faculty and administrators. Students welcome their recently bestowed responsibilities and independence, but sometimes seem unwilling or unable to exercise them in ways that acknowledge the preferences, rights, and privileges of fellow students...or the claims of campus community.

We are concerned. Where, we ask, does institutional responsibility for student behavior start and end? Has it been delegated and redelegated so far down the line—in some cases almost exclusively to students themselves, that college presidents and faculty members are only remotely concerned with it?

This question may not be one of regulation so much as one of integrating—more thoughtfully than we seem to do now—the academic and nonacademic life of students.

We take the position that a college needs standards not just in academic matters, but in nonacademic matters, too. Rules and regulations not only clarify the expectations of the institution, but, more importantly, they also help to define the character of the college as a learning community.

Because Clemson is nationally known for its intercollegiate athletic record, perhaps our Foundation's longstanding bias on that subject will not be too welcome here. But in all fairness I must report that we strongly urge that intercollegiate
sports be organized and operated to serve the students, not the institution. We also ask presidents of universities and colleges to say publicly what they acknowledge privately: that big-time sports are out of control. Finally, we flatly recommend that when serious athletic violations are discovered at an institution, the accreditation status of that institution should be revoked—along with its eligibility for membership in the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

The sixth problem we encountered involved disagreement over how the college should be governed. On most campuses we visited, efforts to accommodate the needs and expectations of students, faculty members, departments, schools, colleges, research and information centers produced an ineffective Rube-Goldberg-like governing arrangement.

At every college and university, forums are needed to address common educational questions and consider campus-wide matters that cannot be handled in other ways. Representative campus-wide organizations of faculty
and students are needed to facilitate communication and deliberation on matters of direct concern to those constituencies. But special forums for all constituents are needed to discuss in formal fashion some of the concerns of our report, including recruitment, orientation and advising, the quality of campus life, and student assessment.

The undergraduate college, we conclude, more than any other division of higher education, must be guided by a sense of common purpose; it must be sustained and nurtured by procedures that cut across the separate departments and divisions.
The seventh problem addressed in our report is to determine how the outcome of the college education should be measured. Undergraduates are being measured almost constantly, as they go to class, take notes, write papers, take tests, report orally and are graded on their performance of every task.

Colleges and universities are evaluated too. Federal and state governments monitor their programs. Accrediting bodies review the overall health of institutions. One hundred and fifty-four professional accrediting bodies look at specialized programs. And many states have coordinating bodies that try to keep collegiate programs well balanced.

Despite all of this assessing and evaluating, we aren't really sure we're doing it right.

One difficulty, of course, is that, for all intents and purposes, most of the evaluation that goes on now is done by individual professors who determine not only what is to be taught, but how the students' progress and knowledge are to be tested and graded. That is a far cry from the colonial practice of requiring students to deliver oral declamations before a panel of outside examiners to demonstrate that they learned what they were expected to learn and learned it well.
We suggest what may be a modern version of the original notion: a requirement that all students complete senior theses that relate their majors to historical, social, or ethical concerns, and that they participate in a senior seminar to present their reports orally and critique the papers of fellow students.

Although our report does not spell it out, one could assume that student performance in their theses and seminars would have significant weight in determining the overall assessment of their college experience.

Building on that basic notion, our report further suggests that every college and university conduct a senior colloquium series in which a handful of graduating students would be invited to present their final papers to the college community. The report concludes: These public lectures, followed by discussion, would make it clear to all students that the outcomes of a college education are to be measured by the students' capacity to integrate knowledge and apply what they have learned.

It is also suggested that students compile a portfolio of the activities in which they have participated while in college. The feeling is that
such a portfolio could address the student's progress in meeting social and cultural objectives.

You will note that none of these suggestions respond to the interests of public agencies that would like to impose "outcome measures" on colleges and universities. Quite frankly, we doubt such measures can be devised. We also doubt that external assessment holds much promise of improving higher education generally. To quote directly from our report:

"In the end, excellence in education will be achieved not simply through better testing but through better teaching. If we look down the road, it is unimaginable that the American college in the foreseeable future, will not have courses and will not rely primarily on the classroom teacher to both instruct and test. It is hard to imagine that such evaluation—course by course—will not remain the primary means of quality control. Talk about external measures is simply a diversion if it assumes that quality is to be achieved by bypassing the professors and their classrooms."
The eighth, and final problem addressed by our report is the disturbing gap between the college and the larger world. To respond to this problem, we repeat a suggestion we had made in our report on High Schools: that all students complete a service project as an integral part of their undergraduate experience. We also suggest that colleges consider requiring high school students to complete a service unit to qualify for admission to college.

These eight problems—discontinuity between school and college; confusion over goals; divided faculty loyalties; absence of interactive instruction, separation of academic and social life; disagreement on governance; assessing outcomes, and the gap between college and the larger world—are addressed in considerably more detail in our report than I have indicated here. They are not, however, the centerpiece of the report. No part of our study involved more effort and discussion than that having to do with the content of the undergraduate instruction. Our final recommendations focus on three components:
The first component is proficiency in the written and spoken word. Students need language to grasp and express feelings and ideas effectively. They need to write and speak with clarity and read and listen with comprehension. Although, these skills should be acquired before student enroll in college, they need to be used and honed throughout the undergraduate years. As they develop language skills, students should sharpen the quality of their thinking and become intellectually and socially empowered.

The second component is what we call the integrated core. By this we mean a program of study that introduces the student to essential knowledge, to connections across the disciplines, and in the end, to the application of knowledge to life beyond the campus. The integrated core might include:

Language: the crucial connection
Art: The Esthetic Experience
Heritage: The Living Past
Institutions: The Social Web
Nature: Ecology of the Planet
Work: The value of Vocation
Identity: The Search for meaning.
To appreciate the significance of the integrated core, one has to understand that it is not necessarily made up of courses that survey broad fields of study. Some of the examples of our report demonstrate the principle that the integrated core may simply show how one field of study can inform another. Think, for example, about the possible range of a course on "Signs and Communication" that investigates how language relates to particular cultural codes; or one on "the city" that views the metropolis in depth; or the exploration of a single institution pulling together environmental, ecological, and sociological information. The integrated core need not be limited to courses. It also can involve pieces of courses on other subjects. It can involve lectures, seminars, or exhibits. The important thing is that a conscious effort be made to address elements of the core in a variety of planned contexts and experiences.

One more thing. Properly designed, the integrated core will not be something to get out of the way before taking up a major. Ideally, it will be a part of a student's experience throughout the undergraduate years.
The third component is what we called the enriched major. It involves not only exploring a field of study in depth but putting it in perspective. It would respond to three questions about a major field of study: What is the history and tradition of the field? What are its social and economic implications? and What ethical and moral issues does it confront and how are they resolved?

Again, the means of achieving the enriched major may not entail new courses so much as it requires a sense of context when courses are taught. We believe that when a major is enriched it could lead students from depth to breadth and focus not on mere training, but on liberal education at its best.

We were told that at Clemson students are now required to take:

- 9 hours of composition and speaking skills
- 6 hours of mathematics
- 11 hours of science and technology
- 6 hours in the humanities
- 6 hours of the social sciences

This clearly is the distribution pattern prevalent in the general education requirements of many institutions. It has strong potential for preventing students from learning too narrowly at an institution.
that is historically geared to technology. In my view, one of its unintended advantages is that it provides room for manipulation to experiment with new courses and adaptations of old ones that could ultimately produce something like the three part-curriculum we advocate—assuming, of course, Clemson decides to move in that direction.

Whatever course is taken brings us back to the student I quoted earlier in this review. Remember, he said—unforgettably if inelegantly—"The goal of Clemson University is to make its students more whole people." Perhaps you and I can agree with him on that. But we also know something else that is less apparent to students and external kibitzers. It is that the effort to achieve such a goal involves the faculty and staff in a university in a challenging adventure. It is an adventure worth having. But, like most other endeavors of value it isn't easy. We commend you for accepting the challenges and extend heartfelt good wishes for your success.
I.  CALL TO ORDER
President Dyck called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II.  OLD BUSINESS
Senator Calhoun moved that the regular order of business be suspended so that the resolution from the Ad Hoc Committee on Fine Arts could be considered. Dean Waller needed the results for his meeting with candidates for department head of the new department of Performing Arts.

Senator Nowaczyk moved adoption of the resolution (Attachment A) from the Ad Hoc Committee on Fine Arts. Senator Hare seconded. Senator Nowaczyk reviewed the background on the resolution. President Dyck stated that the Council of Deans had reviewed the report and did recognize that academic freedom problems paralleled those involved in research efforts. However, the Deans did feel that these matters had to do with the public and that there was, therefore, a need for a review process beyond the academic unit. Senator Nowaczyk said that the committee had met again and considered this and other issues such as consulting the committee on Fine Arts, and the possibility that funding for theater productions go directly to the academic unit rather than through Student Affairs. They decided not to include them in the final resolution, feeling that some of those issues were not in the committee's charge.
Discussion followed. Senator Birrenkott noted that the Faculty Manual does not cover this kind of violation of academic freedom in the grievance procedures. President Dyck recognized Professor Egan who said that he supports this statement; it is a reaffirmation of a right that already exists. The university should acknowledge that right is extended to performing arts faculty. He does not want funding sources tied to academic freedom and would take academic freedom over funding and turn to the box office for financial support. He does believe, however, that the two can work together.

Senator Brannock commented that he found the use of the word "offensive" in the final "resolved" to be a value judgment and would prefer something like "controversial." Egan felt that offensive is narrower than controversial and would favor a change. Senator Hedden agreed with Brannock and suggested striking the last paragraph altogether. Again, Egan concurred. Senator Nowaczyk suggested voting separately on the final paragraph but Senator Titus was against that, wanting all or none to pass.

Senator Mullins proposed an amendment to delete the final paragraph, it was seconded by Senator Snelsire. Egan spoke in favor of this, stating that they would like the University to trust faculty to make those decisions on their own. It is good public relations for Performing Arts to keep people who might be offended out. Senator Baron agreed that the last paragraph was unnecessary and viewed it as a form of censorship. Senator Daniels suggested that the departments involved include some
kind of statement that they are responsible to the public and will be aware of possible problems. Senator Titus agreed, seeing it as a reinforcement of the commitment to the public. Senator Baron asked where we were supposed to be, wasn't a university the place for controversy and new ideas? Senator Hare noted that the resolution states earlier that the faculty assume the responsibility. Senator Linvill agreed with Baron and Egan that the final paragraph was not needed. A certain level of intelligence has to be assumed in the audience. Senator Nowaczyk said that part of the committee's charge was to deal with the issue of sensitivity to community standards and that they tried to choose their words wisely. Most other school's review processes stop at the college level and they, therefore, felt that this was appropriate. Senator Baron wondered "if this would snowball and someone would have to review exhibits at Lee Hall, etc."

The Senate voted to remove the final paragraph and then passed the resolution, 87-2-1.

III. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

A representative from the Student Alumni Council, Matt Carr, spoke about the Master Teacher Award, a $1500 award given each year. He asked that the senators announce to the faculty and students that nominations are being accepted until February 27 at the Alumni Center and that the Senators then help by supplying resumes, etc on nominated professors. Call Brian O'Rourke, 656-2345, for more information.
IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the December 9, 1986 and January 13, 1987 meetings were approved as corrected.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Policy: Senator Linvill read the report (Attachment B)

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

C. Scholastic Policy: Senator Nowaczyk gave the committee's report (Attachment C). Senator Baron asked that, when the committee looks at advising, they investigate whether the faculty should sign documents that say they are responsible, when they're not. Senator Nowaczyk said that he had discussed this with Corinne Sawyer who had gotten a legal opinion stating that faculty are responsible. Senator Baron wanted to know what would happen if a faculty member refuses to sign.

D. Welfare: Senator Calhoun read the report (Attachment D.)

E. Ad Hoc Committees

Grievance Procedures: Senator Linvill said that the draft report was almost ready to go to deans and department heads for comments.

Commission Structure: Senator Mullins stated that they had formulated a preliminary statement and hoped to receive input on it from the President, Cabinet, and the Senate Advisory Committee. He will have a report at the next Senate meeting.
F. University Commissions and Committees

Undergraduate Studies: Senator Nowaczyk said that the Senate's Admission policy recommendations are up for review and had survived fairly intact after review by the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee. The Admissions Exceptions and Appeals Committee also survived in a form similar to the Senate's original recommendation. The Commission formed three sub committees to consider: extending the amount of time between the last final exam and when senior grades are due, how long a student may be allowed to change a grade, and scheduling of final exams and other academic calendar changes in general.

Scholarships and Awards: Senator Calhoun reported that the committee had discussed scholarship needs and inequities at Clemson. There is only $732,000 per year to give out and some colleges get much more than others. Specifically, the committee discussed the MacDonald Scholarship which will be brought up under new business.

Admissions and Continuing Enrollment: Senator LaTorre said that the issues that they discussed (Attachment E) were sent to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, as reported above.

Fine Arts: Senator Brannock said that they would be meeting to discuss accepting the sculpture "Tilted Arc." (see Attachment F, Item 4)

Traffic and Parking: Senator Derr said that she wanted to make it clear that the parking plan to be discussed later came out of Vice-President Larson's office and, in no way, came through or from this committee. Larson did apologize for that.
Director of Housing Search Committee: Senator Nowaczyk reported that an offer had been made to one of the three finalists—all outside candidates—and the choice should be announced soon. President Dyck commented that it was good to have faculty representation on this committee.

VI. PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Attachment F)

President Dyck highlighted and added to several items in the Report and Update.

At the cocktail party for the Trustees (Item 1), Dyck discussed the HMO problem with Senator Waddell and has since sent him some material about that. Waddell will try to work with the appropriate people in Columbia to get the problem solved.

The close relationship of the location of the Continuing Education building and the Performing Arts Center (Item 3) is one of which everyone might not be aware. The funds are available for the education portion of the Continuing Education Building. It is highly important that the faculty involved in continuing education (Agriculture, Education, Commerce and Industry, Engineering, Forestry and Recreation Resources, and Nursing) attend this meeting on February 18, at 1:30 in the Board Room to express their opinions.

Related to the acceptance of the "Tilted Arc" (Item 4) is the problem of who should review potential gifts such as this. The Facilities Planning Committee may not be the best group for this task and this time they did refer it to the Fine Arts Committee.
President Dyck has met with Vice president Larson about the budget assessment process (Item 8). Plans will be coming forward, as the parking proposal already has, and deans should be discussing many of them with the faculty.

If the Faculty Senate is offended by bestowing the "President's Awards" (Item 11) at graduation ceremonies, President Lennon would be glad to discuss the reasons with the Senate. The new graduation attendance plan (Item 12) will probably go into effect at the beginning of the next academic year.

Senators should alert 9 month colleagues about Item 17, so that they can send in their retirement statement for correction. Personnel will be changing this past year's sick leave records. There is no indication that they will go farther back than that.

The Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Salaries (Item 20, Attachment G) has come out. Senators should share it with their colleagues.

The listing of snow clearing priorities (Update Item 3) is provided (Attachment H) for the Senate's reading pleasure.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolution on Teaching Awards: Senator Daniels moved adoption of the resolution (Attachment I) and Senator Calhoun seconded. Discussion followed. Senator Birrenkott questioned the need for more teaching awards, stating that already 86% of all titled and endowed chairs at Clemson are for teaching and that more were needed for research and public service. This new award is also not
a generic award like the Provost's Awards. Senator Calhoun notes that the large monetary awards are not for teaching. He likes the new concept of this rotating award, opening up teaching for faculty, and felt that it was good that it was an established budget. There are not enough awards for either teaching or research, but this specific award answers a charge received in the context of the Carnegie Report.

President Dyck reminded the Senate that the charge to establish this award stems from the Advisory Committee meeting last fall with President Lennon. Lennon noted the Senate's concerns about increased research emphasis and suggested that the Senate work with the Provost and recommend a teaching award.

A discussion followed about the mechanics surrounding application and budgeting for the award. The intent of the award was that a budget be given the recipient to spend for educational travel, equipment, or anything that would enhance teaching and that possibly one per college be awarded. Problems seen in this award included the fact that it might be viewed as a second rate titled professorship and that it may not be the best use for the money. President Dyck noted that the proper intent was there in the resolution and that, after the administration approved of that, it could be sent back for further clarification and filling in of details. The resolution, 87-2-2, passed.

B. Resolution on MacDonald Scholarship: Senator Calhoun introduced a resolution for the Scholarships and Awards Committee (Attachment
J.) which was seconded. Senator Brown then introduced a substitute motion which was seconded (Attachment J2) with some editorial corrections. She stated that the Scholarships and Awards Committee resolution went against MacDonald's will which states that the Senate is supposed to determine the fields in which the scholarships should be awarded. The Senate should not turn over its rights to the Scholarship and Awards Committee.

Senator Nowaczyk spoke in favor of the substitution as did Senator Bryan who stated that if we ignore our responsibility the alternative would be to return the money to the MacDonald Estate. The motion for the substitution passed. The resolution, 87-2-3, passed unanimously.

C. Resolution on the Snow Plan: Senator Nowaczyk moved adoption of this resolution (Attachment K) and it was seconded. Attention was drawn to the University's snow cleaning priorities (Attachment H) which may also need to be reconsidered, especially as it does not mention clearing lots. Senator Baron questioned whether the Senate should pick issues important to it and possibly handle this problem informally, rather than passing a resolution. President Dyck noted that this was an issue of major concern at the first Cabinet meeting after the January snow and that the administration wishes to receive comments. Senator Nowaczyk noted that this was not a reprimand, but merely a request for review. The resolution, 87-2-4, passed.
D. Athletic Council Reorganization (Attachment L):

Senator Mullins led a discussion of the proposed changes using data and a draft resolution (Attachment M), the resolution later being tabled. The first part of the discussion centered around Section II, Membership. Many colleges want their one choice to go forward according to Senator’s Baron and Bryan. Why do the students get to choose their representatives when the President gets to choose the faculty representative? Senator Nowaczyk said that the reason for this has always been that the faculty has always had to supply minority representation. Senator Baron felt that if the faculty are not allowed to choose its own representatives, the faculty should refuse to serve and reject all responsibility for athletics.

Senator Linvill objects to Section I, Responsibilities, which results in the faculty losing rights given them in the current Faculty Manual. President Dyck noted that the Athletic Council has not assumed institutional control and responsibility and that when Vice-President Lomax spoke to the Senate last fall, he had said that the responsibility rested on the Athletic Director, the Vice-President for the Student Affairs and the President. Senator Linvill agreed with Senator Baron that this revision violated the Faculty Manual and stated that the Senate should not legitimize this.

In a section by section review of the reorganization proposal the following resulted. In Section I, Senator Bryan noted that the
faculty has the responsibility. He cited a James Kirkpatrick editorial about the inept faculty at the University of Georgia who were, in part, blamed for the problems there. Senator Baron proposed that the Senate state that it does not accept the changes proposed in Section I as they differ from the Faculty Manual. Senator Mullins wanted to know if the CEO has the responsibility and President Dyck stated that the NCAA Manual assigns it to faculty and/or administration. Senator Nowaczyk reiterated that he would rather have the Athletic Council fall into line with the Faculty Manual and not make changes to reflect current practice. A straw vote was unanimous in support of the old manual.

In Section II, Membership, a variety of changes were discussed. Senator Sly asked that II. A.1 be changed to 10 members, in order to include the Library which is a "collegiate unit." The general concern was that there should be no nominating process or pool, but that the faculty of each college and the Library should elect a representative and an alternate. Opinion varies on the value of consecutive terms. Some Senators felt that 6 years was too long and that consecutive terms should be prohibited, Senator Woodard spoke for a 2 term limit, noting that it takes three years for a member to come up to speed and accumulate the information needed to function well on the council. There was general agreement that a graduate student representative should be added. Reduction of the number of athletes to one was considered, but if
two were retained, one of those could be from a non-revenue producing sport. There was support for increasing the number of Faculty Senators back to two as have served previously, with some Senators desiring a faculty majority on the council and others hoping for responsible membership. Senators questioned the need for IPTAY representation and the two members (II. A 4&7) of the Clemson Alumni Association. Are they responsible for or to the University and do they have the time to serve? It was suggested that "non-faculty" and "at least one of which shall be a member of the Alumni Association" be struck from II.A.7.

There was some discussion of extending the Chair's term (II) because one year was a very short time to learn about issues. It was noted that, if the first recommendation in V for a chair-elect was adopted, this would help the chair prepare for these responsibilities.

President Dyck asked that this information be shared with the Senators' constituents and that comments be sent to him soon. He will send forward the Senate's comments to be discussed at the Athletic Council. Senator Baron asked that President Dyck tell President Lennon that the Senate needs more time to consider these issues.

E. University Parking Plan (Attachment N.): President Dyck welcomed two guests-Vice President David Larson and Bill Pace, Director of Parking and Vehicle Registration. Vice-President Larson noted that
he had been meeting with students and other groups and that he hoped the Newsletter article would clarify the issues. President Dyck then opened the floor for comments.

Senator Snelsire said that he felt that free parking was the last benefit remaining and that it would not be good to lose it. Senator Hedden stated that the faculty in Forestry were unanimously opposed to pay parking and Senator Bryan agreed that it was the same in Commerce and Industry and that they felt it was the equivalent to a pay cut. Senator Daniels agreed that the faculty in Agriculture felt the same way. Senator Brannock said that if the money was going for something like a garage or deck, it would be more acceptable and Senator Haselton noted that this wasn't Raleigh or any other "big city." Senators Brown and Linvill wanted to know why a transportation system was needed when, in Linvill's view, a ten minute walk from any lot on campus will get you where you want to go. Senator Birrenkott noted that the Trustees who own companies don't charge for parking and Senator Baron said that as other state employees didn't pay, Clemson University should be entitled to the same program. Baron went on to ask that if the shortage in classroom and office space continued, were faculty going to have to lease an office next year? The administration laid out the buildings, why didn't they plan ahead and design a parking garage under the new Chemistry building or as part of the Strom Thurmond Institute. The administration is not considering
all the problems, just asking for money. Senator Huey saw that the immediate reaction to the proposal was that it was an insult.

Senator Reichenbach said that Nursing was concerned for the safety of the students, especially those who have to walk from outer parking lots. And Senator Derr, concurred, noting that student safety was also a concern in the College of Education which ran many night courses. She added that faculty often have to park further than a 10 minute walk away.

Senator Mullins objected to the faculty and staff paying for a student shuttle bus. Would a student wait 15 minutes for a bus or walk anyway, and Senator Bryan asked why the University was reducing the number of spaces, citing the loss of 33 spaces in the Sirrine lot.

Vice-President Larson then was given the floor. He explained that his office had been asked to put together a parking proposal to encourage and focus debate in order to begin improvement. He supplied the FY85-86 expenditures as part of the information. Many people have said that Clemson needs a transportation system operating only from perimeter lots to the center of campus. Part of his office's charge was to review the costs of lot upkeep and, therefore, the Physical Plant's figures on that are supplied. Money for upkeep is also needed. He feels that fees are not unusual and that creating an auxiliary enterprise rather than using funds in the E & G Budget is a better way to go.
Larson went on to say that there has only been a small study on the need for a transportation system. Clemson may need outside help from people who have implemented this at other universities and who will do it for the cost of transportation and room and board.

Senators Bryan and Baron reiterated the fact that faculty and staff were unwilling to pay for a student transportation system, especially without knowing of what the system will consist. Senator Birrenkott noted that transportation might become less necessary after dark as more spaces open up closer to the center of campus.

Bill Pace stated that 400 vehicles were towed in January 1987 alone, as opposed to only 2000 in all of Fall 1985 and that 30,000 tickets had already been given out in Fall of 1986.

Senator Sly asked if faculty and staff were required only to pay for upkeep and not the transportation system what the cost would be. Larson replied that 40% could be cut off the figures if the transportation system was eliminated. Senator Morris asked if barring Freshman and Sophomore cars had been considered. Senator Nowczyk asked a) why the Traffic and Parking Committee had not been consulted, b) why the figures projected had such high percentages of increase and c) whether IPTAY paid lot maintenance? Vice-President Larson replied that it came out of his office because he was asked to find the figures and do a feasibility study. The high
figures were padded in an attempt to leave them room and prevent 'politically' unfortunate increases. They are talking to the Athletic Department about lot maintenance.

Bill Pace noted that he has been working on a transportation system for twelve years. He added that it was not possible to walk from some lots to a building in a few minutes.

Vice-President Larson said that he had received letters from many people who were giving good reasons why they did not like the proposal. President Dyck indicated that he would probably be receiving more input in that vein, reflecting the Senate's unhappiness with the proposal. He thanked Larson and Pace for coming to speak to the Senate.

F. Resolution on Facilities Planning Committee: Senator Huey moved adoption of the resolution (Attachment O) and Senator Nowaczyk seconded. President Dyck said that this resulted from a Larson document linking the Continuing Education Center and the Performing Arts Center (See also Attachment F, Item 3). The resolution passed unanimously.

G. Other. Senator Bryan agreed to defer a resolution about the parking proposal until the March meeting.
VIII. ANNOUNCEMENT

President Dyck said that he had appointed the Ad Hoc Committee on the MacDonald Scholarship. Senator Polk will chair and, among others, Senator Birrenkott, Chair of the Research Committee, and Senator Nowaczyk, Chair of the Scholastic Policy Committee, will be members.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:36 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Margery N. Sly
Secretary

MaryAnn B. Reichenbach
Acting Secretary

Senators absent: Carter, Drews, Madison
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 87-2-1
REVIEW OF ARTISTIC AND CREATIVE ENDEAVORS

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that artistic and creative endeavors that are part of a faculty member's professional responsibilities are protected under the guarantees of academic freedom; and,

WHEREAS, a committee of the Faculty Senate surveyed a number of institutions with regard to their policies and procedures concerning the arts; and,

WHEREAS, this survey revealed that other institutions 1) consider faculty endeavors in the arts to be protected under the guarantees of academic freedom; and 2) place responsibility for these endeavors within the appropriate academic branch of the institution; and,

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that these endeavors at Clemson University are co-curricular activity;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Administration reaffirm that artistic and creative endeavors of faculty that are part of their professional responsibilities are protected under the guarantees of academic freedom as described in the Faculty Manual; and,

THAT the faculty undertaking these endeavors assume the responsibilities associated with academic freedom; and

THAT faculty who feel that their academic freedom has been violated with regard to these activities have recourse by following the grievance procedures as outlined in the Faculty Manual; and,

THAT responsibility for these artistic and creative endeavors resides entirely within the academic unit housing the faculty members who initiate the endeavor.
REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE POLICY COMMITTEE

February 1987

A draft of material for an annotated Faculty Manual Table of Contents to be included in the Board of Trustees' Manual was reviewed. This draft lists important points within each section highlighting policies effecting the faculty.

An answer was received from our inquiry to the Provost about Vice Provost position descriptions in the Faculty Manual. New position descriptions are being drafted.

A booklet listing committee appointments is being prepared. This booklet is designed as an aid to the administration to assure that appointments are done properly and on time. This project is on temporary hold since the Commission structure is under study.

A concern has been forwarded to the Policy Committee about the course approval process. This concern is being investigated and a report will be forthcoming.

jp

Dale Linvill
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE REPORT
FEBRUARY 10, 1986

The committee met twice in January. The first meeting dealt with assembling a list of questions, if they were needed, for the Senate meeting with Mr. Stadtman. The second meeting involved a discussion of the charge to the subcommittee developing a proposed policy on common exam scheduling during the semester and during final exam week. This will be the last major item of business for the Scholastic Policies committee this Senate year.

The committee also discussed examining the problems associated with advising. The results of several surveys done at Clemson are circulating among members of the committee. The committee hopes to review this issue and provide feedback to the Senate and appropriate University committees.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron Nowaczyk, Chair
To: Larry Dyck, President, Faculty Senate  
From: Richard J. Calhoun, Chairman, Welfare Committee  
Date: February 10, 1987  

The Welfare Committee met on January 27. The main item of business was to turn the recommendations made at the December meeting into resolutions. The Committee has prepared a resolution to be presented under a new business for a new type of rotating professorship intended to reward teachers and to further teaching at Clemson. This resolution is in response to our charge from President Dyck to propose awards for teaching to demonstrate a commitment to good teaching at Clemson, as we already have to research, with new research professorships and with the Provost awards. We would support new proposals for research awards from the Research Committee. Our resolution is also in response to the Carnegie Report emphasis on equal status for teaching.

The Welfare Committee also discussed further support for the Leatherman Bill in its revised form. We seem content to let stand the resolution of support last year for the bill in its original form without further action. An item for concern in March is whether there has been any change of concern to faculty in the way retirement is computed, especially in relation to summer teaching.
The Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee met on Jan. 15, 1987 to discuss the issues that began as Faculty Senate Resolutions 86-2-1 and 86-2-2. After long debate two proposals are ready to be forwarded to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies which meets on Friday Feb. 13. The proposal on admissions is basically the same as the original FS 86-2-1. The Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee will be responsible for setting the grade point ratios needed for admission to each college.

A proposal concerning the structure of the Appeals Committee and the newly formed Admissions Exception Committee replaces the original FS 86-2-2. The Appeals Committee will be composed of six of the nine elected faculty college representatives and one additional faculty member may be appointed by the Provost. The Admissions Exception Committee will be composed of three of the nine elected faculty college representatives and two additional faculty members may be appointed by the Provost. Other members for these committees are non-voting. Hence, both committees will now function as actual sub-committees of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee.

Jeuel LaTorre
The Committee recommends:

1. That the Continuing Enrollment Appeals Sub-Committee be composed of six of the nine elected faculty representatives on the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee and one faculty member may be appointed by the Provost, all with staggered terms to assure continuity. The three faculty committee members not represented on the sub-committee could be consulted regarding appeals of students from their College. Since most appeals are necessarily considered between terms (after grades are in and before registration for the next term), this should be a major consideration in establishing this Sub-Committee's membership. The Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs (Admissions & Registration) will be the Chair and a non-voting member, and the Registrar will be a non-voting member;

2. That the Admissions Exception Sub-Committee be composed of three elected faculty representatives on the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee and two faculty members may be appointed by the Provost all with staggered terms to insure continuity. This committee should review the credentials of applicants who, through one avenue or another, have appealed the Admissions Office's decision. The Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs (Admissions & Registration) will be the Chair and a non-voting member, and Director of Admissions will be a non-voting member.
ADMISSIONS POLICY RELATING TO ENTERING FRESHMEN AND TRANSFER STUDENTS

Prospective Freshmen and Transfer Students with Fewer Than 30 Hours

The Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) is required of all freshman candidates and of prospective transfer students with fewer than 30 hours of acceptable credits. The quality of the student's high school record in combination with the results of the SAT will be used as the major predictor of performance at Clemson. These factors will be used in generating a predicted grade-point ratio which will be of primary importance in accepting or denying a majority of the students applying for admission. The admissions information sent to prospective students will contain recent data from which the applicant can gain insight concerning his/her chances for successful admission to Clemson University.

Effective with the fall semester of 1988, applicants are expected to satisfy the course requirements established by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. These requirements are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>At least two having strong grammar and composition components, at least one in English literature, and at least one in American literature (completion of college preparatory English I, II, III, and IV will meet these requirements.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Including Algebra I &amp; II; geometry is strongly recommended as the required third</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
unit and a fourth unit is recommended but not required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laboratory Science</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least one unit each of two laboratory sciences chosen from biology, chemistry, or physics; a third unit of a laboratory science is strongly recommended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign Language</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two units of the same foreign language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One unit of advanced mathematics or computer science or a combination of these; or one unit of world history, world geography, or western civilization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. History</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economics</th>
<th>1/2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government</th>
<th>1/2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Social Studies</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education or ROTC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to high school records and SAT scores, other factors will be used to influence decisions—especially in cases of a borderline nature. Some such factors are as follows:

1. Work taken and grades earned in academic courses such as English, science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

2. Recommendations by guidance counselors and/or appropriate school officials.

3. Curriculum to be studied at Clemson. An analysis of past
performance at Clemson indicates that certain courses of study require higher SAT scores and high school standing for successful completion than do others.

4. An essay from the applicant.

5. Anticipated participation in intercollegiate athletics.
   (Note: Students entering Clemson on athletic grants-in-aid must satisfy all NCAA requirements.)

The Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee will be responsible for establishing the predicted grade-point ratio for admission to each college within the University. This grade-point ratio will be established in consultation with the Dean of each college, the Provost, and the Vice President for Student Affairs. Students failing to meet this minimum will be admitted only upon approval of the Admissions Exceptions Committee, based on a consideration of the above mentioned factors.

Prospective Students with Advanced Standing

Transfer candidates applying for entrance with 30 or more hours of credit acceptable to Clemson University will be evaluated on the basis of their post high school records. The evaluation will be made by a professional admissions officer; and should this officer deem that SAT scores and/or other appropriate credentials are needed to reach an equitable decision, such credentials will be required. Transfer students entering Clemson University on athletic grants-in-aid must satisfy all NCAA requirements.
FACULTY SENATE

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. The Chairman of the Board of Trustees asked that I convey the Board’s appreciation for the reception on January 16. I believe the event provided ample opportunity for discussion and should be declared a success. Thanks to all of you.


3. The location for the Continuing Education Center, whether to be at the lake or along Perimeter Road, across from the Thurmond Institute/Performing Arts center is to be debated at the next meeting of the Facilities Planning Committee. Please inform your constituents, particularly those associated with the continuing education program, of the pending discussion. They may convey information to one of the committee members (Senate representatives: Cecil Huey, Martin Davis, Joe Mullins, Larry Dyck) or they may take advantage of the opportunity to testify at the Committee’s Hearing on Wednesday, February 18, at 1:30 p.m.

4. The University is interested in accepting a Richard Serra sculpture, titled "Tilted Arc." The latter is approximately 120 feet long and 12 feet high. If you would like more information or would care to provide comment, contact one of the members of the Facilities Planning Committee.

5. The Facilities Planning Committee has recommended that the University establish a Special Account for the Funding for Hazardous Waste Disposal. The plan removes a financial disincentive and encourages participation in the legal disposal of hazardous wastes.

6. Following the seminar by the Carnegie Commission’s Verne Stadtman at the January meeting of the Faculty Senate, the eight committees charged with reviewing the report’s "tension areas" met for a plenary session on January 28. Each committee is to prepare a preliminary report in which they determine if their "tension area" exists here; and if so, its prevalence on the Clemson Campus. Committees are to present their preliminary evaluations on March 11 and discuss their final reports before the President’s Council on April 24.
7. The University Administration has indicated a willingness to support Senate Bill, S.171, the optional retirement program for faculty and administration. The bill is being reviewed by the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee, but is essentially unchanged from the Leatherman Bill discussed by this body in 1986. The Bill, if approved, would offer new faculty and administrators the option to join either the State Retirement System or the Optional Retirement System (presumably TIAA). There is, however, no direct benefit for faculty already in the employment of the university.

8. The process of budget cuts continues. For FY 1986-87 the cuts now total 4.1% (an initial 2.6% followed by a new 1.5% cut). The new and additional cuts will cause severe impact on unencumbered elements within budgets. For FY 1987-88 cuts are 4.8%, resulting in about a $10 million shortfall for the university. Amidst these conditions the budget assessment process must continue. All units of the university have experienced reductions in personnel budgets. Academic units were "assessed" proportionately less than administrative and support areas. The nature of additional budgetary cuts will be made public soon and in some cases faculty will be brought into the debate (e.g. parking; see New Business).

9. Funds allocated by the state for asbestos abatement will be used to renovate the Barnett Hall dormitory.

10. The Provost has concluded that the Continuing Education program will be highly coordinated at a University level, but decentralized in program at a collegiate level.

11. The Faculty Senate’s recommendation that Graduation Awards be known, respectively, as the "President’s Award for Outstanding Service to Education" and the "President’s Award for Distinguished Achievement" was accepted by the Development Office and the President. However, no university event, other than graduation ceremonies, was considered appropriate for bestowing these awards.

12. The University Administration accepted the Faculty Senate’s proposal related to graduation attendance. Faculty will be provided the option to voluntarily participate in the either the Winter or Summer graduation ceremonies in lieu of commitment to attend the Spring Commencement.
13. Provost Maxwell has agreed with the Faculty Senate that Curriculum Committees should be involved in the approval of courses offered for the first time through the Telecampus Program. In addition your Faculty Senate President has written to the chairs of College Curriculum Committees and encouraged them to arrange for their committees to learn more about the Telecampus Program and its implications to curricular development and presentation.

14. The Faculty Senate's resolution on filling academic administrative positions did not receive favorable review by Provost Maxwell. His memorandum on the matter is attached to this report.

15. Joe Mullins and I participated in a retreat held for the President's Cabinet on January 10. At this event the members of the Cabinet presented their agenda for the coming year. Senator Mullins and I will share the results of this meeting with members of the executive committee.

16. The university now has in place an employee suggestion program, designed to provide economic reward to those who provide the state with budget-saving procedures. Following a rigorous internal and statewide review of the suggestion, the successful author is eligible to receive 25% of the net annual savings provided in the first year of implementation ($5,000 max). Dick Simmons, Assistant Personnel Director, is serving as the University's coordinator.

17. Two items have come to my attention recently. First, nine-month faculty, may not have received full retirement credit for the past academic year. Many nine-month faculty report having been credited only 0.92 years service rather than the full year's service. While the Personnel Department attempts to correct the generic character of the problem, they ask for your assistance and request that you send them a copy of your annual retirement statement to insure that your file is correct. Statements should be sent to Debby King. Second, nine-month faculty employed on research grants in the summer are not accruing sick leave. The matter is being investigated by both the Personnel Department and the Grants and Contracts Office.

18. I was pleased to meet with the Graduate Student Association January 30. I have encouraged them to work with us and to have a representative at our meetings. In turn, I have asked the chair of the Research (and Graduate Education) Committee to send a representative to GSA meetings.
19. Faculty members interested in providing general interest seminars associated with the Alumni's 1987 Reunion should contact their College Dean.

20. An interim report of the ad hoc committee on Faculty Salaries was presented to the President's Cabinet as information. A copy will be distributed at the Senate Meeting. Please share this document with your fellow faculty members.

21. Software necessary to access the various University Manuals, including the Faculty Manual should be purchased by July 1, 1987.

22. I'm pleased to report that our very valuable Senator, Margery Sly, Secretary to the Faculty Senate, is highly regarded by other institutions. I regret to report, however, that she has accepted a post elsewhere, and will be leaving for Smith College at the end of the month. Many thanks Margery, your work has been splendid. We wish you the very best! For the remainder of the Senate year Senator MaryAnn Reichenbach has agreed to serve as Secretary.
January 15, 1987

TO: Larry Dyck, President
Faculty Senate
240 Long Hall

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

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Resolution 86-12-1

Section VI:G, page VI:32 of the Faculty Manual refers to the procedures to be followed when there is an academic administrative position to be filled. In the instance that gave rise to subject resolution an administrative decision was made to change the administrative structure of the University so that the administrator in charge of Computer Information Services would report to the Provost. The University did not create a vacant position or an additional position by this action and there was therefore no appointment to be made to an unfilled position.

Please assure the Faculty Senate that when there is a vacant academic administrative position to be filled, and consequently an appointment to be made to such a position, the procedures in the section of the Faculty Manual cited above have been and will be followed. When the University, however, changes the reporting line of an administrator in charge of an existing unit it does not by this action make the position of that administrator vacant and this action does not create the circumstances to which the section of the Faculty Manual cited above and in the resolution refer.

Incidentally, there have been a number of similar administrative changes in the past, such as that of changing the reporting line of the Director of the Energy Research Center so that this individual reports to the Dean of Engineering rather than to a vice president, and there have been other changes proposed of this nature (e.g. that the Director of Admissions report to the Provost) without its being contended that such changes cause the position of the existing administrator in charge of the affected unit to be vacant. Such changes are, in my opinion, within the purview of the administration. I appreciate the fact that the faculty are interested in "all matters academic" but this can not be construed so as to require faculty involvement in all administrative decisions in which they are interested.

Finally, I am not aware of any provision of the Faculty Manual that requires faculty participation in decisions concerning changes in the titles of administrators.

WDM/b

207 SIKES HALL • CLEMSON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29634-5101 • TELEPHONE 803/656-3323
PRESIDENT'S REPORT
UPDATE

1. Elections for the Faculty Senate's 1987-88 Vice-President/President Elect and Secretary will occur at the March meeting. The Advisory Committee solicits your nominations.

2. The University-wide ad hoc Committee on Child Care has brought their recommendations to President Lennon. The committee proposes that the University call for open bids from private, established child care operators to provide child care services sought by Clemson University faculty, staff and students. I am asking the Senate's Welfare Committee to review the report. Please contact me or members of the Welfare Committee for further information.

3. A listing of the "job priorities" associated with snow clearing is provided. Review the document with your colleagues and transmit responses to me or members of the Advisory Committee.

4. Edgar's will become a faculty and staff dining area as of Monday, February 16, 1987. It will be open for lunch (11:30 to 1:30) and will feature an "All You Can Eat" soup and salad bar for $3.25. It will also be open for coffee break periods before and after lunch.
MEMORANDUM

TO: President's Cabinet
FROM: W. David Maxwell, Provost
SUBJECT: Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Salaries

Presented herein is an interim summary report of the major findings to date of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Salaries. For ease of comprehension only bar charts rather than the tables from which they were extracted are presented.

The Committee set out to accomplish four tasks, three of which are largely completed. The four tasks were to make or construct:

1. An internal comparison of Clemson salaries by discipline, by rank
2. A comparison of Clemson salaries to those of other Southeastern institutions by discipline, by rank
3. A comparison of Clemson salaries to those of the Nation by discipline, by rank
4. A regression equation, or a set of such equations, that would isolate individual salaries that warrant detailed investigation.

The fourth task listed above is by far the most difficult and has not yet been completed. To be of value such an equation or equations must reflect in its coefficients all the major factors that determine the individual's salary - rank, discipline, time in rank, year of Ph.D., teaching effectiveness, research productivity, administrative responsibilities, service contributions, etc. There are no national models that can simply be applied to Clemson salaries so, understandably, less progress has been made on this task than on any other.

I. Internal Comparison
Charts 1-A, 1-B, and 1-C provide a comparison, by rank, of the salaries each Hegis Code discipline to the overall Clemson University average. As Chart 1-A indicates, full professors in Fisheries, Game and Wildlife Management; Agricultural Education; and Engineering Technology (being phased out) receive salaries that are less than 80% of the C. U. average for full professors. Receiving more than 80% but less than 90% of the C. U. average are professors in Agronomy, Animal Science Husbandry, Dairy Science Husbandry, Poultry Science, Horticulture, Plant Pathology, Entomology, Secondary Education, Music, Foreign Languages, Psychology, History, Political Science and Sociology.

On the other hand, no full professors earn salaries that are more than 120% of the C. U. average and only Computer Science, some of the engineering disciplines, Mathematics, and Economics pay more than 110% of the C. U. average.

At the associate professor rank only those in Music earn less than 80% of the C. U. average for this rank. Earning more than 80% but less than 90% of the C. U. average are those in Fisheries, Game and Wildlife Management; Food Science and Technology; Biology; Foreign Languages; English; Psychology; and History. On the other hand, the number of disciplines in which individuals at this rank earn more than 110% of the average salary is much larger than was true at the full professor rank. Computer Science retains this distinction, the number of engineering disciplines of which this is true increases and the business administration disciplines join this group. Finance, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering break the 120% "barrier" for the first time at this rank.

At the assistant professor level some of the agricultural disciplines appear to have declined in relative position while others (still low) have increased, relative to their standing at the associate professor level. Biology continues to be less than 90% and is joined for the first time by Forestry, Architecture, and Vocational Education. Most Liberal Arts disciplines continue to pay at this rank less than 90% of the C. U. average.

Nonetheless the increase in skewness that occurred between full professor salaries and those of associate professors continues as the salaries of assistant professors are compared to the other two ranks (relative to their means). All but one (and that one nearly so) of the business administration disciplines exceed 110%, three exceed 120% and two exceed 130%. Similarly, only Agricultural Engineering and Mechanical Engineering (by a very small margin) fail, among the engineering disciplines, to exceed 120% although none exceed 130%. The relative position of Interdisciplinary Studies also exceed 120%.

II. Comparison of C. U. Salaries to the Southeast
Data presented in the Oklahoma State Salary Survey permits comparison of C. U. salaries (by discipline and by rank) with those of twenty Southeastern public institutions that comprise most of the better known institutions from West Virginia to Louisiana.

Examination of Charts 2-A, 2-B, and 2-C suggests that the same market forces that affect strongly the differences in salaries among disciplines and even between ranks among disciplines at C.U. are also operative in the other Southeastern institutions, leading to the overall conclusion that Clemson's salaries are quite competitive with those of other Southeastern institutions. Nonetheless, some distinctive differences exist, particularly in "mission" areas, that should be noted.

At the full professor level, Fisheries, Game, and Wildlife Management ranks low as it did in the C. U. comparison. The same is true of Psychology, History, Political Science, and Sociology. Microbiology, while nearly matching the C. U. average was less than 85% of the Southeastern average. Only Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Studies (the latter probably due to definitional differences and/or the particular C. U. "mix" of disciplines) exceeded 110% of the Southeastern average.

At the associate professor level Fisheries, Game, and Wildlife Management is again less than 90% of the Southeastern average for this discipline. Also at less than 90% are Biology, Textile Engineering, and Economics. The Liberal Arts while still below the Southeastern average are significantly closer to it than was true at the full professor rank. And only Nursing appears to be close to 110% of the Southeastern average for this rank and discipline.

At the assistant professor level a number of the disciplines are not represented. Dairy Science Husbandry salaries are less than 90% of the Southeastern average for this discipline and rank as are those of Forestry. Biology and Textile Engineering have improved in their relative positions although still below the Southeastern averages for their disciplines. Improvement at this rank is even more apparent in the Liberal Arts, several of which exceed the Southeastern average. Physics, Music and Interdisciplinary Studies (the latter two probably due to particular circumstances) pay salaries at this rank that are more than 110% of the Southeastern average for these disciplines.

III. Comparison of C. U. Salaries to the Nation

Not surprisingly, examination of Charts 3-A, 3-B, and 3-C yields no unexpected results. The data for the Southeast mirrors those for the nation as a whole although salaries in the nation are slightly higher. Thus the average full professor at Clemson receives 97% of the salary of his Southeastern counterpart and
95% of that of his national counterpart. And assistant and associate professors at Clemson, who are paid slightly more than their Southeastern counterparts (on average), receive only 99% of the salaries of their national counterparts.

For full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors the disciplines and ranks that compare unfavorably with the Southeastern average also compare unfavorably with the national average and the same is true of those disciplines and ranks that compare favorably with the Southeastern averages.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The large differences among disciplines in the internal comparison shrink drastically when the more relevant comparisons are made by discipline to the Southeast and the nation. The basic conclusion has to be that Clemson's salaries are "about average." This conclusion should cause concern, however, rather than apathy, for Clemson cannot meet its own expectations if its salaries remain "about average."

2. A more detailed analysis, employing workload and other data, needs to be made of those disciplines that are consistently low in the Southeastern and national comparisons. In some instances these comparisons reflect an implicit and perhaps unconscious "trade off" as enrollment declines but faculty have not been reduced commensurately. In these instances as vacancies occur they should not be filled so that the salaries of the faculty that remain can be increased. In such instances recruitment of students should be an explicit alternative to faculty reduction and increased workloads a prerequisite to salary increases.

3. Clemson is less competitive at the full professor rank than it is at lower ranks. While this is perhaps to be expected of an emerging research university this "gap" should be monitored in order to ensure that it does not lead to diminished performance of full professors or to an exodus of the most productive members of this rank.

4. It may well be that the regression equation approach to the isolation of individual salaries that merit intensive scrutiny, while more theoretically defensible and certainly more intellectually appealing than any other alternative, may pose so many programmatic difficulties that a cruder approach may well, on balance, be preferable. For example, while there should be no presumption of normality, it may well be that the use of a stipulated standard deviation magnitude from the Southeastern average for a given rank and discipline would adequately serve as a means of determining individual salaries that should be examined in terms of the factors known to affect the distribution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEGIS DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA ALL CU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102 AGRONOMY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104 AN.SCI.HUSB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105 DY.SCI.HUSB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106 FOUL.SCI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107 FISH,GA.,W.L.MGT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108 HORTICULTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0111 AG.ECON.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0113 FD.SCI.&amp; TECH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0114 FORESTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0201 ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0202 CCRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401 BIOLOGY.GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0404 PLANT PATH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0411 MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0421 ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0502 ACCOUNTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0504 BANK. &amp; FIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0506 BUS.MGT. &amp; ADMI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509 MKT. &amp; PURCH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701 COMP. &amp; INFO.GEN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0803 SEC.ED.GEN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0839 VOC. &amp; TECH.ED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890 AG.ED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900 AG.EMGR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0903 AG.ENGIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0906 CHEM.ENGIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0908 CIVIL ENGIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0909 ELEC.ENGIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0910 MECH.ENGIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0913 IND. &amp; MGT.ENGIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0916 CER.ENGIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0917 TEXTILE ENGIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0922 ENV. &amp; SYS.ENGIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0925 ENGIN. TECH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005 MUSIC(LIB. ARTS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101 FOR. LANG. (GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203 NURS. (BAC. +)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 ENGLISH(GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701 MATH. (GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702 STATISTICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902 PHYSICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905 CHEMISTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103 PRIM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204 ECONOMICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205 HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207 POLITICAL SCI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2208 SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4999 INT. DISC. ST. (OTH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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[FILE: SALCHR10]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEGIS DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL CU</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRONOMY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN.SCI.HUSB.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DY.SCI.HUSB.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUL.SCI.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH,GA.,W.L.MGT.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORTICULTURE</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG.ECON.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD.SCI.&amp; TECH.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORESTRY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRP</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGY,GENERAL</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLANT PATH.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTING</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK.&amp; FIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS.MGT.&amp; ADMI.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKT.&amp; PURCH.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP.&amp; INFO.GEN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC.ED.GEN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC.&amp; TECH.ED.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG.ED.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG.ENGIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM.ENGIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIL ENGIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEC.ENGIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECH.ENGIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND.&amp; MGT.ENGIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CER.ENGIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXTILE ENGIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV.&amp; SYS.ENGIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGIN.TECH.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC(LIB.ARTS)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR.Lang.(GEN.)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS.(BAC.+)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH(GEN.)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH.(GEN.)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEMISTRY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMT</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL SCI.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT.DISC.ST.(OTH)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**DISCIPLINE SALARIES AS % OF ALL CU AVERAGE**

**RANK: ASST. PROF.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEGIS DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0102 AGRONOMY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104 AN.SCI.HUSB.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105 DY.SCI.HUSB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106 FOUL.SCI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107 FISH,GA.,W.L.MGT.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0111 AG.ECON.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0113 FD.SCI.&amp; TECH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0114 FORESTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0202 ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0206 CCRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401 BIOLOGY.GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0404 PLANT PATH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0411 MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0421 ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0502 ACCOUNTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0504 BANK.&amp; FIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0506 BUS.MGT.&amp; ADM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509 MKT.&amp; PURCH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701 COMP.&amp; INFO.GEN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0803 SEC.ED.GEN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0839 VOC.&amp; TECH.ED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890 AG.ED.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0903 AG.ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0906 CHEM.ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0908 CIVIL ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0909 ELEC.ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0910 MECH.ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0913 IND.&amp; MGT.ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0916 CER.ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0917 TEXTILE ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0922 ENV.&amp; SYS.ENGIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0925 ENGIN.TECH.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005 MUSIC(LIB.ARts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101 FOR.LANG.(GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203 NURS.(BAC.+)&amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401 ENGLISH(GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701 MATH.(GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702 STATISTICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902 PHYSICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905 CHEMISTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103 PRMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204 ECONOMICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205 HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207 POLITICAL SCI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2208 SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4999 INT.DISC.ST.(OTH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AROLD E. ALBERT 12/12/86*
*
*FILE: SACLCH12*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEGIS DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>CHART 2-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALL CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102</td>
<td>AGRONOMY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104</td>
<td>AN.SCI,HUSB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105</td>
<td>DY.SCI.HUSB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106</td>
<td>POUL.SCI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107</td>
<td>FISH.GA.,W.L.MGT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108</td>
<td>HORTICULTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0111</td>
<td>AG.ECON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0113</td>
<td>FD.SCI.&amp; TECH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0114</td>
<td>FORESTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0202</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0206</td>
<td>CCRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401</td>
<td>BIOLOGY.GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0404</td>
<td>PLANT PATH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0411</td>
<td>MICROBIOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0421</td>
<td>ENTOMOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0502</td>
<td>ACCOUNTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0504</td>
<td>BANK.&amp; FIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0506</td>
<td>BUS.MGT.&amp; ADMI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509</td>
<td>MKT.&amp; PURCH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701</td>
<td>COMP.&amp; INFO.GEN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0803</td>
<td>SEC.ED.GEN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0839</td>
<td>VOC.&amp; TECH.ED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890</td>
<td>AG.ED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0903</td>
<td>AG.ENGIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0906</td>
<td>CHEM.ENGIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0908</td>
<td>CIVIL ENGIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0909</td>
<td>ELEC.ENGIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0910</td>
<td>MECH.ENGIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0913</td>
<td>IND.&amp; MGT.ENGIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0916</td>
<td>CER.ENGIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0917</td>
<td>TEXTILE ENGIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0922</td>
<td>ENV.&amp; SYS.ENGIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0925</td>
<td>ENGIN.TECH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>MUSIC(LIB.ARTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>FOR.LANG.(GEN.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>NURS.(BAC.+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>ENGLISH(GEN.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>MATH.(GEN.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>CHEMISTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103</td>
<td>PRTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205</td>
<td>HISTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207</td>
<td>POLITICAL SCI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2208</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4999</td>
<td>INT.DISC.ST.(OTH):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAROLD E. ALBERT 12/12/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[FILE: SAL CHAR4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEGIS DISCIPLINE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102 AGRONOMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104 AN. SCI. HUSB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105 DY. SCI. HUSB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106 POUL. SCI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107 FISH. GA., W.L. MGT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108 HORTICULTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0111 AG. ECON.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0113 FD. SCI. &amp; TECH.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0114 FORESTRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0202 ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0206 CCRP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401 BIOLOGY, GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0404 PLANT PATH.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0411 MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0421 ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0502 ACCOUNTING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0504 BANK. &amp; FIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0506 BUS. MGT. &amp; ADMI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509 MKT. &amp; PURCH.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701 COMP. &amp; INFO. GEN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0803 SEC. ED. GEN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0839 VOC. &amp; TECH. ED.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890 AG. ED.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0903 AG. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0906 CHEM. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0908 CIVIL ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0909 ELEC. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0910 MECH. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0913 IND. &amp; MGT. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0916 CER. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0917 TEXTILE ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0922 ENV. &amp; SYS. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0925 ENGIN. TECH.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005 MUSIC (LIB. ARTS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101 FOR. LANG. (GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203 NURS. (BAC. +)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 ENGLISH (GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701 MATH. (GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702 STATISTICS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902 PHYSICS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905 CHEMISTRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103 FRTM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204 ECONOMICS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205 HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207 POLITICAL SCI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2208 SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4999 INT. DISC. ST. (OTH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clemson Salaries as % of S.E. Average/Discipline Rank: Assoc. Prof.

Harold E. Albert 12/12/86
[File: SALCHAR5]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEGIS DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102 AGRONOMY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104 AN. SCI. HUSB.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105 DY. SCI. HUSB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106 POUL. SCI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107 FISH. GA., W.L. MGT.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108 HORTICULTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0111 AG. ECON.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0113 FD. SCI. &amp; TECH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0114 FORESTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0202 ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0206 CCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401 BIOLOGY, GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0404 PLANT PATH.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0411 MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0421 ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0502 ACCOUNTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0504 BANK. &amp; FIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0506 BUS. MGT. &amp; ADMIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509 MKT. &amp; PURCH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701 COMP. &amp; INFO. GEN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0803 SEC. ED. GEN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0839 VOC. &amp; TECH. ED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890 AG. ED.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0903 AG. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0906 CHEM. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0908 CIVIL ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0909 ELECTR. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0910 MECH. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0913 IND. &amp; MGT. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0916 CER. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0917 TEXTILE ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0922 ENV. &amp; SYS. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0925 ENGIN. TECH.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005 MUSIC (LIB. ARTS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101 FOR. LANG. (GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203 NURS. (BAC.+ )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 ENGLISH (GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701 MATH. (GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702 STATISTICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902 PHYSICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905 CHEMISTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103 FRTM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204 ECONOMICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205 HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207 POLITICAL SCI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2208 SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4999 INT. DISC. ST. (OTH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HAROLD E. ALBERT 12/12/86
(FILE: SALCHAR6)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEGIS DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>SALARIES AS % OF NAT. DISC. AVERAGE (85/86)</th>
<th>RANK: PROF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102 AGRONOMY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104 AN.SCI.HUSB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105 DY.SCI.HUSB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106 FOUL.SCI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107 FISH,GA.,W.L.MGT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108 HORTICULTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0111 AG.ECON.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0113 FD.SCI.&amp; TECH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0114 FORESTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0202 ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0206 CCRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401 BIOLOGY,GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0404 PLANT PATH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0411 MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0421 ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0502 ACCOUNTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0504 BANK.&amp; FIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0506 BUS.MGT.&amp; ADMN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509 MKT.&amp; PURCH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701 COMP.&amp; INFO.GEN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0803 SEC.ED.GEN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0839 VOC.&amp; TECH.ED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890 AG.ED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0903 AG.ENG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0906 CHEM.ENG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0908 CIVIL ENG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0909 ELEC.ENG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0910 MECH.ENG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0913 IND.&amp; MGT.ENG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0916 CER.ENG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0917 TEXTILE ENG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0922 ENV.&amp; SYS.ENG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0925 ENG. TECH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005 MUSIC(LIB.ARTS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101 FOR.LANG.(GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203 NURS.(BAC.+)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 ENGLISH(GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701 MATH.(GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702 STATISTICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902 PHYSICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905 CHEMISTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103 FRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204 ECONOMICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205 HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207 POLITICAL SCI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2208 SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4999 INT.DISC.ST.(OTH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HAROLD E. ALBERT 12/16/86
[FILE:SALCHR30]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEGIS DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>CU SALARIES AS % OF NAT. DISC. AVERAGE (85/86)</th>
<th>RANK: ASSOC. PROF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 8 9 9 0 0 1 1 2 2 3 3 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALL CU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102</td>
<td>AGRONOMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104</td>
<td>AN.SCI.HUSB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105</td>
<td>DY.SCI.HUSB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106</td>
<td>FOUL.SCI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107</td>
<td>FISH.GA.,W.L.MGT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108</td>
<td>HORTICULTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0111</td>
<td>AG.ECON.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0113</td>
<td>FD.SCI.&amp; TECH.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0114</td>
<td>FORESTRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0202</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0206</td>
<td>CCRR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401</td>
<td>BIOLOGY.GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0404</td>
<td>PLANT PATH.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0411</td>
<td>MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0421</td>
<td>ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0502</td>
<td>ACCOUNTING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0504</td>
<td>BANK.&amp; FIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0506</td>
<td>BUS.MGT.&amp; ADMI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509</td>
<td>MKT.&amp; PURCH.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701</td>
<td>COMP.&amp; INFO.CENS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0803</td>
<td>SEC.ED.GEN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0839</td>
<td>VOC.&amp; TECH.ED.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890</td>
<td>AG.ED.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0903</td>
<td>AG.ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0906</td>
<td>CHEM.ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0908</td>
<td>CIVIL ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0909</td>
<td>ELEC.ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0910</td>
<td>MECH.ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0913</td>
<td>IND.&amp; MGT.ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0916</td>
<td>CER.ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0917</td>
<td>TEXTILE ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0922</td>
<td>ENV.&amp; SY.S. ENGIN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0925</td>
<td>ENGIN.TECH.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>MUSIC(LIB.ARTS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>FOR.LANG.(GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>NURS.(BAC.+).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>ENGLISH(GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>MATH.(GEN.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>CHEMISTRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103</td>
<td>FRMT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205</td>
<td>HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207</td>
<td>POLITICAL SCI.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2208</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4999</td>
<td>INT.DISC.ST.(OTH)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harold E. Albert 12/16/86
[FILE: SALCHR31]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEGIS DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>CU SALARIES AS % OF NAT. DISC. AVERAGE (85/86)</th>
<th>RANK: ASST. PROF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA ALL CU</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102 AGRONOMY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104 AN.SCI.HUSB.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105 DV.SCI.HUSB.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106 POUL.SCI.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107 FISH.GA.,W.L.MGT.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108 HORTICULTURE</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0111 AG.ECON.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0113 FD.SCI.&amp; TECH.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0114 FORESTRY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0202 ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0206 CCRP</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401 BIOLOGY, GENERAL</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0404 PLANT PATH.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0411 MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0421 ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0502 ACCOUNTING</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0504 BANK.&amp; FIN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0506 BUS.MGT.&amp; ADMNemonic</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509 MKT.&amp; PURCH.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701 COMP.&amp; INFO.GEN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0803 SEC.ED.GEN.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0839 VOC.&amp; TECH.ED.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890 AG.ED.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0903 AG.ENG.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0906 CHEM.ENG.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0908 CIVIL.ENG.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0909 ELEC.ENG.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0910 MEC.ENG.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0913 IND.&amp; MGT.ENG.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0916 CER.ENG.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0917 TEXTILE ENG.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0922 ENV.&amp; SYS.ENG.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0925 ENGIN.TECH.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005 MUSIC(LIB.ARTS)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101 FOR.LANG.(GEN.)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203 NURS.(BAC.+ )</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 ENGLISH(GEN.)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701 MATH.(GEN.)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702 STATISTICS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902 PHYSICS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905 CHEMISTRY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103 FRMT</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204 ECONOMICS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205 HISTORY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207 POLITICAL SCI.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2208 SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4999 INT.DISC.ST.(OTH)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HAROLD E. ALBERT 12/16/86
(FILE: SALCHR322)
HEAVY EQUIPMENT SNOW CLEARING PRIORITIES

Streets

1. Security Dept. street
2. G Street (Security Dept. access)
3. Perimeter Road
4. Fire Station driveways
5. McMillan Road
6. S. Palmetto Blvd. to Redfern Health Center
7. Redfern Health Center parking lot
8. Cherry Road from S. Palmetto to Perimeter Rd.
9. Williamson Rd.
10. Ft. Hill Street (hill next to filter plant)
11. Heisman St. & Klugh Ave. (Fike to Harcombe Dining Hall)
12. President's Drive
13. Parkway Drive & drive around Sikes Hall
14. Streets around Clemson House
15. Calhoun Drive (inner campus)
16. Drives to parking lots
17. Streets in Douthit Hills & Thornhill

TO Dr. Lennon

For the Cabinets consideration. These are the existing priorities.

Claire
3 Feb 87
Small Motor Grader

1. Security Dept. Street
2. G Street (Security Dept. access)
3. Williamson Rd.
4. Ft. Hill Street (hill next to filter plant)
5. Heisman St. & Klugh Ave. (Fike to Harcombe Dining Hall)
6. Drives to parking lots
7. Streets in Douthit Hills & Thornhill

Large Motor Grader

1. Perimeter Road
2. Cherry Road from S. Palmetto to Perimeter Rd.
3. President's Drive
4. Parkway Drive & drive around Sikes Hall
5. Streets around Clemson House
6. Calhoun Drive (inner campus)
7. Drives to parking lots
8. Streets in Douthit Hills & Thornhill

Truck with blade

1. Fire Station driveways
2. McMillan Road
3. S. Palmetto Blvd. to Redfern Health Center
4. Redfern Health Center parking lot
5. Drives to parking lots
6. Streets in Douthit Hills & Thornhill

Sand truck - spread sand on following streets after streets have been scraped in priority order.
1. Security Dept. street
2. Fire Station driveways
3. S. Palmetto Blvd. to Redfern Health Center
4. Ft. Hill Street (hill next to filter plant)
5. Heisman St. & Klugh Ave. (Fike to Harcombe Dining Hall
6. President's Drive
7. Parkway Drive & drive around Sikes Hall
8. Streets around Clemson House
9. Drives to parking lots
10. Streets in Douthit Hills & Thornhill
GROUNDST DEPT.

SNOW CLEARING PRIORITIES

Steps and immediate sidewalks in the following priority order:

1. Redfern
2. Dining Halls
3. Sikes
4. President's home
5. Library (including bridge)
6. Tillman
7. Physical Plant
8. Steps on campus near and between buildings
9. At least 1 sidewalk from Clemson House to rest of campus
10. Both ends of Library bridge (walkways)
11. Sidewalk from high rises toward Library behind Nursing Bldg.
12. Sidewalk behind amphitheater
13. Sidewalk from P&A to Library
14. Sidewalk from Calhoun Courts to high rises
15. Sidewalks between Sikes and Brackett
16. Sidewalk from high rises to Sikes
17. Sidewalk from Johnstone to Tillman
18. Sidewalk from Trustee House to Library bridge
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 87-2-2

RESOLUTION ON TEACHING AWARDS

WHEREAS, excellence in teaching is of vital importance to the University's mission, and

WHEREAS, the success of the classroom experience is essential to the University's fine scholastic reputation, and

WHEREAS, the University wishes to maintain the high standards of classroom activity as it increases its emphasis toward research, and

WHEREAS, there exists a need for additional recognition and reward for excellence in teaching; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the University institute a policy that recognizes and rewards excellence in teaching, and be it further

RESOLVED, that titled professorships, bearing the name(s) of former distinguished educators, be awarded to one or more faculty members in each of the University's Colleges on a rotating basis; that this once-per-lifetime award provide a budget of $3,000/year, that it be awarded for a period of two years, and that it be used by the recipient to enhance scholarly activity related to teaching, and be it further

RESOLVED, that any tenure track faculty member with the rank of assistant professor or above be eligible to apply for the award and that a selection committee be established by each College to accept nominations and forward their recommendation to the College and University administration.
Additional Comments:

1. Funding for the awards should come through a grant from the Development Office, possibly through unrestricted annual gifts.

2. Evidence submitted by an applicant would include:
   a. a brief narrative outlining major teaching accomplishments;
   b. written supportive statements from:
      1) present and/or former students
      2) peers
      3) parents of students
      4) other university personnel

3. Selection Committees would include the following among their members:
   a. two graduate and two undergraduate students currently enrolled within the respective colleges; appointed by the dean on a rotating basis among the various majors in the college;
   b. one faculty member from each academic department within the college; appointed by the department heads of the respective departments.

4. The committee's operational protocol may be established by each group, with consideration being given to the following suggestions:
   a. the chairperson would be elected by the committee from among its faculty representatives;
   b. committee members from the faculty would serve two year terms, student members would serve one year terms;
   c. any committee member submitting an application would resign from the committee and would be replaced by a new appointee.
RESOLUTION

BE IT WITNESSED THAT:

WHEREAS: The late Mr. George R. McDonald stated in his will that "It is my desire to encourage and assist financially any student in the fields of study promising the most rewarding service to the economy and culture of the nation, ...who could not study or continue their studies without financial assistance."; and

WHEREAS: All curricula at Clemson University, by their inextricable ties to the complete education of Clemson students, are fields that contribute to the economy and culture of the nation; and

WHEREAS: The Undergraduate Scholarships and Awards Committee at Clemson University oversees, advises, and authorizes all undergraduates scholarships and awards;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

(1) The University Scholarships and Awards Committee is assigned the responsibility for decisions concerning the monies from the McDonald gift designated for undergraduates study.

(2) The University Scholarships and Awards Committee is given responsibility in scholarship distribution for providing criteria that will meet both the full intent of the McDonald will and University standards for monies designated for undergraduate study.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

The Faculty Senate recognizes the University Scholarships and Awards Committee as the decision making body for all gifts, inheritances, and endowments specifically identified by the donor (or donors) for Undergraduate Scholarship use.
Resolution on MacDonald Scholarship

WHEREAS, it was George R. MacDonald's wish to provide assistance to students so that they might initiate or continue their studies at Clemson University,

and

WHEREAS, Mr. MacDonald's will stipulates that, in the awarding of scholarship from the MacDonald Endowment, the Faculty Senate shall: a) designate "... the fields of study promising the most rewarding service to the economy and culture of the nation. . . .", b) "... select the field or fields of undergraduate or postgraduate study meeting. . . the definition expressed above," and c) review "... the definition expressed above" every five years,

and

WHEREAS, time constraints for awarding scholarships for the 1987-1988 academic year do not permit the Faculty Senate to complete its review task;

be it, therefore,

RESOLVED, that, for this year only, the Faculty Senate recommends that one third (1/3) of the income be designated for distribution as graduate fellowships, to be administered by the appropriate subcommittee within the Commission on Graduate Studies, and two thirds (2/3) of the income be designated for distribution as undergraduate scholarships by the University Scholarships and Awards Committee,

and be it further

RESOLVED, that, for this year only, the Faculty Senate instructs the administration that the scholastic awards may be distributed, in keeping with the requirements of the will, to candidates who show aptitude for and interest in any undergraduate major or graduate program resulting in a degree awarded by Clemson University,

and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate immediately appoint an ad hoc committee to determine the procedure to be followed in fulfilling the Faculty Senate's responsibility as mandated in the MacDonald Will, and that this committee report its findings and recommendations at the August 1987 meeting of the Faculty Senate.
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 87-2-4
RESOLUTION ON THE UNIVERSITY'S SNOW PLAN

WHEREAS, the current University snow plan states that local media will be informed of the operations of the University by 6:30 a.m. on days of inclement winter weather, and yet, on Thursday, January 22, local media reported having no information concerning Clemson University as late as 6:50 a.m.; and,

WHEREAS, a 6:30 a.m. notification deadline may be too late for faculty, staff, and students who live a considerable distance from Clemson; and,

WHEREAS, on Friday, January 23, the campus parking lots and walkways had not been cleared of snow and ice, creating hazardous conditions that resulted in a number of accidents among members of the University community; and,

WHEREAS, a number of faculty observed snow removal equipment in the vicinity of Littlejohn Coliseum on Friday, January 23, instead of being located on the main portion of the campus, creating the perception of ill-advised priorities on the part of the University Administration;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT,

1) The University Administration review the snow plan and consider making their decisions with regard to University operations by 5:00 a.m. on days of inclement winter weather.

2) The University Administration ensure that the University campus is safe in terms of clear walkways and adequate parking conditions prior to scheduling classes on days of inclement winter weather.
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ATHLETIC COUNCIL REORGANIZATION

(NOTE: Brackets reflect changes in or additions to the draft distributed with the minutes of the council meeting of 12/16/86.)

I. Responsibilities of the Athletic Council

The Athletic Council functions to [assist the Athletic Department in overseeing] compliance of Clemson University with the rules and regulations of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, Atlantic Coast Conference, or any other such body in which the university holds membership. The Council is charged with such specific duties as: [reviewing] athletic schedules and ticket prices; reviewing the recruitment, scholastic eligibility, and academic progress of student athletes; and reviewing the policies and programs of the Athletic Department to ensure their compatibility with the overall aims and mission of the University.

The primary role of the Athletic Council is to advise the Director of Athletics on all major decisions affecting the administration of the Athletic Department. In addition, the Council recommends policy on intercollegiate athletics to the [Athletic Director and, when appropriate, to the President of the University through the office of the Vice President for Student Affairs.]

II. Membership

The Athletic Council is composed of 19 voting members and [five] ex-officio non-voting members.

A. Voting members

1. Nine regular, full-time faculty members appointed by the President of the University from nominations by the collegiate units, with each college having one representative on the Council. The representative from each college shall be selected by the President from a list of three nominees chosen by the college faculty. Faculty Council members serve staggered three-year terms. Consecutive terms are permissible.
2. Two members of the student body, one each appointed by the Student Body President and President of the Student Senate.

3. Two student-athletes appointed by the Director of Athletics.

4. One member of the Clemson Alumni Association appointed by the Alumni National Council.

5. One member of IPTAY. The IPTAY representative may be the President or the President's designate.

6. One Faculty Senator appointed by the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate.

7. Three at-large non-faculty appointees of the President of the University, at least one of which shall be a member of the Alumni Association.

[Student members of the Athletic Council serve one-year terms consecutive up to two years. Except for the faculty representatives of the nine colleges, whose terms are described in II.-A.-1., all other voting members of the Council serve one-year terms consecutive up to three years.]

B. Ex-officio non-voting members include:

1. The university's NCAA/ACC representative.

2. The Director of Athletics.

3. [One Associate Athletic Director designated by the Director of Athletics.]

4. The Vice President for Student Affairs.

5. The chairman of the University Scholarship and Awards Committee.

[III. Council Chairman

At the March meeting of the Athletic Council the voting members elect from the ranks of the regular, full-time faculty members a Chairman whose one-year term commences at the August meeting and expires with the conclusion of the July meeting of the following academic year. Should a faculty member in his or her final year of a three-year appointment be elected chairman, that person's term on the Council is extended for one year.]
IV. Committees

Committees of the Athletic Council are appointed and charged by the Chairman as deemed appropriate by the members of the Council.

V. Additional Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee

1. For reasons which will be explained at the January 21 meeting of the Council, the committee recommends against establishing a position of chairman-elect.

2. The committee recommends that the Council request the Athletic Director or Vice President for Student Affairs to supply the Council the services of a recording secretary whose duty will be to record and distribute minutes of Council meetings.
recreation facilities and programs to the Commission on Student Affairs. Policy recommendations are also forwarded to the Commission on Faculty Affairs for review. The committee's membership consists of two undergraduate students nominated by the President of the Student Senate; a graduate student representative; three faculty members (one from the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management) elected by the Faculty Senate for staggered three year terms; one staff member each from the offices of Business and Finance, Student Affairs, and Development, each nominated by the appropriate Vice-President or Director; the Director of Fike Recreation Center; the Director of the University Union; and the Director of Tennis. The Chairperson is designated by the Vice-President for Student Affairs.

University Union Board. The Board governs the Clemson University Union, and has the responsibility for all program activities of the Union. It formulates and recommends policy to the Commission on Student Affairs. The board consists of sixteen students; a faculty member elected annually by the Faculty Senate; the University Union Director (non-voting) and the Union Program Director (non-voting). The student members are the President, Vice-President, and Secretary of the Union; the Chairperson of the Union Program Committee; and two students appointed by the Student Senate. The President of the Union is Chairperson.

Media Advisory Board. The duties of the Media Advisory Board include advising the joint media adviser on any matter concerning the operation of the media, hearing complaints and suggestions from any person concerning any media organization or the media in general, and accepting or rejecting the annual budget proposal as presented by the joint media adviser. The board consists of the joint media adviser (Chairperson), and administrator appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs, one member of the faculty selected by the Faculty Senate, one non-faculty employee from University Relations appointed by the Executive Director of University Relations, two members of the Student Senate selected by the Student Senate to serve one-year terms, two students-at-large who shall be selected by the President of the Student Body to serve one-year terms, the editors of TAPS and The Tiger, and the program director of WSBF.

Athletic Council. The Athletic Council functions to exercise "institutional responsibility and control of intercollegiate athletics" and to insure accountability of the Athletic Department to the University as required by the constitution of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the Atlantic Coast Conference, and Clemson University.
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The Athletic Council recommends policy on intercollegiate athletics to the President of the University through the Vice President for Student Affairs; serves in an advisory capacity to the President of the University on any matters referred to it; and keeps students, faculty, staff, alumni, and IPTAY informed about athletic policy. The Athletic Council is charged with ensuring that Clemson University is in compliance with the rules and regulations of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and Atlantic Coast Conference, or any other such body in which the University holds membership. Thus, all communications with the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Atlantic Coast Conference will be with the full knowledge of the chairman of the Athletic Council, who receives copies of all official correspondence.

The Athletic Council in no way relieves the President of the University of full responsibility for the conduct of the executive functions of the University administration.

The Athletic Council is composed of 21 voting members: 9 faculty members appointed by the President of the University from nominations by the Collegiate Faculties for staggered three year terms (faculty members may serve successive terms); the University's ACC/NCAA representative (appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the President of the University); the president and immediate past president of the Alumni Association and of IPTAY; the president and the immediate past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; the Chairman of the Scholarship and Awards Committee; and the presidents of the student body, the Student Senate, the Graduate Student Association, and the Block C Club. Clemson University's Vice President for Student Affairs, Athletic Director, and Associate and Assistant Athletic Directors are non-voting members of the Council. The University ACC/NCAA representative chairs the Council, and the secretary is elected annually by the Council from among its faculty members.

The Commission on Public Programs studies and recommends policies and procedures concerning programs and events directly serving or concerning the public other than regular courses of study. Members are the Vice President for Institutional Advancement (Chairperson); the Associate Vice President for University Relations; the Associate Vice President for Institutional Advancement; the Associate Vice President for Development; the Executive Assistant to the President; the Executive Secretary of IPTAY; the Director of Information and Public Service; the Director of the University Union; a representative of the Student Life Office appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs; and the Vice President for Student Affairs.
RESOLUTION ON ATHLETIC COUNCIL

WHEREAS, an ad hoc committee of the athletic council has proposed a reorganization of the council; and

WHEREAS, some of the features of the proposed council do not meet with the approval of the Faculty Senate;

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate recommends to the ad hoc committee the following changes to their proposal for their consideration:

1. Each of the nine colleges will elect a representative and an alternate to represent the college
2. Consecutive terms are permitted only if reelected by the college
3. In the event that the representatives continue to be selected from a pool of nominees, consecutive terms will require renomination by the college
4. One student athlete appointed by the Director of Athletics
5. One graduate student appointed by the President of the Graduate Student Association
6. Two nonfaculty appointed by the President with at least one from the Alumni Association.

Current

9 Fac. appointed by Pres. from pool
1 Fac. Senate President
1 Fac. Senate Past P.
1 Fac. Acc/NCAA Rep.
1 N.F. Pres. of Al. Assoc.
1 N.F. P. Pres. of Al Assoc.
1 N.F. Pres. of Iptay
1 N.F. P. Pres. of Iptay
1 Fac. Ch. of Scholarship & A. Com.
1 S. Pres. of Student Body
1 S. Pres. of Student Senate
1 S. Pres. of G.S.A.
1 S. Pres. of Block C

13 Fac./4 N.F./4 Students

Nonvoting

V.P. for Student Affairs
Athletic Director
Associate Athletic Director

Proposed by ad hoc committee

9 Fac., 1 from each College
1 Fac. Appt. by F. S.
0
0
1 N.F. member of Nat. Alumn.
0
1 N.F. member of IPTAY
0
0
1 S. appt. by Pres. Stud. B.
1 S. appt. by Pres. Stud. S.
0
2 S. student ath. appt. by athletic director
3 N.F. appt. by Pres. 1 from Alumni Assoc.

10 Fac./5 N.F./4 Students

V.P. for Student Affairs
Athletic Director
1 Assoc. Ath. Dir. (appt. by Ath. Dir.)
Ch. of Scholarships & Awards
NCAA/ACC Representative
MEMORANDUM

TO: Business and Finance Personnel

FROM: David R. Larson

SUBJECT: PARKING

I am enclosing an advance copy of the February 11 Newsletter which should answer some of your questions about the parking proposal that are being discussed on campus. I have also included a copy of my letter to Dr. Lennon concerning parking which lays out the original concept along with financial information about parking operations at Clemson University.

As stated in the news article, I recognize that both employees and students are concerned about parking just as they are concerned about what they might have to pay for parking. Hopefully if faculty, staff and students work together we can develop a solution that we all feel is in the best interest of Clemson University. I would appreciate receiving any comments or suggestions you have about the proposal as outlined in the attached materials.

DRL/rr
Attachs.
Ridley wins award

John Ridley, an Extension Service horticulturist and associate professor, has received an award from a national organization for his contributions to the peach industry.

The National Peach Council presented the award to Ridley during the council's convention Feb. 3.

Ridley was cited for outstanding contributions to the industry and for service to the council, an industry-wide group involved in promotion and marketing of peaches.

Make award nominations by Feb. 20

This spring the Honors and Awards Committee will award a $2,000 scholarship to a student who shows excellent leadership qualities and has an outstanding academic record.

In addition, a $1,000 cash award will be given to an academic or organization adviser who has excelled in developing students in the areas of leadership, devotion to duty and service to fellow students.

Both of these prestigious awards have been made possible by an endowment established by Frank A. Burtner, who served Clemson for many years as a professor and adviser to numerous student groups.

For more information or to nominate a student or adviser for the awards, call Teresa Evans, assistant dean of student life, at 656-5994.

The deadline for submitting nominations is Feb. 20.

Larson wants to know

Will employees support a transportation system?

The new parking system proposed by the Office of Business and Finance and described in part in The Tiger Jan. 24 has been a hot topic of conversation on campus lately.

Some students and staff and faculty members applaud the administration for making progress toward improving the current parking situation, and others don't understand why they suddenly may be charged for parking places that have been available to them free for years.

Well, David Larson wants to hear your comments.

"Clearly there is a consensus that the (parking) situation needs to be corrected, although quite obviously many individuals do not want to have to pay for correcting the problem," said the vice president for business and finance.

"The one thing that stands out is that we need a transportation system to improve the utilization of our lots," he said.

Because the University is facing such a large budget cut for the 1987-88 fiscal year, Larson said nothing can be done to improve parking using general funds.

"We need to generate additional revenue to pay for a transportation system and for redesigning parking lots to hold more cars, if everyone agrees we need those improvements," he said.

According to Larson's proposal, a shuttle system would make using the lots along the perimeter of campus a little more attractive to both students and employees.

If more people park in the outlying areas of campus, Larson said, traffic flow would improve and fewer people would violate the parking code and create problems for everyone else.

Larson said there are several misconceptions about the proposal spreading across campus. He explained in more detail some of the issues employees are concerned about:

- The parking issue will be addressed in three steps. 1) Larson wants to know whether or not employees and students think a transportation system will help improve parking and whether or not they are willing to pay for the system. 2) If everyone agrees, a consultant will be brought in to help design a transportation system; and 3) another consultant will be brought in to help redesign the parking lots.

Each step, Larson said, will require employee and student suggestions and approval.

- The shuttle schedule will be efficient enough to accommodate employees and students at the "rush hours," Larson said. Specific schedules and routes will not be set until staff, faculty and student groups have made suggestions.

- The price of parking decals will be $15 per month for reserved parking close to office buildings, $15 per semester for general parking on campus, and $5 per semester for perimeter parking.

(Continued on next page.)
transportation system, cont. 

be competing for parking spaces. Employees will have the first shot at reserving spaces in what are now employee lots, and students will have first shot at what are now student lots.

For example, if only 400 spaces in an employee lot with 500 available spaces are reserved by employees, students then would have an opportunity to reserve the remaining 100 spaces.

- People with reserved space decals can park in reserved, general or perimeter lots; people with general space decals can park in general or perimeter lots; and people with perimeter space decals can park only in perimeter lots.

- If a reserved lot has 500 spaces, only 500 people will be given decals for that lot.

- After 5 p.m. and on weekends, you will be able to park in any lot, regardless of what decal is on your car.

- Parking lots, such as the one behind Sikes Hall, will have metered, handicapped and general spaces available for visitors, employees and students conducting business in nearby buildings, Larson said.

- The new system will have no effect on the athletic department's use of parking lots during home ball games.

Larson said that similar transportation systems have been successful at neighboring universities.

Annual parking fees for employees range from $12 for perimeter lots at the University of Georgia to $192 for access to all lots at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

"We recognize employees and students are concerned about parking just as they are concerned about what they might have to pay for parking," Larson said.

"I want to hear employees' and students' ideas so we can work together to find the best solution to our parking problems."

Send your comments to David Larson in the Office of Business and Finance, 206 Sikes Hall, or contact your representatives on the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs or the Faculty Senate.

State co-ops join Clemson research group

The South Carolina Electric Cooperative Association, with headquarters in Cayce-West Columbia, has joined the Clemson University Electric Power Research Association to support research aimed at improving efficiency of utility operations.

The association serves as a statewide trade organization for the 20 rural electric distribution systems and two generation and transmission cooperatives that do business in South Carolina.

On behalf of the association, Clemson alumnus Charles Dalton, general manager of the Blue Ridge Electric Cooperative in Pickens, presented a check for $15,000 to the electrical and computer engineering department for the first year's membership.

The electric co-ops, which provide electrical service to approximately 1 million S.C. residents, join five utility companies in the Southeast that are members already.

The research association has helped the power systems program at Clemson develop at a rapid pace, said department head Wayne Bennett.

Author to talk about Harlem Renaissance

Jim Haskins, the author of "The Cotton Club," which inspired the motion picture of the same title, will speak here Feb. 16.

Sponsored by the Black Awareness Committee, Haskins' lecture on the Harlem Renaissance will be held at 7 p.m. in Tillman Hall Auditorium. Admission will be free.

Author of more than 50 publications for adults and young adults, he has won recognition for many of his books:

- "The Story of Stevie Wonder," a biography for young people, won the Coretta Scott King Award in 1976.
- "The Life and Death of Martin Luther King Jr." was named a Notable Book in the Field of Social Studies in 1978.

Haskins will talk about the post-World War I Harlem Renaissance and its effects on blacks throughout the country.

Harlem then had the single largest population of blacks outside of Africa and was the center of the rebirth of black history and culture, including art, music, writing and theater, said Lewis Suggs, assistant professor of history.

For more information, call Suggs at 656-5376.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Larry Dyck, President, Faculty Senate
    Mr. Fred Richey, President, Student Senate
    Ms. Pat Padgett, Classified Staff Affairs Commission
    Mr. Bill Pace, Director, Parking & Vehicle Registration

FROM: David R. Larson

The attached proposal was discussed at the President's Cabinet on January 19. The next step is to involve various campus groups in a discussion of the need for a transportation system on campus, and the parking fees that would have to be assessed to pay for such a system. Harry Durham's office will also publish information about this proposal in the Newsletter and seek input from the campus through a survey instrument.

At the Cabinet meeting it was pointed out that we need to also discuss evening parking regulations for guests and parking privileges for donors. Let me know if you would like me to attend a meeting of your group to discuss the parking proposal. Our target is to obtain input from a variety of campus constituencies over the next 30 days at which time we would finalize the broad details of the final package. Let me know if you have any questions.

DRL/rr
Attach.
cc: President Max Lennon
    Vice Presidents
    Mr. Harry Durham
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Max Lennon, President

FROM: David R. Larson

SUBJECT: PARKING

My staff has reviewed a number of alternatives relative to the parking situation at Clemson. I have discussed this issue with a variety of faculty, staff and students. Clearly there is a consensus that the situation needs to be corrected, although quite obviously many individuals do not want to have to pay for correcting the problem. I believe the one thing that stands out is that we need a transportation system in order to improve the utilization of our lots. We also need to provide funds for future maintenance since these costs will increase substantially over the next few years given the age of many of the parking lots.

I feel the parking issue should be addressed in three steps, keeping in mind that nothing can be done unless we generate some revenue to address the problem since all the potential solutions cost money. My first step would be to have the campus discuss my proposed rate schedule for parking without getting into specifics about which lot will be reserved and which lot will be general. If the implementation of parking charges at Clemson University is approved, I would like to involve outside individuals in the development and the design of the transportation system would require 40% of the potential revenues. As a later phase, I would propose to bring in an outside consultant to help us design our parking lots so that we can maximize their utilization. The layout and design could be substantially improved if we use some of the techniques already implemented at other campuses.

If you require further information, please let me know.

DRL/rr

Attachs.
### REVENUE

- Parking Fines: $302,756.80
- Towing: $21,340.00
- Vehicle Registration: $21,533.00

**Total Revenue:** $345,629.80

### EXPENDITURES

#### Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office(5)</td>
<td>$79,719.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement(2)</td>
<td>$26,700  *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniformed</td>
<td>$52,000  *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringes</td>
<td>$16,655.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringes Total</td>
<td>$14,166  *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Personnel Expenses:** $189,241.47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$1,156.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Other Expenses</td>
<td>$36,465.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing Services</td>
<td>$60,000   *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$2,835.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenses:** $289,698.55

- Maintenance: $60,000
- Towing: $31,416.80

**Total Expenses:** $381,115.35

**NOTE:** Costs budgeted in other university accounts.
REVENUE

Permit Sales:

- 2600 Reserved @ $15/mo. (1.0:1.0) $ 468,000
- 8000 General @ $15/semester (1.8:1.0) 240,000
- 2800 Perimeter @ $5/semester (1.4:1.0) 28,000
- 5000 Summer @ $10 50,000

$ 786,000

Parking Fines 250,000
Towing 25,000
Meters 35,000

$1,096,000

EXPENDITURES

Personnel:

- Office (5) $ 85,000
- Enforcement (2) 30,000
- Uniformed 55,000
- Student 15,000
- Fringes 30,600

$ 215,600

Travel 2,500
Supplies & Other Expenses 43,000
Computing Services 68,000

Equipment:

- Gates $ 10,200
- Other 5,700

15,900

$ 345,000

Maintenance 291,000
Towing 25,000
Transportation System 435,000

$1,096,000
### Duke
- Gated Lots, Staff Only .................. $78.00
- All Other Decals ........................ 30.00
- Motorcycle ............................. 15.00

### Georgia
- **Faculty and Staff:**
  - Basic (Perimeter) ....................... $12.00
  - North, Central or South Region ..... 60.00 + Basic Fee
  - Any Two Regions ...................... 84.00 + Basic Fee
  - All Regions ............................ 108.00 + Basic Fee
  - Motorcycles ........................... 18.00

- **Students:**
  - Commuter .............................. $ .00 (No Charge)
  - Graduate Lots ........................ 9.00
  - Dorm ................................. 15.00
  - Motorcycles ........................... 18.00
  - Transportation Fee Charge to Students to Support Bus System .. 17.00

### N. C. State
- **Faculty - Staff:**
  - North - Main Campus ................. $120.00
  - South - Main Campus .................. 84.00
  - North - Reserve Lot ................... 108.00

- **Students:**
  - Commuter Parking Deck ............... $72.00
  - Commuter Fringe Lots ................. 36.00
  - Resident Lots ........................ 84.00
  - Married Student and Fraternity Lots 48.00

### U.N.C. - Chapel Hill
- **Faculty - Staff:**
  - All Lots .............................. $192.00
  - Gated Lots ........................... 168.00
  - Prime Lots ........................... 132.00
  - Lined Lots ........................... 120.00
  - Fringe (Bus Pass Included) .......... 84.00
  - Motorcycle ........................... 42.00

- **Students:**
  - Decals Priced on Proximity of Lots to Main Areas $99.00
  - Motorcycle ........................... 42.00
MEMORANDUM TO: Mr. David Larson
FROM: W. D. Stone, Jr.
SUBJECT: Parking Lots

Following is a list of parking lot projects accomplished during the last three years:

Clemson House - additional parking
Acct # 5372 - Completed 4-10-85
Modifications to C-4 (behind Lee Hall) 22,743
Acct # 5310 - Completed 9-26-84
Renovate and expand Sirrine Hall parking lot 193,831
Acct # 8-5310 - Completed 7-27-84
Fire Station - expand parking lot 8,875
Acct # 5907 - Completed 10-3-85
Repave street and parking areas, Douthit Hills 106,996
Acct # 5907 - Completed 8-21-85
Parking for Calhoun Courts (constr. Contract B) 174,120
Housing Bonds - Completed 8-83
Engineering cost for design of lots to replace C-3 and to expand C-5 12,888
Acct # 5907 - Completed 4-11-85
Improvement of parking lot lighting 11,000
Acct # 5909 - Completed 8-21-85 543,087

Following is a list of parking lot projects that have been proposed and estimated but not begun:

Replace C-3 and expand C-5 605,000
Mell Hall - reconstruct parking lot 50,000
West Campus - repave Physical Plant parking lot 65,000
PNC Courts - expand parking 70,000

The estimated maintenance cost of existing parking lots during the last 12 months is $17,800.
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RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE AND ITS CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSED CONTINUING EDUCATION AND CONFERENCE CENTER

WHEREAS, the published operating procedures for the Facilities Planning Committee state that, "Hearings will be held for input from various areas of the University and exposure drafts of policies shall be distributed for comment, as deemed appropriate by the committee in order to insure adequate input", and

WHEREAS, there has been no such hearing in the case of the Continuing Education and Conference Center and no general distribution of plans concerning it, and

WHEREAS, the proposed Continuing Education and Conference Center is certainly of campus-wide importance and interest, and

WHEREAS, the Continuing Education and Conference Center and the Performing Arts Center are linked in a special way that is largely unknown to the campus, and

WHEREAS, the Performing Arts Center itself is of acute concern to the entire University community, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate strongly urges the Facilities Planning Committee, following a campus-wide announcement, to conduct an open hearing to inform faculty, students, and staff of the current plans with regard to both the Continuing Education and Conference Center and the Performing Arts Center and to assess the campus view of those plans.
I. CALL TO ORDER

President Dyck called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. President Dyck extended a welcome to Senator Lyle, who is replacing Senator Sly, and to Pat Padgett, Chair of the Commission on Staff Affairs.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the February 10, 1987 meeting were approved as corrected.

III. SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

President Dyck noted that the issue of parking had sparked lively debate throughout the University constituency. Much of the debate has been emotive and it is time to present an unemotional base for further discussion. Dr. Ed Clark, Professor of Civil Engineering and member of the Traffic and Parking Committee, was introduced. Dr. Clark had been invited to present an overview on formulation of a University Traffic and Parking Plan.

Dr. Clark noted that he was apprised of the existence of a new parking plan when he read it in The Tiger. No discussion of the plan had occurred in the Traffic and Parking Committee prior to that publication. He reported that the average person spends about 400 hours each year occupying their vehicle, the rest of the time it is parked, which is an indication of the extent of the problem.
Currently, Clemson University has about 9300 parking spaces on campus. Each parking space requires 300 square feet which means that approximately 64 acres of the campus are utilized for parking.

During the spring of 1981, a study of campus parking needs and traffic planning was done by Harlan Bartholemew Associates. The study presented parking recommendations for a campus of 11,000 students, of 15,000 students, and 25,000 students.

Dr. Clark presented 4 steps which are necessary in development of a comprehensive parking plan. These steps include:

- Development of parking policy
- Data collection and analysis
- Development of a plan
- Implementation of the plan, including any revisions which are needed in order to make it work.

The step of parking development is designed to answer questions about the intent of the policy and goals to be accomplished. Alternative, but not mutually exclusive, policies are directed toward 1) reducing demand, 2) increasing supply, or 3) improving utilization.

Methods of reducing demand might include: encouraging development of car pools, providing van pools or shuttle buses, utilizing public transportation or prohibiting some groups from having parking privileges.
Supply can be increased by the creation of new facilities. Another method of increasing supply is to develop ways to increase turnover. Utilization can be improved by increasing enforcement. This method is difficult at Clemson because of the number of small lots; larger central lots make enforcement much easier. Utilization can also be improved by reallocation of existing spaces.

 Provision of parking has costs associated with it. One big question is "Who is going to pay?" Generally the aversion to paying is reduced if improvement is in sight. Another related issue concerns parking utilization for sporting and other events and for evening classes.

 Clemson does have more spaces than vehicles but distance is also a factor. The average walking distance and time for faculty is 400 feet or about 1.6 minutes. Commuting students walk 1400 feet, about 5 minutes, and Resident students walk 1900 feet to or from their vehicles, a time of 7.2 minutes. It might be more useful for planning to establish a target, or maximum, distance/time instead of using these average figures.

 Data needed for planning include:
  - inventory of spaces and uses
  - measure of usage such as turnovers per day, duration, and occupancy. (1981 occupancy was 76%).
  - demand for parking, the number who want to park in a given area in a high demand hour. A surrogate measure is based on occupancy of nearby buildings.
  - adequacy
  - legal, financial, and administrative factors.
Inventories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1981</th>
<th>1987 (Traffic and Parking Office)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>2299</td>
<td>2753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timed</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>3621</td>
<td>4488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demand: 1981 (per 100 users in category)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>100 -</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>50 -</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>35 -</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>1 per</td>
<td>28 employees to 1 per 26 employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1981 study identified a total of 9645 spaces which, after reserved spaces were subtracted, yielded 8338 usable spaces. The maximum occupancy was between 10:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m., but occupancy was actually fairly constant between 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Dr. Clark also indicated that costs for new spaces, exclusive of land, would be approximately:

- open lot: $1000, debt-9% at (10 yrs.) 13
- garage: $6000, (20 yrs.) 54

The cost, to pay full costs, would be about $15 per month per space for a lot and about $60 per month for a garage space.

Dr. Clark referred to a publication called Parking at Institutions and Special Events, published by the ENO Foundation for Parking. In a discussion of shuttle buses, the author reported that they have not "enjoyed widespread success" at other universities or colleges. It was also noted parking costs were usually funded through tuition or endowments.
Traditionally, parking for resident students has been designated at the institutional periphery. Dr. Clark notes this trend is undergoing change.

Dr. Clark stated that the most important step in development of a parking plan is to examine and decide upon a policy. He suggested that Faculty Senate might initiate this procedure.

Questions from Faculty Senators:
Why have buses not been successful? The authors did not provide an answer. Clark believes that difficulties in scheduling and cost are the answer.

Does enforcement seem uniform across campus? There is no readily available answer to that question. However, it is known that complaints center around specific areas.

Senator Brown asked about the nature of the current policy. Dr. Clark replied that he is not aware of a current parking policy.

Is a fee for parking bicycles part the plan? Clark said he was not sure of the answer. He noted that bicycle commuting should be encouraged.
What are the 1981 recommendations? Some of them were: for a 300 space garage to be located between Lehotsky Hall and the location of the Strom Thurmond Institute excavation, a 600 space surface lot on Cherry Road about opposite from the P & A building, and that all parking enclosed by Perimeter Road be designated as employee parking.

Is banning the parking of Freshman cars a common policy? No.

Were the parking spaces which have been lost during the past few years replaced? No. President Dyck asked if the 1981 study had been widely circulated. Dr. Clark believes that it has not been, he knows of only 2 copies that are available. In response to an additional question as to the availability of the study in Sikes Hall, he had no information.

Senator Mullins suggested that the 700 spaces behind the Athletic Center could be allocated to freshmen residing on the West campus. He also asked Dr. Clark if the Parking and Traffic Committee could recommend a parking policy. Dr. Clark replied that they could if they were asked to do so.

Mr. Pace, Director of Parking and Vehicle Registration commented that he is aware of 2 universities where shuttles are working very well. In both instances they operate in conjunction with a parking garage. He also noted that he has supported the concept of a parking garage for several years. Mr. Pace volunteered that he saw no movement toward making this campus a pedestrian campus.
IV. NEW BUSINESS

Senator Calhoun moved that the regular order of business be suspended so that the proposal originating from the Commission on Staff Affairs could be discussed. The motion was seconded. President Dyck recognized Pat Padgett to speak about the Recommendations for establishing a Child Care Center (attachment A).

Padgett noted that the need for child care affects staff, faculty and students. She reviewed the 2 options outlined by the Child Care Committee. Option 1 proposes leasing non-restricted campus property to a child care provider for the purpose of constructing a child care facility, or leasing an existing building to be remodeled for this purpose. Option 2 would be for the provider to bid on a contract to provide services on their own property within 1 mile of campus. In either option the provider would operate child care facilities according to the specifications established for an open bid.

Padgett added that these options would have greater benefits to Clemson University than providing a new fringe benefit, it would offer new student experiences and be available for research purposes.

Anticipated other benefits included reducing absenteeism and increasing job satisfaction of participating faculty and staff.

Padgett stated the community providers with whom she has spoken are not in opposition to the plan because all area providers would have the opportunity to bid. In addition, the charges for the service would be
competitive and there would be no subsidies. She projects child care would be a self supporting enterprise for Clemson which might, in fact, result in a small profit.

Senator Hedden asked about provisions to insure quality. Padgett said the specifications would include provision for oversight groups.

Senator Mullins asked why the service would be open to persons not connected with Clemson. He added that he had received complaints about this already. Padgett replied that the legal advice was to have an open facility.

Senator Derr noted that the proposal identified age related slots under option 2. If the center was located on campus would there be additional slots? Padgett answered that the on-campus facility would be recommended to have capacity for 110 children. Senator Derr commented that option 2 offers no added benefit over the existing providers as a learning experience for education students. Only an on-campus facility would benefit them as a learning lab.

It was noted that the proposal implies dissatisfaction with currently available facilities, could Padgett explain what is wrong with them? The reply included: The available facilities occupy remodeled facilities and don't lend themselves to student learning experiences. If constructing a new facility, observation rooms could be incorporated. In addition a new facility could be better designed for the child care purpose.
The question was asked as to how a new facility could be built, operated better, and yet the costs remain the same. These factors suggest increased cost. Padgett replied that costs would be controlled by the provider building, operating, managing and staffing the center; she noted that it would be a situation similar to A.R.A. In response to the comment that A.R.A doesn't have to build buildings, Padgett said that not having to buy land could make the cost of building feasible.

Senator Nowaczyk asked if the proposed number of slots would be sufficient and if the committee had contacted other schools who provide child care. Padgett said that the number and demand would not need to match as she wouldn't expect every parent to switch their child to this facility, 110 seemed to be the most cost-effective size for a child care facility. She reported that she has visited Tri-County Tech, which operates a child care center using state employees, and the University of South Carolina, which has a center subsidized by the College of Education. The latter is staffed, at least in part, by graduate students and faculty. Most of their full time employees are state employees. A further question related to whether a survey of demand has been done. A survey was done in either '81 or '82 but the most realistic estimate of need now is for 110 spaces.

In response to a question about who would build a building on state property without a 25-30 year contract Padgett replied that she believes that we could protect the University while making the proposal attractive enough for providers to want to do it.
President Dyck noted that the benefit to graduate students and employees in having such a center is obvious, it would save commuting time and mothers would be able to visit during their lunch breaks. After a pause, he added that "fathers could do that too, I suppose." But, for graduate students, cost is a major factor—would assistance be available for them? The committee proposes a range of fees be included in the specifications. In addition, Padgett suggests that graduate students be allowed to contract for the service on an hourly basis for each semester rather than a daily or weekly fee. She added that many graduate students are paying very high rates for the service of untrained, unlicensed friends or neighbors.

Senator Brown commented that she was dubious about the feasibility of entering into a contract which established rates the providers could charge.

Senator Calhoun moved the adoption of a resolution supporting, in principle, the recommendations of the committee (Attachment B). The motion was seconded.

Senator Birrenkott, noting the analogy of parking cars and parking children, said he would like to see a needs study. Birrenkott offered a friendly amendment to the original resolution to support the "recommendations, not necessarily a center." The change was accepted.
Senator Mullins reported that the joint Clemson-Clemson University Committee was discussing this issue. He questioned whether they had reached the point of making a recommendation and stated that he would like their response before making a decision.

Senator Derr supported the concern with community response but added that many of the users would not necessarily be Clemson residents. They might bring their children to campus from any of the surrounding communities.

Senator Hedden moved to table the motion until information from other sources, such as the Clemson-Clemson University Committee, is available. The motion was seconded and passed 17-8. The proposal was referred back to the Welfare Committee.

V. ELECTIONS

President Dyck presented the ballot (Attachment C) and asked for further nominations from the floor. The motion was made, seconded, and passed to close the nominations for each position. President Dyck offered each candidate the opportunity to speak.

Senators Birrenkott and Reichenbach acknowledged their support for the opposition candidate.

Senator Hedden stated his belief that the next two years would prove to be both exciting and challenging. If the faculty does not initiate
change then the administration will. But the opportunity exists for faculty, particularly Faculty Senate, to be a vital participant in the process. Hedden spoke of his willingness to serve on the Senate in any capacity.

Senator Nowaczyk spoke briefly of his background, he has been at Clemson 10 years and has served on the Senate for 2 years. During this time he has developed a "healthy respect" for the work of the Senate. Nowaczyk pointed to the critical task of looking at the role of Faculty Senate, determining the future roles, and considering the perceptions of both administration and faculty. He noted the importance of promoting a sense of continuity and comfort in dealing with the administration, especially as many of the issues will be very sensitive.

The ballots were cast, counted, and President Dyck announced the election of Senator Reichenbach as secretary and Senator Nowaczyk as Vice-President/President Elect for 1987-1988.

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. Policy: Senator Linvill read the report (Attachment D). Senator Nowaczyk asked if any of the signatures on the course approval form signified approval. Linvill replied that they simply represent review.

B. Research: Senator Birrenkott said that there was no report, the Committee is awaiting the C.U.R.F. policies and procedures for discussion.
C. Scholastic Policy: Senator Nowaczyk presented the report (Attachment E).

D. Welfare Committee: Senator Calhoun gave the report (Attachment F).

E. Ad Hoc Committees

Governance Structure: Senator Mullins said they had the final meeting on March 9. The report is to be available at the next Senate meeting.

MacDonald Scholarship: No report.

Grievance procedures: See Item IX.A.

F. UNIVERSITY COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

Commission on Graduate Studies: Senator Hedden reported that no action was taken on any of the agenda items. The form used for filing an individual's graduate curriculum plan, GS2, will be retained. The issue of a requirement related to numbers of 600-800 level courses was not on the agenda. Hedden did comment that a student can take all of the courses they wish, the GS2 is a listing of courses required for the degree and the requirements refer only to courses listed on the GS2.

Commission on Undergraduate Studies: Senator Nowaczyk reported that the Commission is acting rapidly on several issues, one of these is in reference to withdrawal from the University or requesting a change of grade. Nowaczyk requested that Faculty Senate give the authority to the Committee to recommend, for the Senate, a time limitation on withdrawal from the University or requesting change of grades. At the present time no time limit is stated in the policy, requests have been received to make these changes
several years after the occurrence. Authority to recommend a time limit was granted by assent.

Nowaczyk reported that the President's Council had approved the Resolutions originating from Senate concerning the Admissions Exceptions Committee, the Appeals Committee, and review and approval of the admission grade point average for each College, with the amendments proposed by the Senate Advisory Committee.

President Dyck noted the importance of these changes. As a result of these changes the faculty is now assuming its responsibility for admissions and continuing enrollment.

Scholarship and Awards: Senator Calhoun reported that the committee has completed approval of the scholarship awards to entering students, according to the listing prepared.

Admissions and Continuing Enrollment: Senator LaTorre spoke of the importance of new members being oriented to their task, especially in view of the changes in responsibility. She suggested that Faculty Senators discuss this with new representatives of their College.

Parking and Traffic: Senator Tesolowski attended the meeting in place of Senator Derr. He reported that all recommendations have been tabled until July 1 or later. Vice-President Larson is developing a new committee to develop a comprehensive parking plan. A narrowly defeated motion at this meeting proposed that parking spaces in the Calhoun Court area be auctioned or raffled.
President Dyck recognized Robert Franklin, who represented the Student Senate. Student Senate passed two resolutions on March 9, 1987. One of these requests 3 members of Student Senate and 3 members of Faculty Senate meet to propose solutions to the parking problem. The second resolution proposes that there be no immediate change in parking but that everyone be assessed a $35 fee. This fee would be used to pay for a transportation system from peripheral lots. The appropriate resolution will be sent to President Dyck for action.

Senator Nowaczyk questioned why Vice-President Larson is forming a new committee rather than using Parking and Traffic. President Dyck observed that this was the first he has heard of this new committee.

Fine Arts: Senator Brannock said the Committee has recommended that the University pursue acquisition of the sculpture entitled "Tilted Arc."

Senator Mullins reported that the Vice-President Larson will investigate inviting the artist to come to Clemson and recommend a site for the sculpture.

VII. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Dyck commented on several items from the President's Report and Update Report (attachment G). The Ad Hoc committee related to the fields of study to be awarded MacDonald Scholarships (Item 1) is expected to report to the Senate during the August meeting.
Vice-President Larson is making progress with financial studies of sites proposed for the Continuing Education facility (Item 3). Decision on this matter is tabled until further information is available.

An Ad Hoc Committee will be appointed to develop a proposal and budget for the symposium (Item 4). Faculty Senate will sponsor this event within the University's Centennial Celebration. Senators should consider recommendations for speakers so this can be an outstanding event. Anderson HMO (Item 5) will know by April 15 if their bid to provide services is accepted. Faculty need to watch the time frame closely if they wish to join this HMO.

President Dyck has recommended to President Lennon that the debate related to Faculty Senate Resolution 82-2-1 (Item 7) be limited to groups directly involved.

Budget reductions (Item 9) have been University wide. Academic units have suffered less, proportionally, than have other units.

Particular attention was drawn to the end-of-the-Senate-Year Celebration (update Item 1). This will be held in Kresge Hall at Camp Hope.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS
A. Resolution on Parking: Senator Bryan moved the adoption of the Resolution (Attachment H). Seconded. Senator Bryan said it was important that we say at this point that faculty are opposed to a salary reduction for all employees.
Senator Kosinski commented that he was pleased with Dr. Clark's report. He moved to table this resolution until Senate, or its designee, develop a new plan. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Senator Birrenkott expressed concern that this resolution might be interpreted as an unwillingness to cooperate with the Student Senate. Bryan stated the resolution would strengthen the hand of the committee.

Senator Derr offered a friendly amendment to strike the word "minor" from the resolution. Bryan concurred, saying that the problem was not minor to someone trying to park but that in all of the University problems it was a minor problem. The resolution, FS 87-3-1, passed.

B. Senator Daniels reported that details on the selection process for teaching awards have been worked out. The number of possible awards is being investigated. Use of the budget is being clarified, the award would be non-taxable if service, such as a report, was provided. If the award was used as salary supplement it would be taxable and fringe benefits would also be deducted. Equipment purchased through the award and retained by the individual would also be viewed as income.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to study grievance procedures (Attachment I). Senator Linvill suggested that this report be widely shared. Input is needed by early April. In particular
Linvill noted the need to clarify "fair" and "unfair", the nature of "evidence", and whether violations of Academic Freedom be considered under procedure I or II.

Senator Mullins requested data on use of the grievance procedure. Senator Snelsire commented that the Counselors report about half of the people they see proceed to grievance procedures.

President Dyck noted that the process is essentially legalistic. There is no provision for attempting to resolve issues.

Senator Snelsire added that a large problem exists. If procedures are followed but are blatantly unfair or procedures are not followed but it is recognized that the person should not be tenured, the grievance procedure does not work.

B. Resolution on the Leathemian Bill (Attachment J). Senator Calhoun moved, for the Welfare Committee, adoption of this Resolution. The motion was seconded. The resolution, 87-3-2, passed.

C. Senator Calhoun, for the Welfare Committee, asked permission of Senator Morris not to introduce a resolution related to personnel cuts. Senator Morris withdrew his resolution but asked for further information on budget cuts. Morris also asked at what point and in what areas would "faculty be drawn into the debate?" President Dyck affirmed the need for this information.

D. OTHER

Senator Heusinkveld suggested that President Dyck be charged with appointing 3 Senators to work with the students on the parking problem.
Senator Mullins suggested that Dr. Clark be asked to draft a parking policy proposal. President Dyck suggested that Dr. Clark's comments be circulated in a SENATE SPECIAL. President Dyck was charged with appointing a committee to recommend a parking policy.

X. ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

MaryAnn B. Reichenbach
Acting Secretary

Senators absent: Jenny, Polk, Drews, Leap, Baron (Sparks attended), Huey, Woodard, Madison, Stillwell (Kosinski attended).
THE CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Child Care Committee

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PRESIDENT MAX LENNON

The Child Care Committee proposes that the University call for open bids from private, established child care operators to provide child care services sought by Clemson University faculty, staff and students. The advantages to the University of contracting with a private company include:

--- Eliminating charges of unfair competition since all interested parties will have an equal chance to bid;

--- Eliminating expense to the University;

--- Eliminating future expenditures to the State and University since Children's Center staff members will not be State employees.

--- Limiting the University's liability for the children's safety in transportation or on the premises.

Additionally, the Committee recommends bid specifications to be written to ensure that providers will adhere to the high standards that would be expected of a facility affiliated with Clemson University. The Committee proposes the following approaches, listed in order of preference:

Approach 1: That the University lease nonrestricted campus property on which the Children's Center would be built by the outside provider or lease an existing building to be renovated by the outside provider. This arrangement gives the University the greatest flexibility in having a Center designed to fit employee and student needs. Other advantages of this approach are that the Center would be built at no cost to the University, yet designed primarily with Clemson's needs in mind. Employees and students will be guaranteed priority in enrollment. The on-campus location would be convenient, facilitate greater direct involvement of the University community in the Center's operations, create greater opportunities for interaction with academic programs, and create easier access to the Nursing Center for first aid and other health needs. Such a partnership with the Nursing Center could lead to a contract to provide care for sick children in the Children's Center sick bay. A "sick bay" concept is a very unique service for parents who could leave children who are moderately ill with noncommunicable ailments for periods of time during the work day, yet be assured that their child will be under the care of a health professional.
FACT SHEET

Question: WHY SHOULD CLEMSON UNIVERSITY BE CONCERNED ABOUT CHILD CARE?

Answer: Clemson University has made a commitment to increase enrollments in its graduate programs.

1. In a national survey of today’s students, 43 percent are 25 or older.

2. Between 1970 and 1982, the number of women aged 25-29 enrolling in college went up 249 percent.

3. Between 1970 and 1982, the number of women aged 30-34 enrolling in college went up 314 percent.

4. Two out of three college students over the age of 34 are women.

Answer: Clemson University’s workforce is made up of men and women who have families and associated responsibilities.

1. One family in six is headed by a single, divorced or widowed woman.

2. Less than 33 percent of families have the traditional "father works, mother stays at home" situation.

3. Of mothers with children under 3, 45 percent have jobs.

4. Of mothers with children under 1, 50 percent have jobs.

Answer: Problems with child care are the most significant predictors of absenteeism and unproductive time at work.

In a national survey, 77 percent women and 73 percent men took time away from work to attend to child care responsibilities.

Answer: Child care is likely to be the fringe benefit of the 1990's because being sound for employees, it becomes good for business.
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Resolution in support of recommendations of the Committee on Child Care

WHEREAS, a child care center is a necessity for the children of many faculty, staff, and students;

WHEREAS, a committee appointed by President Lennon has, after extensive study, recommended the establishment of such a center;

RESOLVED: The Faculty Senate wishes to indicate to the administration its support the recommendations made by the Committee on Child Care for the establishment of a program provided that it can be shown that this center can be financially self-sufficient.
BALLOT
FACULTY SENATE

OFFICE: SECRETARY (1987-88)

NOMINEES:

GLENN BIRRENKOTT (COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE)

MARY ANN REICHENBACH (COLLEGE OF NURSING)

OFFICE: VICE-PRESIDENT/PRESIDENT ELECT (1987-88)

NOMINEES:

ROY HEDDEN (COLLEGE OF FORESTRY)

RON NOWACZYK (COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS)
The Policy Committee met on February 25. A draft of the position description for Vice-Provosts to be included in the Faculty Manual was discussed. This draft needed more work and was referred back to the subcommittee.

A discussion of the role of the "course approval form" brought out the intended role of these forms. Curriculum design is the proper role of faculty. Course approval forms are used to indicate routing and review of course material as it goes through the process. Signatures on these forms represent review of the proposed course and not approval. According to information received by the committee, these forms are now being revised to indicate review and not approval.

The issue of granting sabbatical leave to faculty who have not been in tenure track positions for the required time but have had the required amount of service to the University was discussed. It was felt by the Committee that granting of Sabbatical leave is an administrative decision in addition to being an earned privilege. Proposed Faculty Manual changes were discussed, however, no suggestions are brought forward at this time. Further discussion within the committee is needed.

An issue was brought to our attention from the Library. It appears that faculty may be evaluating fellow faculty members in areas other than promotion and tenure. This is not in accordance with procedures contained in the Faculty Manual. This issue needs further discussion and input from the administration.
REPORT OF THE SCHOLASTIC POLICY COMMITTEE
MARCH 10, 1987

The Scholastic Policy Committee met on February 24th. The first item of business dealt with a Student Senate Resolution asking that Clemson University discourage standardized multiple-choice testing. Mr. W. McGill, chair of the Student Senate committee on academic affairs, met with the committee to explain the resolution and answer questions. After some deliberation, the committee asked Mr. McGill to provide us with additional information.

A second item of business was an interim report by the subcommittee investigating the scheduling of common exams during finals week. Senator Bryan reported that the subcommittee had met with Mr. David Fleming and was planning a meeting with Mr. Phil Lyles.

The committee also provided feedback on possible forms for reporting a student's academic record for advising. The committee felt that a form listing the requirements a student has met and requirements still to be met would be helpful. The chair will forward that information to the appropriate subcommittee of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies.

Lastly, the topic of student advising was discussed. The committee felt that it should be an area of study for the next Faculty Senate year.

[Signature]
TO: Larry Dyck, President, Faculty Senate  
FROM: Richard J. Calhoun, Chairman, Welfare Committee  
RE: Meeting of March 3  
DATE: March 10, 1987

The Welfare Committee had its monthly meeting on March 3. We discussed the report and the recommendations of the Child Care Committee. A resolution will be offered under new business. We discussed next the support at USC and on the part of the administration here for the Leatherman Bill on optional retirement, in its revised form, as an aid to faculty recruitment. We have also a resolution to offer on this bill. We discussed the statistics on faculty salaries compiled by Harold Albert and the administration's response. We noted that any optimism in this response was based on 1985-6 comparison and decided to study 1986-7 information as soon as it is available. We recommend inviting Professor Albert to the Senate in April.
1. The University Administration has accepted both the recommendations and instructions associated with Faculty Senate Resolution 87-2-3, entitled, Resolution on MacDonald Scholarships. The resolution required the creation of an ad hoc committee to determine the field or fields of study that meet the spirit of the MacDonald bequest and that qualify to receive scholarships and/or fellowships for the next five years. The ad hoc committee is comprised of George Polk, chair, Glenn Birrenkott, Cecil Huey, Ron Nowaczyk, and George Haselton.

2. The Athletic Council met February 18. The ad hoc committee reviewing the Council's organization received and discussed many of the Faculty Senate's comments. A revised draft should be available for discussion at the April meeting of the Faculty Senate.

3. The Facilities Planning Committee met February 18. Hearings associated with the location of the Continuing Education and Conference Center were postponed until April. Prepare the appropriate faculty to participate in the discussion. In other business, the Planning Board subcommittee was charged with the review of the major renovation proposal for Johnstone.

4. The opportunity to participate in a symposium with the Board of Trustees appears feasible. Details are not fully developed, but are focused within the University's Centennial Celebration.

5. Good News! Our efforts to have Pickens county transferred from Health Service Area 2 to Health Service Area 1 have been successful. Thus, University employees may elect to change medical insurance plans and may now access a local HMO plan. Changes will be formalized during a "mini" enrollment, scheduled for May 1-31. Keep your colleagues informed of this benefit change.

6. The Deans are currently working on a revision of research priorities in an effort to incorporate many of the features of the Research Investment Act into the CHE's Initiatives for Excellence in Higher Education, entitled "The Cutting Edge." The Research Committee will be reviewing details of this plan and shall keep us informed.
7. The Faculty Senate’s Resolution 87-2-1, entitled, Review of Artistic and Creative Endeavors has been sent to President Lennon. Discussions have occurred within the Cabinet on the proper scope and character for the debate that now should occur. No decision has been reached.

8. The Faculty Senate’s Resolution 87-2-4, Resolution on the University’s Snow Plan, was forwarded to Vice-President Larson along with comments regarding the snow removal priorities. His office has noted the merits of the proposal and has indicated a willingness to incorporate the suggestions into the inclement weather plan now being prepared.

9. The budget reductions for FY 1986-87 have been revised again. However, this time the outlook is a bit more optimistic. Predictions of revenue shortfalls that imposed the 1.5% budgetary cut after the first of the year have been reevaluated. The latest evaluation decreases the cut to a 0.8% budget reduction. More importantly, it removes the necessity for an employee furlough plan.
1. The Faculty Senate will hold its Annual End-of-the-Senate-Year Celebration on April 7, 1987, following next month's Senate meeting. Invite your spouse or guest to come and meet "those people" who have made you "late for dinner" on so many Tuesdays. The evening of casual dining and gala festivity will be held at the Outdoor Lab (Camp Hope). More information will follow.

2. Dr. Gary Ransdell, Clemson University's new Vice-President for Institutional Advancement, is now on campus. Prior to arriving at Clemson Dr. Ransdell was Director of Alumni Relations and Executive Director of the Alumni Association at Southern Methodist University.

3. Dr. Glenn Birrenkott is to chair a "blue ribbon" ad hoc committee of the Faculty Senate. The committee is to review and update a 1979-80 Faculty Senate report, entitled, University Research and Research Funding. The committee is charged with obtaining broad faculty input in order to identify problem areas and to make recommendations that will assist the faculty and the University in improving their research productivity and competitive posture within the regional, national and international arena.
WHEREAS, there exists a problem of inadequate parking spaces on the University campus, and

WHEREAS, this problem is not severe enough to demand extreme solutions, and

WHEREAS, any fee charged to employees without a compensating pay raise reduces their disposable income, and

WHEREAS, imposition of parking fees for employees amounts to a pay reduction for faculty and staff, and

WHEREAS, the possibility of pay raises in the coming fiscal year to offset this pay reduction is slight, and

WHEREAS, there are easier, simpler ways to solve the University's problem by better enforcement of existing parking regulations including the impoundment of illegally parked vehicles and the increase of parking fines to levels consistent with nearby municipalities; THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate condemns any action to impose parking fees on employees of Clemson University without a specific, special pay raise to compensate for this fee imposition.
REPORT OF THE SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Academic freedom as mentioned under GP-I procedures is limited to cases of termination or dismissal. Academic freedom plays a significant role in the life of a mature university. Addition of academic freedom to a list of issues that includes questions of salary, promotion and tenure, etc. addressed by GP-I is more than appropriate.
The issue of how promotion, tenure, and reappointment files are processed should be taken up by either the Senate Policy Committee or the Commission on Faculty Affairs. A clarification and modification of the processing procedures can potentially reduce the number of grievance petitions.

The timeline for processing grievance petitions needs modification. The time between receipt of a grievance petition and the initial meeting of the GP-II Board should be shortened from thirty (30) to fifteen (15) calendar days. References to "calendar days" in the current procedure should be changed to "work days". Time for responses by the Provost and President should be increased from the current ten (10) to thirty (30) days. The Board's decision should be rendered within ten (10) working days after the final meeting at which statements are taken from witnesses, the petitioner or the respondents.

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

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

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

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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

The following paragraphs set forth both our findings and our suggestions for improvements to the grievance procedure in use at Clemson University.

Issue: Selection of Grievance Procedure II Board Members

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

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

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

Increasing the Board to seven (7) members will allow appointment of a chair whose major responsibilities will be coordination, record keeping, and seeing to the orderly and timely progression of petitions through the grievance process.
The changes we suggest - a January election, staggered terms, selection of an overall chair with coordination responsibilities - insure continuity between Boards by having experienced people always available for election. Members of the Senate will have had the opportunity to work together for several months prior to this election. In addition, it makes possible the election of outgoing Senators to the Grievance Board reducing pressure on active Senate members while taking advantage of experience and knowledge of faculty with Senate experience.

Issue: Training of Grievance Boards

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

We suggest that orientation sessions for new Grievance Board and Advisory committee members be conducted by experienced Board members, perhaps past Chairmen of Boards, together with the Grievance Counselors and the University Legal Counsel. Mock cases should be prepared to acquaint new members with fact finding procedures before they sit on their first hearing. These sessions will emphasize the role of participants and the orderly searching out of information necessary to decide a case.

The outgoing chairman of the Grievance Board will be responsible for orientation of new Grievance Board members. The President of the Faculty Senate will be responsible for orientation of new Advisory Committee members to their responsibilities in the grievance procedures.

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

Issue: Materials Required for Inclusion in a Grievance Procedure

II Petition

There have been instances in which grievance reviews were held and the issue was found to be not grievable. If additional information had been submitted in the grievance filing procedure, the right of further access to the grievance procedure could have been determined prior to holding these reviews.
We suggest that a policy sheet and petition outline be developed for use in GP-II cases. This document will amplify statements in the Faculty Manual. It will contain a list of information that must be included when a GP-II grievance is filed. It will also include a section listing types of information sought during reviews as a guide to the Petitioner. This policy sheet and petition outline can be developed by past grievance chairmen in conjunction with the Provost and University Legal Counsel.

Preparation of such materials will be very valuable to the Grievance Counselors and to the Advisory Committee. This material will be a major part of the training materials used with new Board members.

Issue: Determining the Definition of "Unfair"

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

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

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

Issue: Screening of Non-grievable GP-II Complaints

Section II:32 paragraph 2 clearly states that "normally not grievable (are) ... complaints arising out of ... judgments and discretionary powers by faculty and administrators." This would include "...recommendations concerning nonrenewal of contract and denial of promotion or tenure..." The section also includes a reference to "minor complaints" but does not specify the nature of such complaints.

Some vagueness in language is necessary when differentiating between grievable and non-grievable issues. We feel that within broad guidelines the Board should review grievances. This is the proper forum in which to air complaints against University procedures and the University's decision making process. Thus,
it appears to us that the Faculty Manual contains sufficient guidelines for screening of complaints to be heard under the GP-II procedure.

Issue: Apparent "Prima Facie" GP-I Cases

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

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

Issue: Treatment of Academic Freedom as a GP-I petition

Academic freedom as a grievable issue is mentioned under GP-I procedures. The issue, however, is limited to cases of termination or dismissal. In view of the significant role that academic freedom has played and continues to play in the life of a mature university, we suggest that addition of academic freedom to the list of issues addressed by GP-I is more than appropriate.

GP-I is distinguished from GP-II not by the type of relief sought or the specific act precipitating the grievance (denial of tenure or promotion, etc.) but rather by the underlying cause. There are two such causes in a GP-I; discrimination against a protected minority (age, nationality, religion, sex, etc.) and violation of academic freedom.

If both these causes are sufficiently grave to warrant a GP-I rather than a GP-II petition, then it seems logical that both causes should support a GP-I petition in cases of salary, tenure, promotion and work assignment as well as in cases of termination. Yet under the current wording of GP-I, protected minorities may file on the basis of any of these issues while academic freedom cases are not addressed unless termination is involved.

We recognize that there are more limitations on our flexibility with the GP-I than the GP-II. We suggest that the University request a ruling from legal counsel on the advisability of including academic freedom as an issue in cases other than termination.
Issue: Change in Review Process of Promotion and Tenure Decisions

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

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

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

We suggest that the issue of how promotion, tenure, and reappointment files are processed be taken up by either the Senate Policy Committee or the Commission on Faculty Affairs.

These bodies should consider procedures similar to those suggested by Professor R. F. Larson in a letter to this committee. Improvements in the way faculty personnel files are handled can potentially reduce the number of grievance petitions filed.

Issue: Timeline for Processing Grievance Petitions

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

We suggest that the time between receipt of a grievance petition and the initial meeting of the GP-II Board be shortened from thirty (30) to fifteen (15) calendar days. The initial meeting of the Board will be for the sole purpose of determining whether the matter is grievable. If the matter is determined grievable, a Hearing Board consisting of three (3) persons will be assigned and a time set to initiate the review. The review must commence no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the initial meeting.
We suggest that many of the references to "calendar days" in the current procedure be changed to "work days." Specific places in the Faculty Manual where this change will improve overall operation of the grievance process will need to be determined in conjunction with the Provost. This change will be minimal yet allow more time for preparation of necessary documents, Board meetings and formulation of decisions.

We also suggest that the time for responses by the Provost and President be increased from the current ten (10) to thirty (30) days. This will allow more time for review of especially lengthy documents compiled as part of the review process.

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

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

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

From information received by this committee, we conclude that GP-II reviews are best conducted prior to the GP-I hearing. Issues put forth in GP-I petitions are many times resolved through the less formal GP-II process. Thus, the added costs and delays inherent in GP-I hearings can be avoided. We note, however, that the legality of delaying the GP-I petition will need to be determined prior to implementing this change.

Issue: Appeals to the President

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

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

We suggest that guidelines be established for Presidential appeals. These guidelines must state who can initiate an appeal to the President - petitioner, respondent(s), Hearing Board member(s). They should include provisions for notifying all parties involved - petitioner, respondent(s) and Hearing Board. They should also include the form in which the President is to receive information, written and/or verbal, and from whom this information is to be received.

Issue: Confidentiality of Petitions

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

In our work, however, we have uncovered no instances in which Grievance Board members or Counselors have talked to anyone except other Board members or Counselors as the case may be. Up to this time and to the best of our knowledge, information about cases that has flown through the rumor mill did not originate with the Board or the Grievance Counselors.

We find no problems with members of the Board consulting with one another on procedures and issues. Counselors also must have this ability in order to assure that similar cases are handled similarly. It often takes consultation with a fellow Board member or Counselor to solidify ideas and support conclusions.

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

Issue: Counselors for Faculty and Administrators

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

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

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

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

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

Issue: Role of Lawyers, Counselors and Other Advisors

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

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

We recommend that each party to a grievance be permitted to have the assistance of counsel of their choice. This counsel may be an academic advisor, fellow faculty member, or legal counsel. The role of the counsel, however, will be solely advisory with no active access to floor discussion.

NOTE: We will be adding a section here denoting places in the Faculty Manual in need of clarification and or change.
RESOLUTION
(FS 87-3-2)

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate supports the Leatherman bill (Senate Bill 171) in its present form with the recommendation that the option be opened to more faculty as soon as it is feasible; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate recommends that the administration go on record as taking a public position seeking better retirement benefits for existing faculty at Clemson University.