MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
DECEMBER 12, 1989

1. Call_to_Order. President Halfacre called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

2. Special_Order_of_the_Day.

   a. President Halfacre introduced Professor Thomas W. Zimmerer, Assistant Director, Emerging Technologies Center. Professor Zimmerer presented Mr. William Chard, Director of the Emerging Technologies Center and Associate Vice President of Research. Mr. Chard is also an executive with Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio.

   Mr. Chard said the purpose of the alliance between Clemson and Battelle is to provide a broad technological resource in the Southeast and to assist in economic and technological development in South Carolina. Battelle will provide a conduit for Clemson University to establish and stimulate economic development through technology transfer. It is expected that the alliance also will provide opportunities for students to work at Battelle on projects for industry and government.

   Mr. Chard made a visual presentation of Battelle's wide range of projects. Product development by Battelle include xerography, glossy decals for T-shirts, exploded tips on paint brushes, correction fluid, a copper-core nickel-shell alloy for "sandwich" coins, and coatings for plastics which allow use in the human body.

   Mr. Chard responded to questions from the audience.

   How many Relationships does Battelle have with other universities?

   Mr. Chard: Battelle has worked with several universities on individual projects, including a project in veterinary medicine with North Carolina State University. This is the first time the corporation has had a full affiliation with a university.
Welfare Committee. Chairman Kennedy reported the Provost has approved an increase (from 2.7%) to 3% per hour for teaching in the summer. The implications are not totally clear as there is a "cap" of 30% for teaching and 33% for research during the summer.

Items being studied by the Committee include pregnancy leave for 9-month female faculty, faculty/staff dependent tuition reduction, problems related to the complexity of the State Blue Cross/Blue Shield forms, extending the TIAA window beyond entering faculty to include faculty of longer standing, and the future of the campus YMCA.

Senator Kennedy and Senator Luedeman will meet with the Athletic Director to discuss parking on the Rugby field for athletic events.

b. University Commissions and Committees

Senator Kosinski reported Dr. George Carter presented to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies a plan for an extended session of Chemistry 101. Four weeks into the session students having problems would be placed in a separate section for the remainder of the semester and the next semester to complete Chemistry 101. Four credits would be awarded for the two semesters. The plan is being investigated by a subcommittee.

Mr. Denny Smith presented to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies a proposal for the establishment of a center for Instructional Support Services for audio-visual equipment. The center would have a staff as well as a budget for equipment available to the departments. Part of the equipment might be provided by departments which voluntarily give items to the center in return for having the equipment maintained free of charge and provided to them as needed.


7. Old Business

a. Update on contributions to the fund for the Centennial Professorship. Vice President Dunn reported $57,719 in the fund. He requested that Senators continue their efforts in contacting colleagues on behalf of the fund.
b. Proposal on Rotation of Centennial Professorship. President Halfacre ruled the rotation of the Centennial Professorship can be considered as the report approved by the Faculty Senate on November 14, 1989, did not define rotation.

Senator McGuire moved acceptance of the Proposal, Award Schedule for Centennial Professorship included in the agenda (Attachment E). The motion was seconded.

Senator Murr spoke against grouping colleges. He urged the concept of simple rotation be retained, as "rotation" was not defined in the report previously approved by the Senate.

There followed discussion on issue of defining rotation and concerns related to discrimination against larger and smaller colleges. Concerns were also expressed regarding possible breach of contract with contributors whose gifts were made with the understanding the Professorship would be rotated among the colleges.

Senator Kennedy moved to amend the original motion to use the wording of "Proposal, Award Schedule for Centennial Professorship," included with the agenda, and Alternative 2 in "Groups for Centennial Professorship" (Attachment F) provided by Senator Eleanor Hare. Senator Gaddis seconded. The amendment carried.

Proposal for Award Schedule for Centennial Professorship as amended (FS89-12-1 P) (Attachment G) was approved.

c. Scientific Misconduct and Research Ethics Policy. Senator Graham moved acceptance of the Policy on Research Ethics (Attachment H), forwarded by the Research Committee and included with the agenda. Senator Graham said that in order for Clemson to submit research proposals to the National Institute of Health and Human Services, a policy must be in place as of January 1, 1990.

Senator Schalkoff, a member of the ad_hoc committee responsible for preparing a preliminary report on research ethics, said the policy before the Senate is basically the same as submitted by the ad_hoc committee and similar to policies on research ethics at other universities.
There followed discussion of the paragraph on Disposition calling for "termination of tenure and employment of the accused" Senator Luedeman pointed out the provision does not supercede a person's rights as a faculty member.

The Policy on Research Ethics (FS89-12-2 P) (Attachment H) was approved.

8. New Business

Resolution on Moving the Last Date for Students to Drop Courses Without Record. Senator Kosinski moved acceptance of the resolution from the Scholastic Policies Committee (Attachment I). He offered an amendment to correct a typographical error to read, "Resolved, That the Faculty Senate recommends that the administration move the first drop date to one day before the last day to add a class". There was a second to the amendment; the amendment carried. The amended Resolution on Moving the Last Date for Students to Drop Courses Without Record (FS89-12-3 P) (Attachment J) was approved unanimously.

9. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Kenneth R. Murr, Secretary

Margaret K. Cannon, Staff Secretary

Members absent: G. Christenbury (C. Thompson attended), R. Young, J. LeBlanc, J. Harris, J. Hammond, E. Coulter, E. Carney, T. Tisue, E. Pivorun, H. Pate, A. Steiner (E. Hare attended)
Scholastic Policies Committee  
Report of the December Meeting

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on November 28. The main items discussed were GS 800 (a course without a sponsoring department), changing the first drop date, admissions exceptions, and the suggestion that graduate courses ought to be taught when scheduled, regardless of enrollment.

Despite a negative response by Dr. Farrell Brown on our recommendation that GS 800 seek a sponsoring department, we again suggested that this be done in order to comply with the Faculty Manual. We have invited Dr. Brown to our January meeting.

Senator Steiner presented the attached resolution on moving the first drop date to one day before the last add date. This would allow students to add courses after spaces had been freed up by students who had dropped them. After some discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of this idea, we voted to propose Senator Steiner's resolution as a committee resolution to the full Senate.

The committee examined data furnished by the Admissions Office on the high school class rank and SAT scores of freshmen who entered in Fall of 1989, plus data on the students who failed to meet normal admissions standards and entered Clemson in Fall as "admissions exception" students. The rank and SAT data is attached. In Fall of 1989, there were 78 admissions exceptions. 78% of these were scholarship athletes, 13% had misleading class rankings because they came from small, competitive high schools, 6% were "political" admissions and 3% deserved scrutiny because they had a high class rank but came from a high school whose graduates have not done well at Clemson. Because of the overwhelming importance of the athletes in this group, we then discussed the policy that athletes who do not meet normal admissions standards are "reviewed" by the Admissions Exceptions Committee under NCAA eligibility standards (700 SAT score and high school GPR of 2.0 on a specified series of courses). The committee asked Senator Kosinski to determine the nature of this review, the powers of the Admissions Exceptions Committee to approve and disapprove athletes, and where the policy of using NCAA guidelines for scholarship athletes had orginated.

Finally, we decided not to recommend that graduate courses be taught when scheduled, regardless of enrollment.

Robert Kosinski  
Chairman
Comparison of Freshman Enrollment by Decile Rank and SAT Scores for 1988 and 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT Score Below</th>
<th>800</th>
<th>899</th>
<th>999</th>
<th>1099</th>
<th>1199</th>
<th>1299</th>
<th>1399</th>
<th>1499</th>
<th>1600</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Tenth</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Tenth</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Tenth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Tenth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Tenth</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Tenth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Tenth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Tenth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Tenth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom Tenth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Avail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT

December, 1989

The Faculty Senate Research Committee met at 10:30 am, December 1, 1989 in Room 104, McAdams Hall. Attendees were Ed Pivorun, Joe Hammond, Doyce Graham, Bill Stringer, Eldon Zehr and Roy Young. Visitors were John Luedeman and Gordon Halfacre.

The major activity of the meeting was the development of a Policy on Research Ethics. An urgency exists at this time to have a written policy since the National Institute of Health and Human Services will not receive research proposals from Clemson University after January 1, 1990 without its existence. Other government research sponsors are expected to follow soon the lead of this first agency. Beginning with the ad hoc committee Report to the Faculty Senate on Scientific Misconduct and Research Ethics, April, 1989, we drafted a Policy on Research Ethics. This policy will be submitted to the Faculty Senate's December meeting for vote.

Joe Hammond submitted a written report on the survey of colleges concerning allocation of indirect costs from sponsored research. Bill Stringer moved and Ed Pivorun seconded that the report be submitted to the December meeting of the Faculty Senate for information. The motion carried.

Ed Pivorun reported talking with his dean about allocation of CHE funds for graduate students. Consistent with Vice President Larson's remarks to the October Faculty Senate meeting, this dean said that the funds were included in his "block fund" according to the CHE formula, but he was unable to identify it separate from other allocations to the department levels. The specific identity of these funds becomes lost in block funding. Consequently, it's between the department heads and the dean to negotiate for specific identity of these funds apart from all other funds in the department's allocated budget.

Directories of addresses of Faculty Senates at other universities in the United States are being sought before an inquiry will be made concerning post doctoral classification at other institutions.

Due to limited time the continuation of discussion relative to procedures for awarding URGC and Provost Awards was deferred until the next meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for 2:00 pm, Friday, January 5, 1990 in Room 104, McAdams Hall.

Roy Young, Chair
The Research Committee has carried out a survey of the research incentive policies of the colleges at the University. A questionnaire with the following four questions was sent to each college:

1) What percentage of the indirect costs returned to the college is allocated to the department that generated the grant/contract?
2) Is the percent fixed or does it vary yearly?
3) Is there a cap on the amount of money returned to the department?
4) Do your departments have a uniform method for allocating indirect costs? If so, how was that method developed? If not, how is the decision made at the department level?

The results of this survey are given in the attached table.

The primary conclusion drawn from the results of the survey is that there is a considerable difference in how indirect costs are allocated in the several colleges. The difference, however, appears to result from differing budgetary procedures used by the colleges. Furthermore, the budgetary procedures are often unique to the colleges and appear to differ for sound reasons.

It would seem to be more prudent to pursue any needed modifications to indirect cost allocation procedures at the individual college level, rather than at the university level.
### RESULTS OF RESEARCH INCENTIVE POLICY SURVEY

*(table pertains to funds returned to the college)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% allocated to dept.</th>
<th>% of allocation fixed</th>
<th>cap on money returned to dept.</th>
<th>allocation by dept.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>uniform method/by faculty vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88%</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>nonuniform method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>nonuniform method/by dept. head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>nonuniform method/by faculty rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st $5000 to PI over $5000</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>uniform method/by dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 to PI</td>
<td>based on univ. indirect cost rate</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>nonuniform/by dept. head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*one college does not currently have returned indirect cost funds*
The Policy Committee met on November 28, 1989. The following items were discussed:

1. The Policy Committee of the Classified Staff Commission has asked for our input concerning classified staff representation on committees hiring and evaluating academic administrators (department heads and deans). The committee decided to delay our input until the Classified Staff Commission has formulated a written draft policy.

2. The Policy Committee discussed the possibility of input to the Research Committee concerning a policy on Scientific Misconduct and Research Ethics. The Committee decided to delay input until the Research Committee has approved a policy.

3. The Committee discussed and revised an evaluation procedure for academic deans. We will continue discussion of this proposed policy in January.

John Luedeman, Chair
SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT
DECEMBER 1989

1. Vice Provost Reel presented to the Academic Council on December 4 the implementation plans for the new Continuing Enrollment Policy for undergraduates. The proposal was approved by the Academic Council (Attachment A).

2. The Council of Academic Deans has requested that the Faculty Senate review the present Grievance Procedure. Specifically, the council would like the eligibility for serving to be examined. The council also suggests an administrator serve on the board.

3. The attached list of undergraduate and graduate courses has been approved by the respective curricular committees and recommended by the Council of Deans to the Provost (Attachment B).

4. The Academic Council approved the attached report from the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research (Attachment C).

5. The admissions report for December 1, 1989, is attached for your information (Attachment D).

6. Congratulations to each of the 17 nominees for the Class of '39 Faculty Award for Excellence. The Review Committee selected the following nominees: Professor Dixie Goswami, Professor Cecil O. Huey, Jr., Professor R. Lawrence Luforge, Professor Margit M. Sinka. The Faculty Senate will select the recipient this week.
IMPLEMENTATION PLANS
New Continuing Enrollment Policy For Undergraduates

In the spring of 1989 the University approved a new continuing enrollment policy for undergraduates. After considering the pros and cons on implementing the new policy for future students and possibly retaining the old policy for current students, the Undergraduate Commission recommends the following approach. Basically, new students enrolling at Clemson will be checked against the new policy and continuing students will be checked against a modified version of the new policy. We believe the plan is fair to the students and it can be administered successfully and with minimum confusion to students, faculty, and staff.

The new continuing enrollment policy (copy attached) will appear in the catalog for the first time in May 1990. The full policy will apply to new freshmen and new transfer undergraduate students who enroll after May 15, 1990, i.e., the first summer session 1990 and thereafter.

Beginning May 15, 1990, the new policy minus the December check will apply to all other undergraduate students until September 1, 1993. After this date, the full policy will apply to all undergraduate students.

A copy of the policy and implementation plans will be mailed to all students planning to enroll in the 1990 Spring Semester.

Comments on Implementation Plans for Currently Enrolled Students

1. Current students will have advance notice of three semesters before their academic performances will be evaluated under the new policy (minus the mid-year check).

2. Both the old and new policy have a "recent performance consideration" that can enable the student to stay in school even though his/her GRP is below the required performance table. The "recent performance consideration" is easier to achieve in the new policy.

3. The minimum grade-point requirements of the new policy are represented by points on a curve. The old policy had four steps. The requirements of the new policy are easier to achieve for the credit ranges 11-30, 51-67, and above 80. The requirements are more difficult to achieve in the credit ranges 31-50 and 68-80.

4. The appeal process under the new policy is more restrictive.
   a. Under the old policy an academically deficient student who made a series of successful appeals could continue to re-enroll in successive terms and avoid suspension. Under the new policy an academically deficient student can continue only once on the basis of a successful appeal. The next time the student is deficient, he/she is suspended one semester.
   b. Under the old policy a student who was dismissed (a second suspension) could appeal after being out of school one semester. Under the new policy a dismissed student must wait one year to appeal.
Continuing Enrollment Policy

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

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

A student on academic probation will be suspended or dismissed at the end of either fall semester or spring semester if his/her cumulative grade-point ratio is below the minimum cumulative grade point ratio (MCGPR). The minimum cumulative grade-point ratio is 2.00 for students with credit levels greater than or equal to 95 hours. For students with credit levels less than 95 hours, the MCGPR is given in the table below. CL in the table is the student's credit level, based on all credits taken at Clemson, plus any advanced standing received from transfer credits and
A student on probation who passes at least 12 semester credit hours and earns a 2.2 semester grade-point ratio on all hours attempted in the most recent semester (fall or spring) is permitted to continue enrollment on probation even though his/her cumulative grade-point ratio is below the required minimum grade point ratio, defined above.
A student's first failure to qualify for continued enrollment will subject him/her to suspension from the University for the next fall or spring semester. Notice of academic suspension will appear on the permanent record.

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

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

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

Signatures

Dr. Jerome V. Reel, Jr.  
Chair  
Commission on Undergraduate Studies  

Dr. David Maxwell  
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  

Dr. Max Lennon  
President
The following courses were approved at the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting on November 3, 1989.

A. College of Agricultural Sciences

   a. RS/SOC 401 Human Ecology 3(3,0)

2. Change in prerequisite.
   a. RS/SOC 471 Demography 3(3,0)

B. College of Architecture

1. Change prefix of all courses listed under Planning Studies from CAPL to CRP.

2. Change prefix of all courses listed under Visual Arts previously CAVA to ART and previously CAAH to AAH.

3. Change prefix of all courses listed under Building Science from CABS to BLDSC.

4. Change prefix of all courses listed under Landscape Architecture from CALA to LARCH.

5. New Course.
   a. AAH 301 Research Methodology 3(3,0)
   b. AAH 392 British Studies Abroad 1-6(1,0)
   c. CABS 455 Team Approach 3(3,0)

6. Change of title and credit.
   a. CALA 351 Land. Arch. Design I 6(1,10)
   b. CALA 352 Land. Arch. Design II 6(1,10)
   c. CALA 452 Land. Arch. Design IV 6(1,10)

7. Change of title and credit hour distribution.
   a. CALA 451 Land. Arch. Design III 6(1,10)

   a. CAPL 472 Plan Process/Adm 3(3,0)
   a. CABS 351 Const Mgt I 3(0,9)
   b. CABS 303 Soils and Fnds 3(2,3)
   c. CABS 401 Formwork and Placing Concrete 3(3,0)

C. College of Commerce and Industry
   1. Footnote change in Announcements.
      Accounting curriculum

D. College of Education
   1. Change in description.
      a. ED 302 Educational Psychology 3(3,0)
      b. ED 334 Child Growth & Development 3(3,0)
      c. ED 335 Adol Growth & Development 3(3,0)

   2. Curriculum change.
      English majors

E. College of Engineering
   1. Change of prerequisite.
      a. IE 473 Micro Appl in IE 3(2,3)
      b. IE 474 Adv Mfg Sys 3(2,3)
      c. IE 481 Methods of OR II 3(3,0)
      d. IE 482 Systems Modeling 3(3,0)
      e. IE 486 Prod Plan and Cntl 3(3,0)

F. College of Liberal Arts
   1. New course.
      a. FR 308 Cont FR Cul and Civil 3(3,0)
      b. JAPN 305 Japanese Conv. & Comp. 3(3,0)
      c. Phil 323 Theory of Knowledge 3(3,0)
      d. PoSc 103 Intro to Govt 3(3,0)
      e. PoSc 105 Intro to Intl Pol 3(3,0)
      f. SPAN 403 Span Amer Wom Writers 3(3,0)
      g. SPAN 412 Trans Theor and Tech 3(3,0)
      h. SPCH 248 Interpersonal Comm 3(3,0)
      i. SPCH 330 Nonverbal Comm 3(3,0)
      j. SPCH 455 Gender Communication 3(3,0)
GRADUATE CURRICULA
November 10, 1989

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE

Change of description:
CAPL 672 Planning Process & Administration, 3 cr(3,0)

COLLEGE OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

Non-Thesis Option for Master of Arts Program in Economics

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

New courses:
IE 691 Selected Topics in IE, 1-3 cr(0,0)
IE 692 Design Topics in IE, 1-3 cr(0,0)

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

New program:
Joint Master's Degree Program in Public Administration (Approved by Graduate Curriculum Committee 10/13/89)

New courses:
POSC 821 Perspectives on Public Administration, 3 cr(3,0)
POSC 822 Public Policy Process, 3 cr(3,0)
POSC 827 Public Personnel Administration, 3 cr(3,0)
POSC 829 Public Financial Management, 3 cr(3,0)
POSC 834 Administrative Law, 3 cr(3,0)
SOC 805 Evaluation Research, 3 cr(3,0)
SOC 810 Theoretical Models, 3 cr(3,0)
SOC 812 Seminar on Marriage & Family, 3 cr(3,0)
SOC 814 Policy & Social Action, 3 cr(3,0)
SOC 830 Human Systems Development, 3 cr(3,0)
SOC 833 Work & Society, 3 cr(3,0)
SOC 835 Work, Leisure & Family, 3 cr(3,0)
SOC 891 Master's Research, credit TBA
SOC 895 Field Experience, 12 cr(0,0)
SOC 899 Special Projects, 1-3 cr(0,0)

COLLEGE OF SCIENCES

New course:
CH 809 Chemical Applications of X-ray Crystallography, 3 cr(2,2)
2. Change of title, description, prerequisite.
   a. PoSc 361 Intl Pol in Crisis
      3(3,0)

3. Change in description.
   a. FR 307 French Civilization
      3(3,0)

4. Change in description and prerequisite.
   a. SPCH 361 Arg and Debate
      3(3,0)
   b. SPCH 364 Org Communication
      3(3,0)

6. Change in Announcements.
   a. Political Science major,
      Page 139, Paragraph 3
   b. Language and International Trade
      Page 137 French
   c. Humanities
      Page 135, Theatre

7. Change in prerequisite.
   a. PoSc 371 Comparative European Politics
      3(3,0)
   b. PoSc 373 Third World Politics
      3(3,0)
   c. PoSc 457 Political Terrorism
      3(3,0)
   d. PoSc 462 Peace & Order in Intl Rel
      3(3,0)
   e. PoSc 463 US Foreign Policy
      3(3,0)
   f. PoSc 465 Foreign Policies of the
      Major Powers
      3(3,0)
   g. PoSc 471 Politics of the Soviet Union
      3(3,0)
   h. PoSc 472 Japan and East Asia; Politics
      Government, & Foreign Policy
      3(3,0)
   i. PoSc 475 Political Systems of Latin
      America
      3(3,0)
   j. PoSc 476 Politics of the Middle East
      3(3,0)
   k. PoSc 482 Political Novel and the
      Cinema
      3(3,1)
   l. PoSc 351 Classical Political Thought
      3(3,0)
   m. PoSc 352 Modern Political Thought
      3(3,0)

G. College of Sciences

1. New course.
   a. CH 105 Beg Gen Org Chem
      4(3,3)
   b. CH 106 Beg Gen Org Chem
      4(3,3)

2. Curriculum change.
   a. Physical Therapy
Academic Renewal

The student who was dismissed from the Graduate School for a grade point deficiency and who has not enrolled for a period of four or more academic years may apply to the Graduate School for readmission under special conditions known as academic renewal. Under these conditions, the previous graduate credits attempted and quality point deficit will not constitute a liability in a new grade point computation. However, no credits passed or their attending quality points will be available to the student for a degree at Clemson and any courses previously passed may not be revalidated by special exam. The previous record will appear on the permanent record as well as the notation of readmission under the policy of academic renewal.

REVISED POLICY

From pages 63 - 64 of Current Graduate School Announcements

Comprehensive Examinations Before Admission to Candidacy

Prior to undertaking the comprehensive examination before admission to candidacy, the doctoral student must have selected an advisory committee and filed an approved graduate degree curriculum (Form GS2) with the Graduate School.

Satisfactory completion of the comprehensive examination must occur no less than six months and no more than five years prior to the date of graduation. It is attempted only at the recommendation of the student’s advisory committee after completion of most of the required course work. The function of the examination, which will be written or a combination of written and oral, is to obtain objective evidence of an adequate intellectual mastery of the areas of the major and minor specializations.

The chairperson of the advisory committee will inform the Graduate School of the result, via Form GSS, within three weeks following the examination. The student’s performance on this examination will determine whether he or she will be recommended for admission to candidacy for the degree.

Should the student fail to pass the comprehensive examination, he or she may be given a second opportunity if so recommended by the advisory committee. A second failure shall result in the student being declared ineligible to receive the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Clemson University.

Some doctoral programs require preliminary or qualifying examinations prior to the comprehensive examination. Information about these examinations may be obtained from the individual departments.

This examination must be administered by the Clemson University program faculty offering the degree. The examining committee may be the student's advisory committee or a standing committee appointed in accordance with published program policies.
The Advisory Committee

An advisory committee will approve the student's graduate degree curriculum, supervise the graduate program, administer the final doctoral oral examination, and initiate the recommendation for the awarding of the degree. Additionally, the advisory committee may administer qualifying or preliminary and/or final comprehensive examinations. One member of the committee will be designated as chairperson or major advisor and normally will direct the student's dissertation or thesis, if required. This committee is selected by the student and approved by the department head or program coordinator. Concurrently with submission of the graduate degree curriculum, the department head or program coordinator will forward recommendations to the dean of the college, who will, if he or she approves, then transmit the recommendations to the graduate dean.

A minimum of three faculty members shall be selected for a student seeking a master's or specialist's degree, and a minimum of four faculty members shall be selected for a student seeking a doctoral degree. Only Clemson University faculty who hold full-time faculty positions which carry eligibility for tenure can serve as major advisors or comprise the minimum membership of the committee. Part-time, visiting, and adjunct faculty may serve as additional members of the committee and as research advisors. The student and committee members are notified of the appointments by the graduate dean.

At least one-half of the graduate advisory committee shall be comprised of faculty from the program (i.e., major) in which the student is enrolled. Committee members of interdepartmental programs shall be appointed according to by-laws, formulated by the program faculty and approved by the Graduate School, that assure appropriate representation of the participating departments.

A minimum of three faculty members shall be selected for a student seeking a master's or specialist's degree and a minimum of four faculty members shall be selected for a student seeking a doctoral degree. The majority of the advisory committee, including the major advisor, must be comprised of Clemson University faculty from the department offering the particular degree and who hold full-time positions carrying eligibility for tenure. Committee members of interdepartmental programs shall be appointed according to by-laws, formulated by the program faculty and endorsed by the Graduate School, that assure appropriate representation of the participating departments.

Part-time and visiting faculty employed by Clemson University may serve on committee. Persons not employed by the University may serve, if they have been appointed to an adjunct faculty status. Part-time, visiting, and adjunct faculty may serve as research advisors and will have full voting status on the outcomes of all examinations given by the committee. Inclusion of part-time, visiting, and adjunct faculty must not compromise the majority requirement defined above.

The student and committee members are notified of the appointments by the graduate dean.
## Freshmen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I/S</th>
<th>O/S</th>
<th>(Total)</th>
<th>I/S</th>
<th>O/S</th>
<th>(Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1990</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1989</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>2157</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>3307</td>
<td>3430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted (Active)</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits Paid</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Freshmen Acceptances by College (Active)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commerce &amp; Industry</strong></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering</strong></td>
<td>228</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forest &amp; Rec. Resources</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberal Arts</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nursing</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sciences</strong></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undeclared</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transfers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I/S</th>
<th>O/S</th>
<th>(Total)</th>
<th>I/S</th>
<th>O/S</th>
<th>(Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1990</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1989</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted (Active)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits Paid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATUS OF FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

FS89-9-2 P RESOLUTION ON COMPENSATION BEGINNING DATE
The Faculty Senate requested that the University pay the salary adjustment monies to unclassified faculty effective July 1, 1989, for 12-month faculty and August 15, 1989, for 9-month faculty; and that in the future the University pay salary increases to unclassified faculty effective July 1 for 12-month faculty and August 15 for 9-month faculty. The Provost approved making faculty salary increases effective July 1 for 12-month faculty and August 15 for 9-month faculty in instances in which doing so is permitted by applicable State laws, rulings, and regulations.

FSFS89-10-1B P RESOLUTION ON PAY RAISES FOR CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES
The Faculty Senate encourages the South Carolina legislature to divide pay raises to the classified employees of Clemson University equally between cost of living and merit. The Provost has requested the reaction of the Classified Staff Committee.

FS89-10-2 P RESOLUTION ON PARKING FOR ATHLETIC EVENTS
The Faculty Senate requested that the Athletic Department conform to the Faculty Manual and secure approval of the University Traffic and Parking Committee before making any changes in parking for athletic events and that the Department restore public parking on the Rugby practice field for football games. Vice President Lewis has suggested that the Chair of the Policy and Welfare Committees meet with athletic Director Robinson.
RESOLUTION ON THE EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

The Faculty Senate requests that each Department Head be evaluated by the Dean beginning with fifth year of his or her administrative service and continuing every third year thereafter. The Dean shall solicit the opinions of all permanent faculty and a representative of classified employees regarding areas of concern. The Dean shall summarize these views in reports to the Department Head and the Provost. New Department Heads should receive an informal evaluation within the first two years of service. The Provost has requested the reaction of the Organization of Academic Department Heads.

December 5, 1989
DONORS TO THE FUND FOR THE CENTENNIAL PROFESSORSHIP

(As of November 14, 1989)

ACCOUNTING
Vincent Guide
Jerry E. Trapnell

AEROSPACE STUDIES

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS & RURAL SOCIOLOGY
Kandice Kahl Barton
Larry Baue'r
Buddy L. Dillman
J. Edwin Faris
Michael Hammig
Harold Harris, Jr.
Max I. Loyd
C. Parr Rosson III
Daniel Smith
Stassen Thompson
W. A. Tinsley

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
Lloyd Blanton
Dr. & Mrs. J. Alex Hash

AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
Thomas H. Gardner
Richard Hegg
Clarence Hood
Dale Linvill
Richard K. White
Roy E. Young
Professor & Mrs. Francis Wolak

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE
Jay W. Chapin
Elwyn E. Deal
Albert W. Johnson
AGRONOMY & SOILS
W. D. Graham, Jr.
Bill R. Smith
William Stringer

ANIMAL SCIENCE

AQUACULTURE, FISHERIES & WILDLIFE
Arnold Eversole

ARCHITECTURAL STUDIES
Martin Davis
Robert Hogan
Peter R. Lee

BIOENGINEERING
Robert A. LaTour

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE
C. Ron Dillon
Larry Dyck
David Heckel

BIOLOGY
Robert Kosinski
C. Kenyon Revis-Wagner

BUILDING SCIENCES
Roger Liska
Greg Corley

CERAMIC ENGINEERING
Gordon Lewis
Gilbert Robinson

CHEMICAL ENGINEERING
Charles Barron
John N. Beard, Jr.
Danny Edie
Charles Gooding
Stephen Weisheimer
Joe Mullins
Amod Ogale
George Pullen
Richard Rice
Mark C. Thies

CHEMISTRY
John W. Huffman
G. B. Savitsky
Garth Spencer
Farrell Brown

CIVIL ENGINEERING
Subhash Anand
William Baron
Rudolf Elling
Paul B. Zielinski

COMPUTER SCIENCE
A. J. Turner

DAIRY SCIENCE
Joseph F. Dickey

EARTH SCIENCES
Villard Griffin, Jr. (Geology)
John R. Wagner (Geology)
David S. Snipes

ECONOMICS
Ralph Elliott
Clark Nardinelli
Russell Shannon
Holley Ulbrich

ELECTRICAL & COMPUTER ENGINEERING
David Dumin
Joe Hammond
John W. Silvestro

ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION
Robert Hefley
Ralph K. Peden
Ed Olive

ENGLISH
Richard Calhoun
Louis Henry
John Idol, Jr.
Roger Rollin
Mark S. Steadman
Malcolm Usrey
Arthur P. Young
LaVerne Christoph
G. W. Koon

ENTOMOLOGY
Paul M. Horton
John B. Kissam
John C. Morse

ENVIRONMENTAL SYSTEMS ENGINEERING
Alan W. Elzerman
Kevin L. Farley
Robert Fjeld
C. P. Grady, Jr.
T. M. Keinath
Thomas & Lynda Overcamp

EXPERIMENTAL STATISTICS
Wilbert Byrd

FINANCE
Richard Klein

FOOD SCIENCE

FORESTRY
Robert M. Allen
Bingham Cool
Allen Dunn
H. Davis McGregor
Ansel E. Miller
Michael A. Taras
Thomas J. Straka

HISTORY
J. L. Arbena
Donald McKale
Edwin E. Moise

HONORS PROGRAM
John L. Stevenson
HORTICULTURE
Gordon Halfacre
Mary Haque
Mary Holbrooks
G. Ansel King, Jr.
Robert Lineberger
Judith D. Caldwell
Jon R. Johnson
Landon Miller
Billy Rhodes
Gregory Reighard

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION
Henry Pate, Jr.
Dennis Tesolowski
J. Page Crouch

INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING
James A. Chisman
Joel Greenstein
Carl Lindenmeyer
W. J. Kennedy

LANGUAGES
Edwin P. Arnold
York Brannock, Jr.
Joan Bridgwood
Rob Roy McGregor
JoAnn McNatt

LIBRARY
Doris S. Calhoun
Maureen Harris
Beth Helsel
Marian H. Withington
S. D. Johnson

MANAGEMENT
John K. Butler
John Davis
William Hendrix
J. J. Kanet
Lawrence LaForge
Thomas G. Christoph
MARKETING
  Peter Hermann
  Gerald Waddle

MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES
  John Luedeman
  Joel E. Brawley

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
  Amit Bagchi
  Donald Beasley
  Leo Gaddis
  James G. Goree
  Frank W. Paul
  Tah-Teh Yang
  Cecil O. Huey, Jr.
  James Jara-Almonte
  Charles K. Roby

MICROBIOLOGY
  John Lawson

MILITARY SCIENCE

NURSING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
  Elizabeth Baines
  Robbie Hughes
  Mary Ann Kelley
  Jeri Milstead
  Madelynn Oglesby
  Mary Ann Reichenbach
  Gloria Tanner

PARKS, RECREATION & TOURISM MANAGEMENT
  G. Wesley Burnett
  Richard Conover, Jr.
  Ann James
  Dr. & Mrs. Robert M. McLellan
  Brian J. Mihalik
  Muzaffer Uysal
  Charlie White

PERFORMING ARTS
PHILOSOPHY & RELIGION
Charles Lippy

PHYSICS & ASTRONOMY
William Gettys
Joseph Manson
Peter McNulty
Donald P. Miller
E. P. Stillwell
Carlton Ulbrich
Henry Vogel
Donald D. Clayton
Alston Steiner

PLANNING STUDIES (Architecture)
James B. London
Barry Nocks

PLANT PATHOLOGY & PHYSIOLOGY
O. J. Dickerson
Graydon Kingsland
Eldon Zehr

POLITICAL SCIENCE
Harold Albert
Edwin Coulter

POULTRY SCIENCE
Glenn & Marian Birrenkott
Ronald J. Thurston

PSYCHOLOGY
Eugene Galluscio
Barry Goettl
Ron Nowaczyk
David J. Senn
Fred Switzer

SOCIOLOGY
Ronald Knapp
Richard Larson
John Ryan
Donald Sturkie
TEXTILE MANAGEMENT & TEXTILE SCIENCE
B. C. Goswami

VISUAL ARTS & HISTORY
John T. Acorn
Robert Hunter
Janet LeBlanc
James A. Stockham
Evelyn C. Voelker
Samuel Wang

ADDITIONAL DONORS TO CENTENNIAL PROFESSORSHIP

ADMINISTRATION
Vice President Hugh Clausen
President Max Lennon
Vice President Nick Lomax
Provost David Maxwell
Vice President Gary Ransdell
Vice Provost Jerome J. Reel, Jr.
Vice President Almeda Rogers-Jacks
Vice President B. J. Skelton
Vice President Milton Wise
Benjamin W. Anderson, University Legal Counsel
Dean Ryan Amacher
Dean Jim Barker
Dean Wayne Bennett
Dean Benton Box
Director Joseph F. Boykin
Dean Jim Daniels
Dean Opal Hipps
Dean Charles Jennett
Dean Arnold Schwartz
Dean Robert Waller
Dean Bobby G. Wixson

OTHER
Dr. Hugh Brown (Emeriti Faculty)
Richard Brown (Agricultural Chemical Services)
Margaret Cannon (Faculty Senate office)
William Coffeen (Emeriti Faculty)
Dr. Morris Cox (Emeriti Faculty)
Martha Duckenfield
Dr. Arthur J. Fear (Emeriti Faculty)
Horace Fleming (Strom Thurmond Institute)
Dr. Alfred T. Hind (Emeriti Faculty)
Louise B. Huey
Laurin McArthur, Jr. (Memorial Gift)
Jack McKenzie (News Service)
Michael Kasha
Michael Kohl (Special Collections)
Gustave Metz (retired registrar)
Marvin Owings (Emeriti Faculty)
Dr. Linvil G. Rich (Emeriti Faculty)
Mrs. Carlton W. Roberts
Calvin L. Schoulties (Regulatory & Public Service Programs)
Dr. & Mrs. Merle Shepard
Frederic Simon (Emeriti Faculty)
Dr. James M. Stepp (Emeriti Faculty)
Dr. & Mrs. W. D. Trevillian (Dr. Trevillian Emeriti Faculty)
David Weatherford (4-H Department)
Milner B. Wilson, Jr. (Emeriti Faculty)
The Clemson University Board of Trustees
Clemson Extension Service
Marvin A. Owings (Emeriti Faculty)
Two schools of thought have surfaced for scheduling awarding of the Centennial Professorship. The currently adopted procedure calls for awarding the Professorship every two years to a different college on a rotating basis which assures that a winning college is ineligible until a complete cycle of colleges has occurred. On the other hand, Senator Gaddis proposes that all colleges be eligible every time that the Professorship is awarded.

The former procedure assures that all colleges receive the award within an 18-year cycle. It is highly conceivable, however, that, particularly in the latter part of a cycle, the truly highest "excellence in scholarship and professional achievement" can be untimely overlooked in preference for completing a full cycle. In the second proposal, it is highly conceivable that smaller colleges will have a lower probability of success because of size of faculty. Perhaps an alternative scheduling is needed. Presently, several faculty express a resistance to contributing to the fund because they view their college's probability for eligibility to be only once in an 18-year interval.

Alternative

Designate three groups of colleges, each based on the relative equality of faculty size of competing colleges within a given group. The three groups represent small, intermediate and large faculties, respectively. Schedule the Professorship to be awarded every other year on a rotating cycle among the three designated college groups. Any faculty member within a college group is eligible for nomination when that group becomes eligible in the rotation cycle. All three groups are eligible during the first awarding of a given cycle, only the two remaining groups in the second awarding, and only the one remaining group in the third awarding. This rotation assures eligibility of all colleges more frequently without increasing the probability of larger colleges dominating the selection process.

Proposed Grouping:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th>Group III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture - 59</td>
<td>Engineering - 150</td>
<td>Liberal Arts - 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry - 55</td>
<td>Commerce/Ind - 140</td>
<td>Sciences - 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing - 40</td>
<td>Education - 88</td>
<td>Agriculture - 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library - 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Groups for Centennial Professorship

In discussion with faculty the following proposal has been strongly supported:

**Alternative 1:** No two consecutive Centennial Professorships may not be chosen from the same college. In addition, a member of the selection committee should promote the nomination of representatives of his college, but should be prohibited from voting for any member of his college.

If it is desirable that the professorship rotate among groups, the following alternatives are proposed as possibilities:

**Alternative 2:**
- Group I (388): Architecture (59), Forestry (55), Nursing (40), Library (27), Liberal Arts (207)
- Group II (378): Engineering (150), Commerce/Ind. (140), Education (88)
- Group III (397): Sciences (204), Agriculture (193)

**Alternative 3:**
- Group I (295): Liberal Arts (207), Education (88)
- Group II (290): Sciences (204), Architecture (59), Library (27)
- Group III (288): Agriculture (193), Forestry (55), Nursing (40)
- Group IV (290): Engineering (150), Commerce/Ind. (140)

**Alternative 4:**
- Group I (244): Nursing (40), Sciences (204)
- Group II (193): Liberal Arts (207), Library (27)
- Group III (248): Agriculture (193), Forestry (55)
- Group IV (209): Engineering (150), Architecture (59)
- Group V (228): Education (88), Commerce/Ind. (140)
PROPOSAL

AWARD SCHEDULE FOR
CENTENNIAL PROFESSORSHIP
FS89-12-1 P

Rationale

Two schools of thought have surfaced for scheduling awarding of the Centennial Professorship. The currently adopted procedure calls for awarding the Professorship every two years to a different college on a rotating basis which assures that a winning college is ineligible until a complete cycle of colleges has occurred. On the other hand, Senator Gaddis proposes that all colleges be eligible every time that the Professorship is awarded.

The former procedure assures that all colleges receive the award within an 18-year cycle. It is highly conceivable, however, that, particularly in the latter part of a cycle, the truly highest "excellence in scholarship and professional achievement" can be untimely overlooked in preference for completing a full cycle. In the second proposal, it is highly conceivable that smaller colleges will have a lower probability of success because of size of faculty. Perhaps an alternative scheduling is needed. Presently, several faculty express a resistance to contributing to the fund because they view their college's probability for eligibility to be only once in an 18-year interval.

Alternative

Designate three groups of colleges, based on relative equality of total faculty size in each group. Schedule the Professorship to be awarded every other year on a rotating cycle among the three designated college groups. Any faculty member within a college group is eligible for nomination when that group becomes eligible in the rotation cycle. All three groups are eligible during the first awarding of a given cycle, only the two remaining groups in the second awarding, and only the one remaining group in the third awarding. This rotation assures eligibility of all colleges more frequently without increasing the probability of larger colleges dominating the selection process.

Proposed Grouping:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th>Group III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Commerce/Ind</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 59            | 150         | 204         |
| 55            | 140         | 193         |
| 40            | 88          |             |
| 27            |             |             |
| 207           |             |             |
| 388           | 378         | 397         |
POLICY on RESEARCH ETHICS

December 1989
FS89-12-2 P

I. PREAMBLE

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

II. DEFINITIONS

Research:

Research is used in a general sense (as opposed to scientific research) to yield a policy applicable to all academic disciplines in the university.

Misconduct:

The serious deviation from accepted practices in conducting research activities.

The substantial failure to comply with university, regulatory and funding agencies' requirements affecting specific aspects of the conduct of research.

This definition includes:

Falsification of data -- ranging from fabrication to deceptively selective reporting, including the purposeful omission of conflicting data with intent to falsify results;

Plagiarism -- representation of another's work as one's own;

Misappropriation of others' ideas -- the unauthorized use of privileged information (such as violation of confidentiality in peer review), however obtained.

Inquiry:

Expeditious gathering and review of faculty information to determine if an investigation is warranted.
The Committee of Investigation, meeting in closed sessions, will review all materials, question relevant parties and allow for all parties to present their views.

The Committee of Investigation will forward a written recommendation for disposition within 90 days through the Vice President for Research to the Provost.

The Provost will review the report and render a decision within 15 days.

Any party involved may submit a written appeal of the Provost's decision to the President within 7 days after receiving the Provost's decision.

Guiding Principles

Maximize confidentiality and protect the reputations for both the accused and accuser during the full process.

Assure the respondent a fair hearing.

Minimize the number of individuals involved in the inquiry and investigation phases.

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

Consultation of university legal counsel is probably necessary.

Appropriate funding agencies should be fully informed in writing at both the outset and conclusion of an investigation. If possible criminal violations are indicated, all agencies will be notified within 24 hours.

All detailed documentation of the Committees of Inquiry and Investigation shall be maintained for at least three (3) years and must, upon request, be provided to authorized personnel.

Appropriate interim administrative actions will be taken at the outset to protect supporting funds and to insure that the purposes of the project are being met.
RESOLUTION ON MOVING THE LAST DATE FOR STUDENTS TO DROP COURSES WITHOUT RECORD

FS89-12-3

Whereas, Many students sign up for courses which they intend to drop;

Whereas, These students take increasingly valuable class space away from students who need to complete their curricula; and

Whereas, Most students drop their unwanted courses far after the last day to add a class, rendering the class space they vacate unavailable to other students;

Resolved, That the Faculty Recommend recommends that the Administration move the first drop date to one day before the last day to add a class.
RESOLUTION ON MOVING THE LAST DATE FOR STUDENTS TO DROP COURSES WITHOUT RECORD

FS89-12-3 P

Whereas, Many students sign up for courses which they intend to drop;

Whereas, These students take increasingly valuable class space away from students who need to complete their curricula; and

Whereas, Most students drop their unwanted courses far after the last day to add a class, rendering the class space they vacate unavailable to other students;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate recommends that the Administration move the first drop date to one day before the last day to add a class.