MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
August 19, 1986

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

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes of the July 8, 1986 meeting were approved as corrected.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. Research: There was no report.
B. Scholastic Policy: Senator Nowaczyk read the report (Attachment A.) He further indicated that the Committee will continue to look at academic exceptions, including the status of the committee which was formed last year to review exceptions.
C. Welfare: Senator Calhoun gave the Committee's report (Attachment B.) He then commented on the Committee's meeting about asbestos held on August 18. Some of the information gained from that meeting follows. Replacement and maintenance may be more dangerous than day-to-day contact. The Physical Plant has received some training on how to deal with the problem. Students have received
warnings about bunk beds close to the ceiling. There is some money available for implementation of the abatement plan. The university has asbestos readings and information beyond that which appeared in the Newsletter. An important first step to be accomplished is air pollution studies, but no one is clear as to who would perform them. A liaison committee has been formed to field questions and oversee abatement procedure. Senator Calhoun asked that faculty give him their comments and concerns. A general discussion followed.

Senator Polk said that architectural literature indicates that asbestos may not be as innocuous as Senator Calhoun's report noted and also commented that, as of last year, the Physical Plant's instruction about asbestos was not too thorough. President Dyck asked if everyone was aware of who had been designated as asbestos liaison person in their building. The response was generally negative. Senator Gardner wondered if this will take precedence over the air quality study at the P & AS Building.

Senator Calhoun also requested input about items to discuss with the University of South Carolina
Senate Welfare Committee—especially salaries, fringe benefits, and other financial questions. The Welfare Committee will be in touch with the President's Blue Ribbon Committee that is constructing a model to evaluate salaries in university departments against those in other peer institutions. Senator Baron noted that the Board of Trustees had ordered the Business Office to make salary comparisons on a regular basis and that it is better if the Business Office contacts other schools because they get better information than a faculty member would. Senator Baron also said that the peer schools should be carefully chosen.

D. Policy: Senator Linvill gave the Committees' report (Attachment C.)

E. Ad Hoc Committees:
   Special Dorms: Senator Nowaczyk said that the Committee report would be taken up under New Business.
   Fine Arts: Senator Nowaczyk said that a survey would be sent out later in the week asking forty institutions about their policies on academic freedom.

F. University Commissions/Committees:
   Joint City/University Advisory Committee: Senator
Mullins presented the report (Attachment D.)

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Attachment E)

President Dyck commented on several items in the report. In Item 1., he noted that these changes can be implemented by changing the number of faculty, changing the number of students in sections (fewer faculty teaching more students), or through an increase in the extramural research budget. The bonus idea is just at the discussion stage right now.

He handed out rough copies of the August 20 Newsletter (Attachment F) which was to be passed out at the General Faculty meeting on that date, noting that some of these statistics have not been available previously. President Dyck and the Provost encourage the Faculty to look at them closely and to ask questions.

President Dyck asked for discussion of Item 8 dealing with graduation and commencement, indicating that President Lennon had been concerned by the lack of faculty at the August graduation. The suggestion that the faculty be split into thirds to attend the three ceremonies—August, December, and May—met with mixed comments. Would it be more work for the marshal? Are one third of the faculty here for August and December
graduations? Would junior faculty be stuck with attending the August and December ceremonies? Senator Bryan suggested that the number of faculty attending each be proportional to the number of graduates. Senator Baron suggested that a committee be formed to come up with a formal proposal to send to the President. Senator Linvill commented that splitting the faculty into thirds had worked well at Michigan State and that people did barter for which one they wanted to attend. A straw vote resulted in 18 for and 4 against dividing the faculty into thirds; 14 for and 6 against a division proportional to the number of graduates.

Senator Baron noted that questions concerning graduation have come up many times and suggested that a committee be organized to consider all the changes. President Dyck asked for comments on some other suggested changes. One possibility would be to issue a letter instead of the diploma at the ceremony. Would this cut attendance? It would solve the problem of the need to get graduation details ready so quickly at the end of a semester. Another option would be to exclude graduates (except for PhD candidates) from the procession. Senator Baron noted that, in a survey of the Student Senate, students wanted to shake the President's hand, so eliminating that might be a
problem. Senator Bryan suggested changing the graduation dates so that there is not such a time lag between the end of exams and the ceremony.

President Dyck asked that the senators poll faculty colleagues about Item 9, the Faculty/University Club. Senator Nowaczyk noted that it was important that the club be close to campus and within walking distance, especially for lunch. President Dyck needed to get the comments in by the end of August and indicated that the current University Club was also putting together a report.

V. OLD BUSINESS
There was no old business.

VI. NEW BUSINESS
Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Special Dorms (Attachment G): Senator Nowaczyk moved that the report be accepted by the Senate. In response to questions, he said that Housing puts non-athletes in Mauldin if there are empty beds, that "voluntary" was a tough issue in the face of possible pressure from the coaches, and that the university will pay no more than what it would cost to build a room for a non-athlete ($17,000 a bed is the current figure.) The university will need to build a dorm no matter
what. He noted that the coaches were for the dorm and also would not want to give the players the option of living or not living together. Athletic Director Robinson was concerned about the need for additional office space—a problem which may have been solved with the renovation of Orange Aids. There was a discussion of the indirect message presented in the report, in which the committee does not indicate their opposition to athletic dorms, with the Committee noting that they felt this was a more positive way of responding to the issue that recommending that the dorm not be built. Senator Bishop asked if any had been done away with and Senator Mullins responded that Georgia Tech had.

President Dyck noted that it may well be a dead issue at this point, but that it was good for the Athletic Council to get data rather than to operate on gut reactions. When asked if the Senate was telling the Athletic Department what to do, the Committee responded that they were looking at the issue from the point of view of the student's needs and that it was up to the faculty to express their views and give their input to the Athletic Council. The Senate voted unanimously to accept the report.

VII. INFORMATION
President Dyck said that he would refer the question of graduation/commencement procedures to a standing committee.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Margery N. Sly
Secretary

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE REPORT

AUGUST 19, 1986

The committee did not meet during July. However, the committee has received the information it requested concerning the performance of students on academic probation during the past year. This information lists the average GPR attained in courses by student year and number of hours taken. The committee will review this information along with the Provost's reply to the Faculty Senate's May resolution on academic probation at its next meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald Nowaczyk, Chair
From: Richard J. Calhoun, Chairman, Welfare Committee

To: Larry Dyck, President, Faculty Senate

Subject: August Meeting

The Welfare Committee met on Monday, August 18, for the primary purpose of hearing reports from faculty and administration in order to determine any recommendations that should be made to the Faculty Senate on the possible asbestos problems at Clemson University. A full report to the Senate with possible recommendations is expected for the September meeting of the Senate.

A resolution from the Faculty Senate at the University of South Carolina supporting the adoption of optional private retirement plans for faculty members was distributed. This resolution was a counterpart to the resolution of the Clemson University faculty last year and indicates cooperation between the two Senates. The Welfare Committee at USC also responded to our suggestion for a meeting with a proposal for a telecommunications conference and a joint meeting to address specifically the financial needs of our two faculties. We are already studying the possibility of the first step, the telecommunications conference.
The Policy Committee met on July 15, 1986.

Presentation of non-university sponsored awards at general faculty meetings was discussed in response to a letter received by the Faculty President. An example is the presentation of the AAUP Award. It is our opinion that if the award is not exclusively for members of the organization and every faculty member is eligible for the award, presentation of such awards in open meetings of the faculty is proper.

Grievance cases during the past few years have uncovered points in the faculty manual in need of clarification. Most of the procedures outlined in the manual are explicit. A major problem is that these procedures are not being followed. A subcommittee was appointed to recommend some needed additions. The Policy Committee will forward some recommendations to the Senate for their deliberation at the next meeting.

Work is continuing to determine sections of the Faculty Manual for inclusion in the Trustees Manual.
The Joint City/University Advisory Committee met on August 11, 1986. General Clausen reported that the University would fund one half of an Areawide Transportation Study, costing a total of $30,000. The study is expected to take approximately one year and will include the possibility of bicycle paths. Mr. Bill Grishaw will present to the President's Cabinet plans for a "communications kit" to aid in establishing interactions between administrators in the City and their counterparts in the University. Problems associated with sewage disposal for the Clemson Heights area were also discussed.

J.C. Mullins
1. The Provost has discussed the concept of instructional productivity with the college deans and has proposed that bonus-funds be awarded to those colleges that show increased productivity. The formula under discussion rewards a college that can reduce its state-appropriation through either an increase in student-faculty ratios, or a decrease in faculty salaries (unlikely), or that can reduce its net instructional costs through either a reduced impact of faculty salaries on the E & G budget, or an increase in sponsored research expenditures.

2. The Search Committee for the Vice President for Student Affairs has reduced its list of candidates from 164 to 17.

3. The Search Committee for the Vice President for Institutional Advancement is accepting nominations of qualified individuals. Nominations should be sent to President Emeritus Walter Cox; the closing date is September 8.

4. The Board of Trustees accepted the revisions to the Faculty Manual at their July 19, 1986 meeting.

5. The August 20, 1986 General Faculty/Staff Meeting will be at 10 a.m. in Tillman Hall. A question/answer period is scheduled following an address by President Lennon.

6. President Lennon has asked me to extend his thanks to all faculty who participated in either the formulation-phase or in the actual presentations of the University's Areas of Emphasis to industrial leaders.

7. Reminder: President Lennon's Inauguration will be held on Saturday September 6, 1986 at 10:30 a.m. in the amphitheater. You are encouraged to participate. Faculty representing professional societies, etc. will assemble in Tillman Hall, those marching as representatives of departments assemble in Brackett auditorium.

8. Questions regarding the regular inclusion of faculty in August and December Graduations as well as the May Commencement have surfaced. Currently faculty are asked to participate in the May Commencement only. How would the faculty respond to being divided into three groups, one for each graduation event?
9. As plans for the Continuing Education Center develop, the possibility exists that a faculty/university club might fit into the overall mission. Very preliminary thoughts include the possibility of a dining room to seat 150-200 for lunch, with dinner operating on a reservation basis. Also included is a lounge to accommodate about 50. Location of the Center is not finalized but includes a possible location at the lake (peach orchard) and another across perimeter road from the Thurmond complex. Would the faculty support a faculty/university club?

10. Parking: anticipate discussions related to limiting the number of parking decals for individual employees and the possibility of a parking fee. If you have thoughts on these issues, pass them along to Alice Derr, the senate representative to the Traffic and Parking Committee.
INAUGURAL LUNCHEON TICKETS
AVAILABLE IN 209 SIKES

Dignitaries, higher education officials, university presidents from across the nation and representatives from learned societies will be on campus Sept. 6 for the inauguration of Max Lennon as Clemson's 11th president.

The ceremony will begin at 10:30 a.m. in the Outdoor Theatre and will be followed by an old-fashioned barbecue luncheon on the library lawn.

Lennon will talk about his goals for Clemson as it begins its second century of public service and education.

No other speaker is scheduled. Music will be provided by the University's symphonic band.

Faculty and staff members, alumni, students and friends of Clemson are invited.

"We're hoping as many people as possible will attend this joyful event for Clemson," says Vice Provost Jerry Reel, who's coordinating the event.

The inauguration ceremony is free.

The luncheon is $5 per person.

Persons planning to attend the luncheon can mail or take checks, made payable to Clemson University -- Inauguration, to Carol Kossman, 09 Sikes Hall, Clemson University, Clemson, S.C., 29634-5105, by Friday, Aug. 29.

Persons planning to attend either the ceremony or the luncheon are advised to bring lawn chairs or a blankets to sit on.

In case of rain, the inauguration and the luncheon will be held in Littlejohn Coliseum.

HONORARY DEGREE RECIPIENT Roy Pearce, right, gets a handshake from commencement speaker James Holderman, president of the University of South Carolina, during graduation Aug. 9. In the middle is Alumni Professor Emeritus Hugh Macaulay, who accepted an honorary degree for Frank Wardlaw, the first director of the USC Press.

FACULTY RECEIVE RESEARCH GRANTS IN 'SECOND CENTURY' EMPHASIS AREA

University faculty members have been awarded two major research contracts in one of the five emphasis areas in the recently announced "Second Century" long-range research and public service plan.

Contracts for projects in the plan's "emerging technologies" area were awarded under the University Research Initiative, a new federal program to boost the capacity of universities to conduct research and train graduate students in key science and engineering areas.

The mathematical sciences department has been awarded a $3.2-million contract from the U.S. Office of Naval Research to support basic and applied research in discrete mathematics and computational analysis.

Mechanical engineering researchers will be

(Continued on page 2.)
ENROLLMENT ESTIMATES
FOR FALL 1986

Here are enrollment figures and estimates from the Office of Admissions and Registration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergrads by College</th>
<th>Estimated Fall 1986</th>
<th>Actual Fall 1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag Sciences</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Ind</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>2,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2,981</td>
<td>2,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest &amp; Rec. Resources</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>1,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undrgrd Total</td>
<td>10,382</td>
<td>10,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Students</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Programs</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ENROLL.</td>
<td>13,860</td>
<td>13,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAT SCORES OF FRESHMEN
BY COLLEGE IN 1985

The following figures from the Provost's Office show average total (verbal & math) SAT scores for new freshmen in 1985.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce and Industry</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest &amp; Rec. Resources</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>1,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued from page 1.)

part of a cooperative research effort, funded by the U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research, involving Carnegie Mellon and the University of California at Berkeley to develop advanced technologies for high-temperature structural materials.

Nearly 1,000 proposals were received from 175 universities, and 70 contracts were awarded. Only three contracts were awarded in mathematics, with Purdue University and the University of California at Los Angeles receiving the other two.

Eleven Clemson faculty members -- 10 in mathematical sciences and one in computer science -- will be involved in the math research initially, but other researchers will become involved in future years. Prof. Dan Warner will coordinate projects in computational analysis, while Prof. Charles Johnson will direct the discrete mathematics research.

"Because of the competitive nature of these research funds, this contract probably represents the single most impressive and visible research award to Clemson," Johnson says.

Clemson's participation in the Carnegie Mellon research project will bring at least $1.25 million over the next five years to the mechanical engineering department. The total project was funded at more than $5 million, and Clemson will receive approximately 25 percent, says mechanical engineering and metallurgy Prof. Henry Rack.

"From Clemson's standpoint, this contract helps our image in the field of composite materials," Rack says. "The major limiting factor on how far we can move in this field right now is faculty. We need to hire more, but it's hard to compete with industry."

President Max Lennon called the contracts "significant news for Clemson. They prove that we can..."
1985-86 PRIVATE GIVING BEATS
PREVIOUS 18 MONTHS BY A MILLION

The following figures from the Development Office show a $1.1-million increase in private giving during the 12 months of the 1985-86 fiscal year over the previous 18-month accounting period.

Development programs switched from a calendar-year accounting system to a fiscal-year system during the extended 1984-85 period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1984-85 (18 months)</th>
<th>1985-86 (12 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>$1,396,138</td>
<td>$2,856,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>233,358</td>
<td>918,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Matching</td>
<td>240,038</td>
<td>230,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; Staff</td>
<td>81,588</td>
<td>78,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>22,602</td>
<td>41,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests, Insurance, Trusts and Deferred Gifts</td>
<td>380,035</td>
<td>215,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>1,201,936</td>
<td>864,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>221,482</td>
<td>177,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Industry</td>
<td>1,912,126</td>
<td>1,481,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$5,754,173</td>
<td>$6,864,847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'TIGER' AND 'TAPS' BEGIN NEW YEAR

The first issue of The Tiger student newspaper for the fall will be Aug. 29. The ad deadline is 5 p.m. on Aug. 25.

University departments and employees may order copies of the 1987 TAPS yearbook for $18 per copy during the fall. The price will jump to $22 in the spring.

Departments wishing to order TAPS should send an interdepartmental order form to TAPS, Office of Student Life, 201 Mell Hall.

For more details on Tiger deadlines or TAPS, call Kirk Brague or Winkie Stiles at 656-2153.

(Continued from page 2.)

...compete with the best and win.

"The efforts to win these contracts started before the Second Century plan was developed, but they fit right in with it. That shows that the faculty and deans were on target when they put the plan together, and it speaks well for future faculty initiatives to develop projects in the key areas."

In addition to emerging technologies, the plan's emphasis areas are agriculture, marketing and management, quality of life and textiles.

COLLEGE RESEARCH EXPENDITURES IN FY 1985-86

The following figures from the Office of Budgets and Planning and the Office of University Research reflect research money spent, not total awards, during the 1985-86 fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>COMPETITIVE GRANTS</th>
<th>TOTAL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>$2,053,620</td>
<td>$16,654,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>$1,248</td>
<td>$139,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td>$367,074</td>
<td>$637,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$2,053,450</td>
<td>$4,265,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest &amp; Rec. Resources</td>
<td>$532,663</td>
<td>$2,518,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>$16,574</td>
<td>$36,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>$9,073</td>
<td>$133,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>$1,976,940</td>
<td>$3,140,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>$319,074</td>
<td>$528,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**TOTAL</td>
<td>$7,329,716</td>
<td>$28,054,626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TOTAL column includes state appropriated, Experiment Station and other non-competitive funds.

**"Other" includes the Water Resources Research Institute, the Energy Research and Development Center, and the Office of Academic Affairs.

NOTES: Total University research expenditures for 1985-86 of $28,054,626 were up $261,182 from the 1984-85 total of $27,793,444. Research proposals generated in 1985-86 totaled 716 -- up 100 from the 1984-85 total of 616. This indicates a marked increase in faculty research activity, which will begin to show in expenditure figures for the next fiscal year.
# Clemson's Basic Education and General Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimated 1985-86</th>
<th>Approved 1986-87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$42,937,946</td>
<td>$39,571,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3,723,232</td>
<td>7,712,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Extension and Public Service</td>
<td>863,526</td>
<td>939,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>13,282,459</td>
<td>13,926,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>4,565,547</td>
<td>4,406,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>10,450,244</td>
<td>11,590,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance of Plant</td>
<td>10,352,601</td>
<td>12,288,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>52,650</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Administration</td>
<td>6,332,921</td>
<td>6,440,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total E&amp;G Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$92,561,126</td>
<td>$96,980,974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Revenue**                                   |                   |                 |
| State Appropriations                          | $60,975,200       |                 |
| Student Fees                                  | 26,040,000        |                 |
| Short Courses and Seminars                    | 4,217,745         |                 |
| Indirect Cost Recovery                        | 1,582,000         |                 |
| Reimbursement — Computer & Info. Sys. Devel. Services | 4,523,412       |                 |
| Student Activities Income                     | 480,470           |                 |
| Other Sources                                 | 1,762,147         |                 |
| Transfers to Student Organizations, Services, Activities | (635,000)    |                 |
| Transfers to Debt Retirement Accounts         | (1,965,000)       |                 |
| **Total E&G Revenue**                         | $96,980,974       |                 |

# Clemson's Public Service Activities Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimated 1985-86</th>
<th>Approved 1986-87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Station</td>
<td>$17,143,588</td>
<td>$16,350,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>23,134,821</td>
<td>24,269,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory and Public Service</td>
<td>1,777,417</td>
<td>1,790,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and Poultry Health</td>
<td>2,095,180</td>
<td>2,201,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest and Recreation Resources</td>
<td>2,800,195</td>
<td>3,209,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Energy Program</td>
<td>226,969</td>
<td>127,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering Alliance</td>
<td>169,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total PSA Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$47,178,170</td>
<td>$48,118,044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Revenue**                                   |                   |                 |
| Federal Appropriations                        | $11,075,698       |                 |
| State Appropriations                          | 35,431,556        |                 |
| Institutional Revenue                         | 1,610,790         |                 |
| **Total PSA Revenue**                         | $48,118,044       |                 |

# Auxiliary Enterprises, Restricted Funds, Etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimated 1985-86</th>
<th>Approved 1986-87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>$32,401,434</td>
<td>$31,942,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Funds</td>
<td>18,778,024</td>
<td>20,660,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Improvement Projects</td>
<td>10,954,700</td>
<td>12,733,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Requirements</td>
<td>5,132,850</td>
<td>5,005,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$67,267,008</td>
<td>$70,342,786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Revenue**                                   |                   |                 |
| Auxiliary Enterprises Revenue                  | $31,942,244       |                 |
| Restricted Funds Revenue                       | 20,660,959        |                 |
| Proceeds from Bonds                           | 12,733,600        |                 |
| Debt Service Funds                            | 5,005,983         |                 |
| **Total**                                     | $70,342,786       |                 |
The ad hoc Committee on Special Dorms has reviewed a number of issues with regard to the athletic dorm for football players at Clemson University. This report reviews a number of the important issues and concludes with the committee's recommendations.

**CURRENT SITUATION**

Presently, all unmarried, scholarship football players are required to live in Mauldin Hall. Because of perceived inadequacies in the current living situation, it has been proposed that a new dorm be constructed for the football, and perhaps basketball, athletes at Clemson. This facility would provide bed space for approximately 160 students with two students per room with private bath. In addition there would be six meeting rooms, laundry facilities, game room, lounge area, two apartments for residence hall directors, study rooms, dining hall, and small training room in the new dorm. The cost is estimated to be $4 million, with IPTAY contributing approximately $1 million to cover the non-revenue producing space. Mauldin Hall will require little renovation and will provide 156 beds to accommodate additional students seeking on campus housing. This fall there are approximately 400 females and 50 males on a waiting list.

**ISSUES WITH REGARD TO RECRUITMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE OF THE ATHLETIC PROGRAM**

An argument can be made that an athletic dormitory facilitates the operation of the athletic program. For instance, an athletic dorm makes monitoring the student-athlete, from the coach's perspective, much easier. Scheduling of meetings and assembly of athletes is easier when the athletes are housed together. During periods when school is not in session (e.g., pre-season training in football) having only one dormitory open is easier than having several dorms open for the athletes. However, the same problem exists for other students such as foreign students and graduate students residing on campus for 12 months.

With regard to recruitment of potential student-athletes, Athletic Director Robinson reported that athletic dorms are a southeastern phenomenon. Our survey reported at the June meeting supported that observation. However, athletic dorms are not common in the ACC. Only two ACC schools, NC State and Wake Forest, have athletic dorms besides Clemson. If, however, one argues that football recruiting at Clemson involves student-athletes considering SEC schools, then the argument for the athletic dorm as a recruiting tool has possible merit. It appears that athletic dorms are more the rule rather than the exception in the SEC.

From our conversations with individuals in athletic departments elsewhere, the existence of athletic dorms as a recruiting tool may be used in a positive or negative manner. For instance, Alabama considers their dorm to be a major
positive recruiting factor; athletes want to live in Bryant Hall. Yet, other individuals have commented that having an athletic dorm can be used against a school. In these instances, living in an athletic dorm might be viewed as an impediment for the student-athlete to interact with the general student population.

Some individuals the committee contacted, such as Jim Jones at Ohio State, have reported that the national trend seems to be away from athletic dorms. Coach Jones reported that the Big 10 as a conference does not permit athletic dorms and has limited training table facilities. Others such as the sportswriter, John Underwood, have recommended that athletic dorms be eliminated as one way to improve the wrongs that he perceives exist in college football (Sports Illustrated, 1985).

Following the lawsuit at Georgia, elected faculty representatives of the College of Arts and Science recommended that the athletic dorm be discontinued at Georgia (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1986). And, most recently in a column about the abuses of cocaine, sportswriter, Rick Reilly, wrote, "Abolish athletic dorms that keep him (the college student-athlete) isolated, typecast, and targeted" (Sports Illustrated, 1986).

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF THE STUDENT-ATHLETE

We were unable to find any published studies on the effect of athletic dorms on academic performance of the student-athlete. Studies of students who have been homogenously grouped have provided mixed results with regard to academic performance. Homogenous grouping, based on factors other than athletics, has not impaired academic performance and, in some instances, a beneficial effect in GPR has been reported.

The committee requested information on the academic performance of the student-athletes in Mauldin Hall. We found that of the 30 students who moved into Mauldin Hall for the first time in 1980-81 79% (11 of 14) of those who had an SAT of 700 or better have graduated. Of the 16 whose SAT was lower than 700, only 12% have graduated. For the 20 students who moved into Mauldin Hall four years ago, 1981-82, 71% (5 of 7) who had an SAT of 700 or better graduated. Only 8% (1 of 13) of those with an SAT less than 700 have graduated. The GPRs of those who graduated are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPR at Graduation</th>
<th>80-81 students</th>
<th>81-82 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 3.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75 - 2.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 - 2.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 - 2.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 - 2.24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee also received information on current student-athletes who meet the 700 SAT minimum recently approved by the NCAA. The committee planned to compare the performance of these student-athletes with other athletes and students based on a matching procedure using predicted GPR. Unfortunately, the matching procedure could not provide meaningful comparison groups (i.e., non-football athletes and non-athletes) because the predicted GPRs for the football
athletes fell below those for the other groups. However, for descriptive purposes, a frequency distribution of GPRs for the current Sophomore and Junior classes of student-athletes in Mauldin Hall is provided below. These GPRs are based on only those students who had an SAT of 700 or better (the range is from 710 to 1170).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPR end of SPRING 86</th>
<th># of sophomores</th>
<th># of juniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 3.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75 - 2.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 - 2.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 - 2.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 - 2.24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75 - 1.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 - 1.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 - 1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOCIAL ASPECTS FOR THE STUDENT-ATHLETE

A consistent finding in the literature on homogenous grouping is that individuals in a dorm are influenced by the values of others in the dorm. Our report on homogenous grouping presented at the June meeting revealed that students like living with others who share similar values and interests. In environments in which students were housed together because of academic interests, academic performance was enhanced. Evidence was also presented to suggest that academic performance suffered when housing was based on shared orientations and values that do not encourage academic performance.

Given that the football players are housed together because of their interest in football, one might argue that an emphasis on athletics rather than academics would prevail in an athletic dormitory. In addition, if the academic preparation of these individuals is not equal to that of the general student population, then one might anticipate that an orientation toward academic success would be less likely to occur in an athletic dormitory.

If one assumes that part of a student's education includes social development and maturity, then living with individuals with the same background and orientation may hinder such development. Furthermore, given that the football team does not reflect the racial makeup of the general student population, the existence of an athletic dormitory does result in a racially segregated dormitory that includes a substantially higher proportion of minority students than that in other dormitories.
There are three specific recommendations:

1) Given that the faculty are concerned primarily with the educational experience that Clemson University can provide to the student-athlete, the committee recommends that the student-athlete be treated like other students as much as possible. According to housing officials, the vast majority of continuing students at Clemson are free to choose their living environment and roommates. The committee recommends that the student-athlete be given this same option. Currently, honors students have the option to live together and many choose to do so. However, it is not a requirement of the honors program that honors students live together. We would like this same procedure to be implemented for the student-athlete.

We recommend that if such a policy is implemented, that the housing office and athletic director ensure that the student-athlete is aware of his freedom in choosing the living environment. The committee recognizes that such a policy may have an impact on the current practices in the football program. However, the committee feels that this policy is effective for the non-revenue producing sports and should be implemented for all student-athletes. Furthermore, the committee feels that the potential benefits in terms of social development and maturity that could result in allowing the student-athlete to choose his or her living environment outweigh any potential negative effects.

2) Given that the national trend appears to be away from athletic dorms, the committee recommends that the President instruct the faculty representative to the ACC to propose that athletic dorms be banned in the ACC. Currently, only three ACC schools have athletic dorms and a policy banning athletic dorms would reduce their influence as a potential recruiting tool.

3) The committee also recommends that this report and the supporting material be forwarded by the Faculty Senate President to the Athletic Council for its consideration.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September 16, 1986

I. CALL TO ORDER
President Dyck called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY
President Dyck introduced David Larson, Vice President for Business and Finance, who was invited to speak to the Senate. This is an opportunity for the faculty to get to know him and for him to educate the Senate on how Business and Finance has an impact on faculty members.

Vice President Larson began by stating that he hoped there would be improved funding and utilization of resources in future years. He then addressed three questions which President Dyck had given him. The first was how Business and Finance relates to the faculty. Larson noted that there are three areas to consider, each of which represents a unique challenge in an academic environment. The first is ensuring that all university fiscal actions are performed in a sound manner, following legal and
other standards, without hampering management flexibility of the units of the institution. Larson hopes to help faculty in coping with bureaucracy and not to use regulations as roadblocks. The second area is the faculty's perception of the environment in which they work. Physical facilities and other environmental factors should assist the faculty in doing their jobs. The third area is that of Business and Finance's impact on personnel matters. Hiring and training programs should be designed to improve the quality of support staff who help the faculty be more productive. This is particularly important in an institution where seventy percent of the budget goes to personnel. Those three areas are his major challenges.

President Dyck asked about the difficulty and expense involved in using the Physical Plant for small jobs and wondered if outside contractors could be used. Vice President Larson responded by saying that they are currently assessing the Physical Plant's financial resources—including the amount of money for staffing, permanent improvements, and its dependence on user charges. The Physical Plant needs to be funded at a reasonable rate, but is currently working with user charges more than Larson is used to. They may phase in a new model eliminating user charges over
Senator Bryan asked about the possibility of contracting functions out to the private sector. Larson responded that as an operating philosophy, contract services can work fine. If they are better and more cost effective than in-house services, they should be considered. Areas which might be open to this are the motor pool or a portion of custodial services. Any such action should carefully consider the welfare of current employees.

The second question was how Larson's knowledge as a resource manager could assist the faculty in becoming better scholars, teachers, researchers, and public service staff. Vice President Larson said that he had learned in his previous position that faculty, in their dealings with students, etc., use many of the same management skills that his own staff use to accomplish their assigned responsibilities. He has discussed these similarities with his staff because he feels that the closer his staff feels to faculty, the better they are able to provide support to the faculty.

The third question dealt with incentives and Vice President Larson noted that it was a challenge to talk
about incentives when funding is tight. However, much can be done through cost containment and communication. He sees three ways to provide incentives: recognition, resources, and raises. Recognition can take many forms, such as election by peers to a Council of Scholars that may supply stipends for travel money to members, or chairs and named professorships. Larson commented on the value of a foundation with a large endowment, especially if a portion of it was dedicated to academic excellence, and he noted that the potential for one exists here at Clemson.

Resources can be used as incentives in several ways, such as return of indirect costs from grants or the willingness on the part of administrators to allow submission of matching proposals. Good managers should be rewarded and resource allocations made in relation to productivity. In the third area — raises, Larson indicated that there were many opportunities to adapt certain plans according to what is best for Clemson. Incentives should be built in wherever possible. Larson used the example of five year interest free loans given to faculty members to buy their own personal computers.

Vice President Larson then discussed the current financial situation in the state and Clemson's plans for gaining funding. The Research Investment Act is
one way to receive help from the state, but Clemson will have to help itself, through cost containment, to get through 1986, 1987, and 1988. We have to look at more cost effective ways to deliver services and President Lennon's 3 to 5% cost reduction plan is a good way to begin. It is worthwhile to look internally at our cost effectiveness and move funding to make money available for incentive and other programs. The University will need to look at everything, get suggestions from the entire campus, and then establish priorities for the distribution of resources.

Senator Stillwell asked about the 25% research return from the state. Vice President Larson noted that it is actually a net of 20% and that Clemson is presenting the best picture of our expenditures so that we will be represented fairly in the formula.

Senator Mullins asked Vice President Larson to discuss the proposed combination of the Planning Board and the Committee on Physical Facilities. Larson responded that he began by looking at processes for permanent improvements and eventually proposed the merger of the two committees into a Facilities Planning Committee. This would eliminate overlap and redundancy, allow the committee to address permanent improvement priorities
on a systematic basis (rather than the current ad hoc method where input from various campus constituencies may have been missing), and to broaden the input mechanism. He foresees membership on the committee as consisting of representatives from the Vice Presidents, the Faculty Senate President, three faculty members, two students, and support staff such as Physical Plant personnel, with a subcommittee structure to address issues such as landscaping and handicapped access. It needs to be a group which is both interested and willing to give considerable time and who have certain areas of expertise. A recommendation for these changes has been submitted.

President Dyck asked about the progress made in discussions of a university research foundation. Vice President Larson said that he and members of his staff will be visiting the University of Georgia to see how their foundation operates. Clemson is dealing with state leaders to inform them of the University's plans and intent. When asked if faculty input had been solicited, Larson indicated that he was sure some faculty had participated in the planning. He said he would discuss the issue with Bob Gilliland.

Senator Stillwell asked what the advantages of a foundation would be. Vice President Larson noted
that operating flexibility, advantages in use of resources, and legal advantages were some of the reasons to develop a foundation.

President Dyck thanked Vice President Larson for spending this time with the Senate.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the August 19, 1986 meeting were approved as amended.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Policy: Senator Huey said that the committee was working on the policy aspects of the Faculty Manual, compiling the policies of the Board of Trustees contained therein. They will make those policies available to the Board and are attempting to determine how to differentiate between policy and procedure.

B. Research: No report.

C. Scholastic Policy: Senator Nowaczyk gave the Committee's report (Attachment A.) He also said that he and President Dyck had met last week with Vice Provost Reel and Dean Skelton to discuss academic exceptions. The ad hoc committee of five appointed by the President to look at exceptions last year admitted fifty-nine exceptions. They had
no power over athletes (26 admitted). The 700 SAT/2.0 GPR minimum standard will be used for athletes and, as long as they meet this, they will be accepted. Last year the Senate recommended that the exceptions committee consist of a faculty member from each college and the Dean of Admissions, Dean Skelton. Both the exceptions committee and the Continuing Education Committee, which handles appeals, meet frequently during the summer which can be a strain on faculty members. One proposal which was discussed last week was to create two committees, one for exceptions and one for continuing enrollment, of five members each. Three members would be faculty elected by the colleges to the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee and would rotate through the colleges. The other two members would be appointed by the Provost. Another issue that was discussed at this meeting was establishing cut-offs for admitting individuals to colleges, which are currently set by the Provost in consultation with the Deans. Senator Nowaczyk would appreciate receiving Senators' comments on these issues.

D. Welfare: Senator Calhoun read the Committee's report (Attachment B.) Several Senators had comments
on the problems with the HMOs. It was suggested that since it was a concern of the faculty, that faculty input should be gathered by the Welfare Committee and forwarded to the University Insurance Office and possibly to the state insurance office. Senator Bryan asked if any surveys had been done on the service HMO users were receiving.

E. Ad Hoc Committees:

Planning Board: Senator Huey said that this ad hoc Committee had been called back into existence to consider the alternate, merger proposal explained earlier in the meeting by David Larson. The committee will be comparing their original proposal with the new one and giving a report to President Dyck.

Special Dorms: Senator Nowaczyk indicated that they would meet with Housing Director Almeda Rogers soon.

Fine Arts: Senator Nowaczyk noted that survey letters had been sent out to forty-seven institutions.

F. Other Commissions/Committees:

Drug and Alcohol Abuse: Senator LaTorre said that the committee had met and agreed to meet more often.

Planning Board: Senator Mullins gave the report
(Attachment C.) Senator Hudson asked if off-campus projects such as the new computer center would be handled by the new Facilities Planning Committee and Senator Mullins said that Larson had indicated that they would be.

Traffic and Parking: Senator Derr reported that the committee had met and considered how P&AS spots had been taken by department vehicles. They will soon begin discussions on long range traffic and parking concerns and Senator Derr asked that anyone with problems or suggestions send them to her.

V. PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Attachment D)

President Dyck highlighted several items in the report and update. He noted that, in Item 5, the Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance Procedures may be holding hearings at some point to get input, but asked that comments be sent directly to the committee also. In Items 8 and 5 in the update, he emphasized that the Athletic Council's meeting with the President would be used to firm up rough spots in the question of the composition of the Council, such as who will chair and whether members will be elected or appointed by the President from elected nominees.

President Dyck mentioned Items 1 and 2 on the update:
The Research Investment Act (Attachment E) and the Permanent Improvement Plan (Attachment F.) Faculty may be contacted to assist when dignitaries come to campus to discuss the Investment Act. Any specific questions that faculty members have about the Improvement Plan should be addressed to President Dyck.

VI. OLD BUSINESS
There was no old business.

VII. NEW BUSINESS
A. Academic Probation: Senator Nowaczyk moved that the Scholastic Policy Committee's report on academic probation be accepted (with the addition of the word 'recommended.') He then gave a brief history of the problems surrounding the issue. The Senate's May resolution recommended enforcement of the policy, but the Provost's response was not encouraging. He did not view preventing registration by students on probation as a good or workable idea. Statistics supplied by the Registrar's Office showed that there was no correlation between GPR and number of hours for which the student was registered and that there is no evidence that fifteen hours is the magic number. Students on probation often register for over the fifteen hour limit and then drop courses
later. The committee decided to present this new report as a workable alternative.

Senator Morris supported keeping the current policy, stating that there should be a penalty if courses are dropped rather than promoting a policy which facilitates the game of looking for easy classes and dropping difficult ones. Academic quality should be safeguarded.

Senator Birrenkott said that we should not talk about using this as punishment or trying to inconvenience the student, and that, while he wondered if the note on the registration form was a type of "scarlet letter," it would at least encourage the advisor to look more closely at the student.

Senator Hare worried about the problem of excessive dropping, when courses were previously closed out to interested students. Senator Mullins wanted to know if the fourteen hour drop limit had helped to solve some of these problems.

The motion to accept the report passed.

B. Election (Attachment H): New members of several committees and commissions were elected to replace Senators Moran and Bishop.

C. Senator Nowaczyk raised the issues of the two
recent rape cases and the perceived inequities in the treatment of the students involved. Should the Senate take a stand? He has received two letters from faculty members expressing concern. President Dyck said that he has asked the Acting Vice President for Student Affairs to discuss this at the Athletic Council meeting on September 17.

Senator Birrenkott yielded the floor to a faculty member from his college, Dr. Graydon Kingsland. Dr Kingsland said that he has waited in vain for a comment on this situation from citizens in this state. He is angry and fears for the rights of individuals in society. Has there been tacit approval given for poor conduct and a tacit admission that success will be achieved on the gridiron by whatever means possible? The integrity of the University has been threatened.

President Dyck said that the Senate should be provided with more information before it decides whether or not to act. Senator Nowaczyk noted that the Student Handbook said that students should not be suspended until they are convicted. It appears that no school regulations have been violated in these cases.
Senator Carter moved for adjournment. The motion was defeated.

Senator Mullins suggested that President Dyck report back after the September 17 meeting of the Athletic Council and then a decision can be made.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

Margery N. Sly
Secretary

Senator Absent: Baron, Drews, Gardner, Leap, Linvill, Madison, McConnell.

Alternates Present: Hipp, Kosinski.
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE REPORT
SEPTEMBER 16, 1986

The committee met on September 2nd. Three agenda items were discussed. The first involved a review of policy on academic probation. After reviewing the Provost’s response to a previous Senate resolution and data on the performance of students on probation, the committee drafted a report which will be introduced under new business.

The committee also discussed the issue of common exams during the semester and during final exams. A subcommittee was formed to review the options available and to recommend policy guidelines if they are needed.

The committee also considered a potential problem concerning the proliferation of microcomputer courses on campus. The committee recommended that the Chair convey these concerns to Dr. Reel, Chair of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald Nowaczyk, Chair
TO: Larry Dyck, President, Faculty Senate
FROM: Richard J. Calhoun, Chairman, Welfare Committee
Subject: September Meeting

The Welfare Committee held its September meeting on September 9 at 3:30 in LL3 of Cooper Library. Ron Herrin discussed with members of the Committee recent developments in health care. We found that several Clemson physicians are now members of the Anderson Health Plan, but currently this plan is open only to residents of Oconee County. Residents of Pickens County must join only one of two HMO plans in Greenville; Companion is closed; Health America is open. We tried to find what we could do about this situation. We were told any action we could take but that the situation might improve by next year. We are still seeking means of making the wishes of the Clemson faculty known.

We discussed a telecommunications conference with the Welfare Committee at South Carolina. Tentatively, Tuesday, October 7 at 3:30 has been set as a date if this proves satisfactory for the Committee there. We shall discuss the financial welfare of both faculties, including alternative retirement, fringe benefits, and salaries. If there is anything you would like to see discussed, please let me know.

The Welfare Committee declined to take action on the suggestion that some faculty be present at all three commencements. We refer this question to the Chairman of the Policy Committee and suggest that he discuss it with the acting University Marshal.

We took note of the list of universities that the Commission on Higher Education uses to compare Clemson with in their budget recommendations.

We have one matter to bring before the Senate, the recommendation that a committee including faculty with expertise be established to handle faculty concerns on the asbestos question and to implement policy. You should have copies.
The Planning Committee met on September 16. The major topic considered was the reorganization of the Planning Board and the Commission on Physical Facilities into a single committee with expanded power. This new committee is referred to as the Facilities Planning Committee. The Planning Board approved the concept of the Committee.

A status report was given for a number of projects:

Godfrey Hall--finished by December 1986.
Chilled Water Project--on schedule.
Indoor Tennis Center--bids received last week.
Soccer Stadium--bids to be received next week.
Johnstone Hall--ideas have been presented to the vice presidents.
Strom Thurmond Institute--preparing to go out for bids.
Waste Treatment Plant--documents being prepared for submission to State Engineer. Bids will be requested in 30 to 90 days.
Chemistry Building--Occupancy expected in about three weeks.
Athletic Dormitory--on hold.

J.C. Mullins
1. The Advisory Committee is meeting with the three finalists in the search for a Vice-President for Student Affairs.

2. The composition and charge of the Planning Board is still under review. The ad hoc Committee chaired by Cecil Huey has been reactivated to comment on a proposal to merge the Planning Board and the Facilities Committee. The Committee's report is expected by September 22, 1986.

3. Senator Bryan has agreed to assist in the development of information that will allow faculty to better understand changes that will occur in the new tax laws. The information will appear in the University Newsletter.

4. The Board of Trustees meet Friday, September 12, 1986.

5. An ad hoc Committee to review the Grievance Procedures has been formed. Members include: Dale Linvill (chair), Margery Sly, Jeuel LaTorre, Bob Snelsire, Steve Wainscott, Holley Ulbrich, Clarence Hood. If you have recommendations relative to either Grievance Process I or II, please provide the committee with your insights.

6. I extend my thanks to all who participated in the President's Inauguration.

7. The Provost's ad hoc Committee on Salaries is making progress relative to both internal and external comparisons.

8. In discussions concerned with the Athletic Council, the Advisory Committee felt the faculty should elect their college representatives. They felt the policy of selecting nominees, rather than representatives, should be abolished.
PRESIDENT'S REPORT...UPDATE
prepared September 16, 1986

1. Enclosed for your information is a summary and draft of the proposed Research Investment Act, a joint funding effort among South Carolina's three research universities.

2. Enclosed for your information is a copy of Clemson University's Permanent Improvement Plan for biennia 87/88, 89/90 and 91/92. The plan was accepted by the Board of Trustees on September 12, 1986.

3. Committee chairs have received a copy of the amplification statement that accompanied the Budget Request (Fiscal Year 1987-1988) as presented to the Commission on Higher Education on August 25, 1986.

4. Appropriate members of the administration are discussing the Faculty Senate's recommendation to realign the Admissions Office with Academic Affairs. No decision has been reached, but discussion continues.

5. President Lennon will speak to members of the Athletic Council when the council meets Wednesday, September 17, 1986.
The proposed Research Investment Act is a carefully planned and well defined five-year strategy calling for significant investment in research. The return on this investment will come in the form of additional research dollars, improved higher education opportunities, a better quality of life for South Carolinians and, most importantly, real jobs and sustained economic growth for South Carolina.

It calls for a new alliance in higher education — a level of cooperation and unity not seen before among South Carolina's research universities — because it is a strategy no one institution can handle alone.

Individually, each institution — the University of South Carolina, Clemson University or the Medical University of South Carolina — is at a disadvantage in direct competition with research centers like MIT, Stanford and Johns Hopkins. But an alliance (of the three South Carolina universities represents a large reservoir of resources consisting of research equipment and laboratories, as well as expertise in practically all aspects of science, engineering, medicine, international business and other fields. These resources will move South Carolina into an enviable position in the international competition for jobs.

It is a carefully constructed strategy. The proposed Research Investment Act focuses on specific areas of emphasis at the three universities, deliberately taking advantage of the potential for collaboration where complementary programs exist. To be listed as part of the Research Investment Act an area has to meet certain criteria:

(1) It must have a direct, positive impact on economic development, education, health or welfare in South Carolina;
(2) it must have an existing basis in faculty expertise, resources and facilities;
(3) it must serve to improve the quality of undergraduate and graduate education for South Carolina citizens in line with the university's stated mission.

In many intensive meetings, faculty members, deans, vice presidents and presidents at each university drew a workable research "blueprint" for their institution that takes advantage of the strengths of each and retains enough flexibility to incorporate South Carolina's economic and technological needs into the next century.

The success of this program depends on the State of South Carolina making an initial five-year commitment to provide half the necessary funds. Such an investment in higher education by the state will enable representatives of each university to solicit funds more effectively from private sources.

The Research Investment Act comes with a high price tag, but one that's much lower than the cost of watching other states move ahead in economic and technological development. The people of South Carolina have shown their concern for high quality education and the state's leaders have demonstrated their willingness to support elementary and secondary education in a meaningful way. The proposed Research Investment Act will continue this investment in public education. It is an investment South Carolina must make.

### SPECIFIC AREAS OF RESEARCH EMPHASIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLEMSON UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA</th>
<th>MEDICAL UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Engineering and Basic Science, Marketing/Management, Quality of Life, Textiles</td>
<td>Trade and Economic Development, Advanced Science and Technology, Mass Communication/Information Management, Health Care/Disease Prevention, Coastal Zone Management, Education</td>
<td>Molecular Genetics and Structural Biology, Cancer, Marine Biomedical Research, Biotechnology, Heart Research, Child Health, Genitrics/Rehabilitation, Wellness, Arthritis and Tissue Repair, Neuroscience, Liver Research and Clinical Care, Deafness, Drug Testing, Mental Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

AGRICULTURE $ 88 million*

Clemson's first and most basic economic partner, the agriculture industry, will benefit from programs in such areas as biotechnology, food and nutrition, pest control, packaging, water resource management and environmental science.

ENGINEERING AND BASIC SCIENCE $ 72 million*

The production of value-added goods will always be the cornerstone of economic strength and depth for any state, region or nation. Clemson intends to promote the next generation of manufacturing productivity through research programs in advanced manufacturing and "expert" systems; computer communication and distributed systems; semiconductor reliability; and highly advanced materials, including the next generation of ceramics, composites, advanced engineering fibers and newly synthesized chemical products.

MARKETING/MANAGEMENT $ 5 million*

Inventing technologies and perfecting products is only half the job. Major areas of emphasis will include marketing research and international marketing, economic policy, advanced industrial management and the incubation services of the Small Business Development Center.

QUALITY OF LIFE $ 15 million*

Commerce and technology are ultimately in service to humanity, so Clemson also emphasizes the human resources and natural resources that make life worth living. Programs involve K-12 education and professional development for businessmen, professionals and engineers; community and regional planning; travel and tourism; and a new proposal, the Palmetto Program for the Humanities.

TEXTILES $ 17 million*

Another of South Carolina's basic industries, textiles will benefit from all of the above programs in technology, management, marketing and human resources, as well as from additional emphasis on textiles research, non-woven fabrics and advanced engineering fibers.

Total $197 million*

*Total funding over five years, half of which would be provided by the state and half of which would be generated by the institution from private and federal sources.
THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

TRADE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT $16.1 million*
Firms owned by foreign nations now employ more than 9% of South Carolina's labor force. More research and training will mean more effective national and international transactions for American businessmen. USC's role as host for conferences on world problems such as the debt crisis and U.S.-Caribbean relations will be strengthened.

ADVANCED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY $85.7 million*
USC will concentrate efforts in machine intelligence, material science, biotechnology and computer applications, research vitally needed to keep South Carolina competitive.

MASS COMMUNICATION/INFORMATION MANAGEMENT $43.1 million*
Integration of communications (voice, video, computer, printing and others), linking USC's research libraries with information sources worldwide and computerizing medical information networks to improve health delivery to South Carolinians and to the nation, will be emphasized.

HEALTH CARE/DISEASE PREVENTION $69.4 million*
Expanded research in biomedicine, nursing clinical practice, disease prevention and pharmaceutical science as well as a Pediatric/Geriatric Village will offer unique benefits for the state and the nation.

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT $10.4 million*
Rapid population growth is most likely to occur in South Carolina's coastal zone, and expanded research will address population needs, wetlands, management and aquaculture. Growth of hotel, restaurant and tourism, South Carolina's second largest industry, should be guided by research to avoid unexpected costs such as road damage and demand for public services.

EDUCATION $23.3 million*
USC's national leadership role, earned from improving the quality of teacher training, will be enhanced by additional research in educational policy, computer technology in education and from service centers which address special needs in South Carolina. These needs include training disabled and gifted students in rural areas; addressing deficiencies in mathematics training of students and offering special help to administrators in non-public schools.

Total $248 million*

*Total funding over five years, half of which would be provided by the state and half of which would be generated by the institution from private and federal sources.
MEDICAL UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

MOLECULAR GENETICS AND STRUCTURAL BIOLOGY CENTERS $ 28 million*
A core technological resource to help determine the genetic and chemical bases of heart disease and cancer and to design new chemical signals (drugs) to control or prevent these diseases.

CANCER CENTER $ 25 million*
Scientific development of new cancer-related technologies, better understanding of the underlying causes of cancer, and clinical evaluations of new drugs, treatments and technologies as they emerge.

MARINE BIOMEDICAL CENTER $ 7.5 million*
South Carolina's coast and MUSC's location provide a broad range of marine biological systems that through exploration and research can provide solutions to medically related problems.

BIOTECHNOLOGY CENTER $ 1.5 million*
Providing the best and most modern biotechnology equipment and skills for scientists and students seeking career opportunities in this rapidly expanding field, with emphasis on supporting firms locating in South Carolina.

HEART CENTER $ 2.5 million*
Bringing together the clinical and research skills of pediatric cardiology, cardiothoracic surgery, and adult cardiology to improve our understanding of normal and abnormal heart function and to provide the most up-to-date methods of care.

CHILD HEALTH CENTER $ 2.3 million*
Building on the existing substantial strengths in understanding mental retardation, care of premature infants, birth defects, genetic referral and diagnosis, and heart and kidney diseases of children.

GERIATRICS/REHABILITATION CENTER $ 3 million*
Combining programs to concentrate clinical care resources and associated efforts on the full range of services for persons who are functionally impaired, with particular emphasis on extending the active life of the elderly.

WELLNESS CENTER $ 1.8 million*
Concentrating on the promotion of healthy living and prevention or reduction of disease by promoting avoidance of adverse lifestyles.

(continued)
RESEARCH INVESTMENT ACT
PROPOSAL

RESEARCH FUNDING NEEDS

Clemson
$197 million

USC
$248 million

MUSC
$155 million

TOTAL RESEARCH FUNDING NEED
$600 million

STATE'S SHARE
$300 million

$60 million per year for 5 years

THREE INSTITUTIONS' SHARE
$300 million

Generated from private and federal sources
Introduction

This document presents both existing and planned permanent improvement projects for Education and General and Public Service Activities. The projects are presented by expected funding source—capital improvement bonds, revenue producing activities and campus funds.

The priorities have been established through a campus-wide process initiated by President Lennon. An individual project list was developed based on needs forwarded by college deans and other directors. The list was reviewed by the deans, refined and recirculated. The Executive officers have approved the priorities and the biennia groupings presented herein.

Existing Projects

Capital bond projects to be completed within the next 10 months are the New Chemistry Building, the PEE DEE Research and Education Center, pesticide storage facilities and swine service facilities. Projects for which capital bonds were approved in June 1986 are listed below. The start date of these projects is dependent on release of the bond funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Authorization</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,112,534</td>
<td>Improvements to the Waste Water Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>Expansion of the Electrical Distribution System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>Continuing Education Center, Education Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,400,000</td>
<td>Show and Sale Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>Completion of Jordan Hall Basement, Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415,000</td>
<td>Laboratory for Hobcaw Barony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>Replacement for Pendleton Road Insectary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,140,000</td>
<td>Completion of Lehotsky Hall Basement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,754,534</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University had signed a consent decree with the Department of Health and Environmental Control pledging completion of the Waste Water Treatment Plant improvements by October 1987. Also of note is the fact the Belle W. Baruch Foundation has pledged $100,000 in addition to the bond funding for the Hobcaw Barony Laboratory.
Revenue producing activities include housing, athletics, dining halls, and the bookstore. These activities will spend approximately $4,450,000 on permanent improvements during the fiscal year. A new soccer stadium and an indoor tennis center will be the most visible of these projects.

Proposals for the University to acquire use of a $6,000,000 Computer Operations Building at the Clemson Research Park have recently been received and are being evaluated. This building will be leased from a private developer and be specifically designed to house the mainframe computer and operations support staff. The lease payment will be paid for from funds generated by the Computer Center.

FY 87 expenditures of campus permanent improvement funds are outlined below. All of these projects are expected to be complete by June 1987.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Funds</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Est'd. FY 86-87</td>
<td>Chill Water System/Sanitary Sewer Line Expansion</td>
<td>$3,272,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renovation of Godfrey Hall</td>
<td>980,672.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion of Jordan Hall Basement, Phase 2</td>
<td>266,902.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Engineering Clean Room</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements to the Water Treatment Plant</td>
<td>132,862.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove Asbestos-Lowry Hall, Rooms 125/127</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&amp;E fees outstanding for projects in abeyance</td>
<td>18,468.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Suites Renovation</td>
<td>11,421.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$4,992,326.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction of the Strom Thurmond Institute Building should begin in October. Estimated construction time is twenty-four months.

And finally, program and space planning is nearing completion for a textile/engineering research building. This facility will house several thrust areas. Federal grants will be sought to provide the $35,000,000 construction costs while $15,000,000 for equipment will be raised from state, private and foundation sources.
Capital Improvement Bonds

Capital Improvement Bonds (C.I.B.s) are issued and paid for by the State of South Carolina. The biennia are defined by the permanent improvement request/approval process. All State agencies submit their permanent improvement plans to either the Commission on Higher Education or the Budget and Control Board in June of odd-numbered years. The plans are reviewed, projects are prioritized and debated, and a bond bill is passed the following June, the even-numbered year. This plan provides the framework for Clemson University’s 1987 submittals.

Exhibit 1 on page 5 illustrates Clemson University’s capital bond request for the next three biennia. $105,605,000 for permanent improvements will be requested during this period. Major new facilities and renovations are outlined individually.

The $16,600,000 for asbestos abatement represents less than half of the total required to remove asbestos from all University buildings. Implementation of the entire abatement program will take 12-15 years.

Major maintenance is a generic category that summarizes needs to replace building components. These include but are not limited to roofs, gutters and downspouts, casements and fan coil units. A backlog of such projects exists and numerous campus buildings do not meet the “satisfactory” standard as defined by the C.H.E. The State should assume responsibility of protecting its capital investment. Similarly, campus utility systems need to be upgraded periodically to meet evermore stringent environmental requirements. Improvements to the Water Filtration Plant, Phase 2 is such a project and is expected to cost $5,000,000.

Both major renovations and new facilities will support existing academic programs and major research thrust areas. Major renovations totalling $24,800,000 will not only provide space responsive to program needs, but also will upgrade unsatisfactory buildings. The new facilities requested will support research, instruction and public service needs.
Revenue Producing Activities

These activities include housing, athletics, telecommunications, and student services as well as developments within the Strom Thurmond Center for Excellence in Government and Public Service. The projects listed below have been identified and are currently being evaluated. Each one will be analyzed for its ability to pay debt service from revenues as well as its impact on the overall debt of the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,615,000</td>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>Modernization of Telecommunication System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,700,000</td>
<td>Renovation of Johnstone Hall-Phases 1 &amp; 2 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>New Men's Dormitory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,000,000</td>
<td>Continuing Education Center (C.I.B.s Included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>Performing Arts Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31,000,000</td>
<td>Lakefront Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>East Campus Student Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$97,815,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campus Funds

Approximately $2,000,000 of campus funds will be spent each fiscal year on permanent improvements. Most of these funds will be spent on minor renovations.

Summary

Every University program is, in part, supported by physical facilities. Permanent improvements are necessary not only to maintain the integrity and functionality of existing facilities, but also to provide additional space for existing and emerging research and public service thrusts.

The projects outlined in this plan represent a significant financial commitment. Every effort will be made to secure funds from federal, private, foundation and other revenue sources for these improvements. Capital bond requests represent only 40% of the needed total.

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

#### Biennia Capital Improvement Bond Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Biennium 87/88</th>
<th>Biennium 89/90</th>
<th>Biennium 91/92</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>$6,100,000</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
<td>$5,100,000</td>
<td>$16,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504 (Handicapped) Compliance Modifications</td>
<td>3,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>1,155,000</td>
<td>1,160,000</td>
<td>1,075,000</td>
<td>3,390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Systems</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Renovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brackett Hall</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtzendorff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Res. Compliance Fac. #1</td>
<td>3,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Research Station</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edisto Office/Laboratory Bldg</td>
<td>4,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Sciences Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Resources Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotechnology Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Sci’s./Eng’rg Res. Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>770,000</td>
<td>1,990,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Capital Improvement Bonds**

|                      | $30,180,000 | $38,680,000 | $36,745,000 | $105,605,000 |
This past year the committee reviewed information that many students on academic probation (a GPR less than 2.00) were registering for more than the allowed 15 credit hours (See current statement below.). Faculty Senate Resolution FS-86-5-1 recommended that the Registrar’s Office take steps toward enforcing the policy.

This summer Provost Maxwell responded to this resolution. He reports that while the Registrar could nullify the schedules of students who violate this policy at the time of registration, he was concerned about the "outcry from students who can’t complete their registration because they can’t find their advisor." He further states that, "... at present, ... stricter enforcement of the policy rests largely with the advisor."

While awaiting the response of the Provost, the committee requested additional information concerning the performance of students on probation by class status and the number of hours registered. We requested this information to determine if the policy of limiting registration to 15 hours resulted in better academic performance. This information for both the Fall 85 and Spring 86 semesters revealed no relationship between grades earned and hours registered. There is no empirical support for a limit of 15 hours.

These data when combined with some previous information, however, suggest that many of these students are dropping courses during the semester. For instance, during the Spring 86 semester 333 of the 455 freshmen on probation registered for more than 15 hours. At the end of 4 weeks 100 had dropped to 15 hours or less, and by the end of the 10-week drop period another 111 dropped to 15 hours or less. Many students on probation are registering for more than 15 hours and then dropping hours during the semester.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

1) Given that the current policy listed below is not being enforced (and may be difficult to enforce) and that the current policy requires the approval of the department head, who may not be as familiar with a student’s record as the student’s advisor we recommend deleting the last sentence of the policy listed below. And, since evidence does not exist to support a limit of 15 hours, the committee recommends that the 15-hour limit be listed as a recommendation. Therefore, the following is recommended. The current statement (1986-87 Undergraduate Announcements, p 42),

"The maximum number of hours in which a student may enroll is 21, and 15 is the maximum credit hours for those on probation. Written permission of the department head in which the student is a major is required for all registration involving more than 21 hours, or 15 maximum credit hours for those on probation."

be replaced with the following,

"The maximum number of hours in which a student may enroll is 21, and 15 is the recommended maximum credit hours for those on probation."

2) The committee also recognizes that students on probation should be careful in selecting their academic schedule. And, although there are a number of factors to be considered in selecting a schedule, a guideline of 15 hours (5 courses) maximum in a semester is reasonable. Therefore, as a guideline for both the student and the advisor, the committee recommends that the following statement (or one similar) be included on the preregistration and registration forms for students on probation,

"It is recommended that students on probation register for no more than 15 hours per semester."
Attachment H

STANDING COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Senator Daniels..............Welfare
Senator Woodard..............Research
Senator Madison..............Policy

ELECTION BALLOT

Commission on Graduate Studies and Research (select one, to replace Senator Moran)

Hedden..................................X
Jenny......................................
Reichenbach..............................

Commission on Student Affairs (select one to replace Senator Bishop; representative form a college other than Agriculture or Engineering)

Madison.................................X

Alcohol and Drug Abuse (select one to replace Senator Moran)

Hendrix, Wm. (Management)..._____
LaTorre.................................X

Greek Affairs (select one to complete the second year of Senator Moran's 2 year term)

Woodard...............................X
I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

President Dyck introduced the Vice President for Student Affairs, Manning "Nick" Lomax. V.P. Lomax expressed his appreciation to the Senators for inviting him and especially thanked those who had participated in the interviewing process for his position. They provided input on the feelings of the Faculty Senate about issues related to Student Affairs. V.P. Lomax then answered a list of questions drafted by the Senate Advisory/Executive Committee.

1. How do you expect the Student Affairs area to change now that you have shed the "acting" portion of your vice presidential title?

V.P. Lomax said that he has great respect for President Walter Cox and hopes to retain the dignity and caring attitude that Cox brought to the division as well as the interest in the welfare of the students and the good framework he had devel-
oped. There are changes to be made, however, and he will use the input he received during the search and from people on campus. As soon as the new assistant vice president for student affairs is appointed, counseling and career planning will be moved under that assistant vice president, which is a more appropriate location. Career services and cooperative education will no longer report directly to the Vice President, but rather to this assistant vice president also, thereby putting counseling/career planning and career services under the same assistant vice president. There will be other minor changes. He has, for example, asked Dean Skelton to look into the proper alignment of international student programs.

2. Do you have specific plans for increasing faculty input into the operations of student affairs? Please respond to the following ideas: 1) establish advisory committees, with significant faculty representation, for each of your department heads; 2) appoint an individual with considerable academic background as the assistant vice president for student affairs.

1) Plans for this are on the move now. Student
Affairs is investigating current means of faculty input and Lomax has asked department heads for what they see as the best method for faculty input—liaison, advisory committee, etc.—are. All Student Affairs departments will have faculty input. 2) V.P. Lomax will appoint an individual with considerable academic interest; academic background is not essential. This person needs to be an organizer who can pull together groups and should have an interest in faculty and in seeking faculty input.

3. There has been much discussion of East Campus Development within the student affairs area, but very little throughout the entire campus. What mechanism will you use to increase campus wide discussion of revenue generating projects? V.P. Lomax said that the East Campus Activities and Recreational Complex will satisfy a critical need. It will have a bookstore, canteen, meeting rooms, and recreational facilities that will relieve the burden on Fike and satisfy faculty and students’ recreational needs. The financing would be difficult if state funding or student fees were relied upon, so there is a need to produce revenue at the site through the bookstore and possible franchising of other stores. These revenues will
be needed in financing non-revenue-producing areas such as meeting rooms. They have a consultant now who is looking at what is needed and how it can be financed.

Another major project is the renovation of Holtzendorff. This will be costly but they need space into which to expand student affairs programs, especially career services and student life. A planning committee was formed a couple of years ago which put together a rough plan. They are looking to the state as the source of funding.

Senator Linvill asked who was on the planning committee. V.P. Lomax indicated that he can supply the names. Senator Calhoun inquired about making the bookstore an outlet for computers. V.P. Lomax said that better access for use of computers has been made available in residence halls. Consequently, an outlet for sale or rental of terminals is a possibility in the future.

4. What is the position of the Office of Student Affairs on the proposed athletic dorm? What is your professional view on the merits of an athletic dorm? How does the proposal for a men's dorm, listed in the Permanent Improvement Plan,
relate to the athletic dorm? Please provide details.

The administration's position on the sensitive issue of the athletic dorm is that it is feasible only if it is in the best interest of the University. This is a bad time to propose an athletic dorm because there are so many athletic issues in the air. The administration is not in a position nor does it desire to recommend moving ahead on a dorm at this time. They recognize the Faculty Senate's position as recently stated, but they also understand that there are those in the athletic department who want a dorm. The project is on hold right now. In V.P. Lomax's professional opinion, a dorm should not be built if it will just be used for recruiting, but it must be a positive part of the academic program as well as the athletic program. He would like to see a return to the days when athletes could participate more in other student activities and views the isolation of athletes as one drawback to a dorm.

Senator Nowaczyk asked if Student Affairs was looking at what the athletes thought of Mauldin Hall and at whether it was helping or hindering academic progress. V.P. Lomax replied that they had instituted a stronger monitoring process of
the academic progress of athletes and that it was now a part of the evaluations of coaches' performances. Senator Mullins asked if Student Affairs approved of the Senate resolution suggesting that athletic dorms be banned in the ACC. V.P. Lomax said that they were not ready to do so now and would wait until Clemson has a firm position on the issue before making any recommendations to the ACC. President Dyck asked in what forum the debate should take place when the final decision about the dorm was being made. V.P. Lomax expects to receive input from the faculty through the Faculty Senate if or when the issue is taken off the table. It is tabled, but not dead.

On the issue of the men's dorm, V.P. Lomax indicated that he had recently received the feasibility study about Johnstone Hall and whether it should be renovated ($25 million) or replaced ($35 million.) If renovated, it will be done in stages and a men's dorm would probably have to be built to accommodate students who would be displaced during renovation. The new dorm would not necessarily be designated as an athletic dorm. The renovation of Johnstone Hall is the number one priority in University Housing and they will
be presenting the plan to the Planning Board soon.

5. Many universities have directed their health services toward a wellness center. What plans, if any, do you have to redirect health services at Clemson?

The East Campus Facility Planning Committee considered the wellness center in its planning. If the Student Health Service, which is an auxiliary enterprise, is to be considered as part of the wellness program for employees, additional staff and funding would be needed to expand services. A source for those funds would have to be found.

6. Many corporations and businesses have recognized the merits of providing periodic physical examinations for their employees. Would your office support the use of Redfern physicians to provide physicals for university personnel?

V.P. Lomax said that he has no objection to this, but questioned who would pay for it. Would the University pay from sources other than student fees? Overall he is pleased with Clemson's health services.

7. The placement services offered to our students have the reputation, in some quarters, of being very good for engineers, but of little assistance
to those in other fields. What efforts should be made to change this perception?

V.P. Lomax said that the faculty advisory groups should give input and that Student Affairs should find out from deans and department heads how a more effective service can be provided. Individual faculty members should call him if there are problems.

8. Currently faculty members are requested to provide the University with a 52% overhead on most extramural grants and contracts. By comparison what level of overhead is paid by the revenue generating areas under the umbrella of Student Affairs (e.g. bookstore, housing, athletics)?

V.P. Lomax responded that he was not familiar with how the 52% overhead was calculated or used. The Student Affairs auxiliaries do pay totally for themselves. With Housing, for example, the revenues from student rentals pay operating costs and amortize the cost of building that housing. It operates free of dependency on funds other than housing fees; it uses no state-appropriated dollars. Student Affairs pays administrative overhead costs back to the E & G budget which makes it totally independent. He views auxili-
aries and the grants program as two totally different operations.

Senator Mullins asked who will be paying for the asbestos removal. V.P. Lomax responded that he hoped that the auxiliaries would not have to pay for it, because it will be so costly. Students should not have to pay double the cost of normal room rental because of something like this. It will probably be resolved in the courts.

President Dyck asked how administrative overheads are calculated. V.P. Lomax said that they use a national formula that has been developed by various academic accounting firms. He has asked V.P. Larson for more details on how overhead costs are determined.

9. Although the Board of Trustees permits a waiver on out-of-state tuition for scholarship athletes, IPTAY maintains that they pay all the costs for scholarships athletes at Clemson. Could it be an oversight that out-of-state tuition is not paid by IPTAY? Given the budgetary cutbacks the University is undergoing, would you be willing to ask IPTAY to assume the costs?

The waiver is not an oversight. Approximately fifteen years ago, the University of South Caro-
lina and Clemson worked to get a waiver of out-of-state tuition for scholarship athletes. Things have changed since then, so it may need to be looked at, but it cannot be viewed as an automatic source of new revenue. A group is looking into this to see how a change would affect the formula. Full payment may be a possibility, but V.P. Lomax needs to look at how a change would affect the University overall.

Senator Hare asked how customary this waiver was in other states. Lomax indicated that he did not know, but that others such as graduate students also do not pay out-of-state tuition.

10. As the Athletic Council undergoes revision, one of the major problems they face is obtaining access to information required to carry out the spirit of the NCAA's "Principle of Institutional Control and Responsibility." How do you recommend the Council solve its problem?

V.P. Lomax responded that he and the administration will be completely open with the Athletic Council. It should review its guidelines and purpose, and become better versed in how the athletic department is run. The Council as well as the Faculty Senate will have access to all
information they desire.

President Dyck said that the Athletic Council's problem was in not getting guidance as to whether it or the administration assumes institutional control. Is the Athletic Council a policy or advisory group? Lomax responded that a subcommittee of the Council is investigating this, as well as other issues, and their findings may change his views. The current role of the Council is an advisory one. It can get involved to a greater degree, but it should not be a decision-making body. President Dyck asked where institutional control does lie and Lomax responded that it lay with Athletic Director, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the President. At this point, President Lennon commented that it was a policy/advisory group where all interests come together and that it was, therefore, important. Lomax indicated that the Council should advise him, the Athletic Director and the President on athletic issues.

11. There are many unanswered questions associated with a much publicized incident in which current and former football athletes were alleged to be involved with cocaine. In an attempt to reconcile
perceived improprieties, please provide the following information: 1) Who hired the lawyers for the football players? 2) Who paid for the lawyers? 3) Were drug tests performed on the players? 4) When, where and what type of tests were performed? 5) What were the test results, and what conclusions do you draw relative to the students' use of cocaine? 6) How do you respond to the following comment? A non-athlete would not receive the same university assistance from the Office of Student Affairs as did these athletes.

Vice President Lomax responded that the football players hired the lawyers and are responsible for paying them. Contact with the lawyers was made by Coach Ford and the players. No one associated with IPTAY or the athletic department will pay and the lawyers cannot render the service for free because both would violate NCAA regulations. It was not out of order for Coach Ford to advise the athletes to get a lawyer or to make suggestions on whom to call, because of the close coach/athlete relationship. Drug tests were performed on the athletes on the Monday morning following the incident and were processed at the Anderson Memorial Hospital, where they were found
to be negative. The players were not mandated by
the administration to take the tests. Since the
tests were negative, drug use must be assumed to
be negative.

The sixth is a tough question. V.P. Lomax could
not remember a similar incident. When students
in trouble have gone to him, he has recommended
that they get an attorney and sometimes given a
name. The same treatment, following due process,
was given in this case, as in any other, but the
circumstances were not normal. The wide publici-
ty created pressure to move away from due process
but the University did not give in to that
pressure. Student Affairs talked to the students
about their conduct and how it reflects on the
University. The athletes received a reprimand
and additional penalties from the Athletic Depart-
ment, which follow that department's guidelines.
He believe that it was handled properly under the
circumstances. As to whether there was any
violation of the honor code, student leaders have
been asked to review the honor code and, in
particular, how it relates to off-campus
incidents.

Senator Nowaczyk asked about the timing on the
drug tests. V.P. Lomax responded that the tests were taken forty-eight hours after the incident and that he understood that cocaine can be detected from up to three to four weeks after use. He believes that the campus has a renewed awareness of the problem, but again stated that nothing in the charges related to the use of cocaine. President Dyck said that he understood that in 99% of cases, after forty-eight hours it is impossible to detect cocaine in the urine test (which is more accurate than the blood test.) V.P. Lomax said that that may be right, but that the tests were not required and that he was fairly sure that the students did not know the time limits when they offered to take the tests.

Senator King asked how the two athletes were reprimanded by the Athletic Department. Lomax said that he could not go into details on how it was handled, but that he supports the in-house actions of the Department, which are constructive, geared toward proper corrective action, and serve as a deterrent to others.

12. Recently the Universities of Georgia, Maryland, and North Carolina transferred control of their tutoring programs to departments outside ath-
15. Athletics. Should Clemson undertake a related feasibility study and look at the possible transfer of tutoring services into the academic affairs area?

V.P. Lomax said that he had discussed this with Dean Skelton recently, because he is sensitive to this issue. He wants the tutoring program in the best location and will be receiving ideas from Skelton soon. It may be discussed by the Athletic Council and he would not discourage closer academic alignment.

13. The Faculty Senate recommended that the University follow the trend established at many peer institutions and transfer the Admissions Office from Student Affairs into Academic Affairs. Please explain your position on this issue.

About the location of Admissions, V.P. Lomax said that he has to ask where it will benefit the University most effectively. There is currently good morale in that unit and they are a full part of Student Affairs. Would they become an island if they were in a different place—not a part of Student Affairs and not a part of the faculty? He knows the opinion of the Faculty Senate and will look at options during the coming year. Faculty involvement is essential.
14. The President recently appointed an ad hoc committee to deal with "admissions exceptions." What is the responsibility of this committee when it comes to athletes?

The committee will function as it did last year. If athletes do not meet the 700 SAT/2.0 GPR minimum, their files will go before the committee. Every exception and appeal for students, including athletes, who do not meet normal criteria will go to the committee. If a student's credentials are at 700 SAT/2.0 GPR, for example, and below what is required to get him into his area of interest, those credentials will be considered by the appeals committee.

Senator Hare asked if the students will be identified or anonymous. V.P. Lomax responded that they will be identified; the committee needs to know why the folder is in front of them.

Senator Nowaczyk wanted to know if this was a change from last year when athletes who had signed letters of intent were automatically admitted. V. P. Lomax stated that commitments had been made to students last year before the new NCAA guidelines were approved. The University honored those
commitments. This will not be the case for students entering for 1987.

15. Many universities around the country have a policy related to dramatic productions that is sensitive to both community standards and the artistic freedom of its faculty. Do you think advertising the occurrence of profanity, nudity, etc., would be a satisfactory method for meeting community standards and protecting artistic freedom? On this issue, V.P. Lomax said that everyone needs to get ahead of the game. Those involved in theater should present a set of guidelines saying how they want to handle sensitive issues. He does not know what kinds of pressures theater people are under or what normal criteria would be. Better communication with the administration will prevent them from being caught off guard.

Senators Daniel and Birrenkott asked if Lomax was aware that recently a private vendor had begun to sell barbecue at football games in competition with the students who had always done it previously and had taken over 50% of the sales. V.P. Lomax said that he would look into it.

Senator Mullins asked whether the Planning Board or some appropriate group had approved the large
tiger paw on the stadium. V.P. Lomax said that he had heard the comments and knows he needs to be more involved in "graphics" in the athletic areas.

President Dyck thanked V.P. Lomax for speaking to the Senate.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes were approved as amended.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Policy: Senator Linvill gave the committee's report (Attachment A.)

B. Research: no report.

C. Scholastic Policies: Senator Nowaczyk gave the committee's report (Attachment B.) He also commented that the prognosis for Senate Resolution FS 86-2-2 was not good and that he was trying to get three Senate resolutions out of subcommittees of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. He distributed a handout (Attachment C) which describes the current situation in undergraduate studies, admissions and enrollment. Scholastic Policies will discuss the issue and try to present something to the Senate at the next meeting. They would like to hear from Senators about what is
wanted. Should the current situation continue, where Admissions and Continuing Enrollment is handled by non-elected faculty who are appointed by the President and do not report to the faculty? Or do we want to elect members who would be responsible to the faculty, thereby adhering to the guidelines in the Faculty Manual?

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

E. Ad Hoc Committees:
Fine Arts: Senator Nowaczyk reported that they had received responses from 20 of the 47 surveys that they sent out. A surprising number of them were in agreement with each other. The committee hopes to have a report at the next meeting.
Planning Board: Senator Huey gave the committee's report (Attachment E) and also drew the Senate's attention to Item 2. in the President's Report. He noted that V.P. Larson seemed committed to making the new Facilities Planning Committee work and that it had good representation of faculty. The committee will make a recommendation as to how faculty representatives should be selected, but the Senate Advisory Committee should appoint interim representatives until the election takes
place. He indicated that he was submitting all relevant documentation with his report, so that it would become part of the record.

F. University Committees/Commissions:
Admission and Continuing Enrollment: Senator LaTorre read the report (Attachment F.) She indicated that she had more data than that which she described in her report and Senator Calhoun asked her if there had been an increase in the number of applicants between last year and this year. She said the numbers were 6440 for 1985 and 6395 for 1986. Senator LaTorre also noted that this committee often does not discuss the issues, but rather refers them to subcommittees immediately, where issues are often decided by two people. President Dyck said that if the faculty is not given the opportunity to give input that the issue should be tabled so that it can be discussed by the faculty.
Alcohol and Drug Abuse: Senator Nowaczyk said that the committee had changed its name to Alcohol and Drug Awareness. Senator LaTorre gave the report (Attachment G.) They both said that October 20 through 26 would be Collegiate Alcohol Awareness Week in South Carolina (Attachment H.)
Undergraduate Studies: Senator Nowaczyk said that
the Senate's recommendation of last month about probation was passed unanimously and forwarded.
He also discussed the proposal for admissions policies to a Special Institute including standards for high school students. Exceptional students, with SATs of 1200 or higher, can take college courses already, but no standards exist for students who have not taken their SATs and who might increase the enrollment in some of the Institute courses. Senator LaTorre worried whether there were legitimate courses for these students and whether they should be receiving college credit for courses that may not be at college level. College curriculum committees should discuss this issue.
Joint City/University Advisory: Senator Mullins gave the report (Attachment I.)

V. PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Attachment J)
President Dyck stressed various items in the Report and the Update. He said that an ad hoc committee had been selected from the Athletic Council to look into Items 1 and Update 2. He suggested that Item 5 be circulated to faculty in all the colleges. The Scholastic Policies Committee will take up Item 6.

VI. OLD BUSINESS
There was no old business.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Senator Mullins introduced a resolution, FS 86-10-1 (Attachment K) and moved that it be adopted. It is in response to a proposal by the Office of Institutional Advancement from a suggestion made by President Lennon. Mullins said that the object of the resolution was to make the award distinct from something presented by the faculty. The resolution passed unanimously.

Senator Mullins introduced resolution FS 86-10-2 (Attachment K) and moved adoption. There was no discussion. The resolution passed unanimously.

Senator Calhoun introduced a resolution, FS 86-10-3 (Attachment L), and moved its adoption. The resolution is in reaction to a letter from Purvis Collins at the State Insurance Office refusing President Lennon's request that the districting for HMOs be changed. After a brief discussion of HMO options, the resolution passed unanimously.

Senator LaTorre moved that the Faculty Senate endorse both the Student Senate's endorsement of the ESUBA walk (Item 6 in Attachment J) and the efforts of the Alcohol and Drug Awareness Committee and the Office of
Student Life in educating the community about these issues during Collegiate Alcohol Drug Abuse Week (Attachment H.) Senator Mullins said that he hoped that it would be made clear that this was not an endorsement of any political candidate who might be involved in these activities. The motion passed unanimously and will be communicated via a letter by President Dyck.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margery N. Sly
Secretary

Senators absent: Baron, Bryan, Drews, Gardner, Lyson, Polk, Snelsire, Stillwell.

Alternates present: Davis (for Polk).
The Policy Committee met October 8, 1986. General Clausen, Secretary to the Clemson Board of Trustees, attended the meeting to discuss how information contained in the Faculty Manual can be put in a convenient form for use by the Board. He is in the process of compiling Policy statements currently in effect.

The Policy Committee will prepare a copy(s) of the Manual for use by the Board in its deliberations. This copy will have sections containing policy highlighted for easy reference. Having such a Manual on hand will ease the job of the Secretary as he advises the Board in their work.

In addition to a special copy of the Manual, a copy of the Table of Contents will be added as an appendix to the Trustees Manual. This copy of the Table of Contents will be annotated referencing specific paragraphs stating policy.

Respectfully submitted,

Dale E. Linvill
Chairman
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE REPORT

OCTOBER 16, 1986

The committee met on September 30th. The main agenda item focused on the ad hoc admissions exception committee formed by the President. The discussion centered around possible responses by the Faculty Senate with regard to the formation and constitution of a permanent admissions exception committee. The Scholastic Policies committee felt that a faculty majority was necessary and that the faculty members should be elected by the faculty and accountable to the faculty. Action was deferred until the Commission on Undergraduate Studies responded to an earlier faculty resolution (FS86-2-2) which called for the establishment of an admissions committee separate from the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron Nowaczyk, Chair
INFORMATION FOR FACULTY SENATE Attachment C

COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES
(11 of 27 members are elected faculty)

ADMISSIONS AND CONTINUING ENROLLMENT
(10 of 14 members are elected faculty)

APPEALS COMMITTEE
(9 of 10 are appt. faculty)

ADMISSIONS EXCEPTIONS COMMITTEE
(3 of 5 are appt. faculty)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Academic Suspension - Student who at the time of review (Spring and/or 2nd Summer session) does not have required minimum GPR (11-20 credits - 1.4 GPR; 21-50 credits - 1.6 GPR; 51-80 credits - 1.9 GPR; 81 or more credits - 2.0 GPR). This is different from academic probation which means that at the end of any enrollment period, a student has a GPR less than 2.0.

Admission Exception - Applicant who does not have predicted GPR of 2.00 (which is based primarily on SAT and HS Rank). This is different from NCAA requirements for athletic eligibility (the "700 rule").

Appeals Committee - Has been in existence for a number of years. Most recently it reviewed 263 appeals. The committee reports overall statistics to Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee but does not require the approval of its actions by the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee.

Admission Exceptions Committee - Formed this past Spring by President Lennon. Reviewed 85 applicants. For scholarship athletes, no action was permitted.

FS 86-2-2 - Faculty Senate resolution passed last February recommending that an Admissions committee separate from the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee be formed to review admissions policies and admission exceptions. This committee would be composed of 11 members, 9 of which are elected faculty. The current status of the resolution is that it is in a subcommittee of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies.
From: Richard J. Calhoun, Chairman, Welfare Committee

To: Larry Dyck, President, Faculty Senate

Re: October Report

Date: October 14, 1986

The Welfare Committee will introduce a resolution under new business in an attempt to secure a feasible HMO option for Clemson faculty who reside in Pickens County.

Our meeting on October 7 was the first telecommunications conference between committees of the Faculty Senate here and our equivalent at USC. The chairman is preparing a typescript of a recording of the meeting. We compared fringe benefits available at the two universities; we considered possible additional fringe benefits for all state employees; we discussed in detail fringe benefits appropriate for faculty as a special group and how we might make a case. A resolution has been offered at USC supporting the Leatherman Bill offering alternative retirement for some faculty. The Welfare Committee will make a decision on another resolution from the Faculty Senate here after a further study of the bill in its present form. The Senate passed a resolution last year. We compared ideas on faculty salaries, on merit raises and cost of living increments, and on salaries for new and fairness to longtime faculty.

Everyone felt that this communication was valuable, and we hope to do this again on this committee, and recommend such a conference, when appropriate, for other committees.

We hope to distribute additional information on this telecommunications conference at the next meeting.
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE PLANNING BOARD

REPORT

October 14, 1986

The Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Planning Board met several times since its formation in May. The committee first considered the function and composition of the Planning Board and made a series of recommendations in that regard. Later it responded to a proposal from Vice President Larson for a Facilities Planning Committee to replace both the Planning Board and the Commission on Physical Facilities. Copies of all recommendations from the committee and some other pertinent documents are attached for the record.

As matters now stand, both the Planning Board and the Commission on Physical Facilities are to be eliminated. They are to be replaced by the Facilities Planning Committee mentioned above. The ad hoc committee had some success in influencing the details of the new committee's structure and composition. However, there is still concern over several issues, primarily the large size of the committee, the comprehensiveness of its mission, and the absence of a check on its authority. These concerns and others are documented in the attachments. The new committee will include several faculty members to be named by the Senate. A recommendation for procedures to be followed in selecting these representatives will be forthcoming.
ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A
Proposal from Dr. Snell to President Lennon for changes in the composition of the Planning Board.

Attachment B
Recommendations from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Planning Board concerning the composition, function, and operating procedures of the Planning Board.

Attachment C
Final recommendation from Dr. Snell to President Lennon regarding the Planning Board.

Attachment D
Proposal from Vice President Larson for a Physical Facilities Planning Committee.

Attachment E
Response from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Planning Board to the proposal for a Physical Facilities Planning Committee.

Attachment F
Additional response from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Planning Board to the proposal for a Physical Facilities Planning Committee.

Attachment G
Final proposal from Vice President Larson for a Facilities Planning Committee as approved by the President's Cabinet, September 29, 1986.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Max Lennon, President

FROM: A. W. Snell, Chairman, University Planning Board

SUBJECT: University Planning Board membership

Rationale and suggested changes

The University Planning Board ensures that the Campus Master Plan is used to guide the orderly and cohesive development of the campus. The board reviews any proposed changes in the physical environment for consistency with the Master Plan, examines any proposed change in the Master Plan, and makes recommendations to the president.

The intent of the board structure is to maximize input from and information to all university groups with the smallest membership possible. Members of the Planning Board can be categorized as belonging to one of three distinct groups:

1. Representatives of functional areas involved in campus planning and/or modification
2. Representatives of constituent groups, whose input is necessary and desired, affected by planning
3. Individuals with an area of expertise that can aid in evaluating physical ramifications of planning.

The majority of members serve as a result of their position. The Campus Master Planner is the professional advisor to the board and ex officio member. Attachment I illustrates the existing structure. Current board members are identified with their generic position.

Membership continuity is felt to be crucial to the successful evolvement of the Master Plan. The complexity of issues addressed, their relationship to other issues, and the data base needed for evaluation requires experience with the plan and a broad base of knowledge. This consideration and the fact that many members serve by virtue of their position limits rotation.

The membership structure was reviewed last August by the board, but no substantive changes were recommended.
Based on your desire for more faculty representation and the need for additional professional input, it is suggested that membership changes as outlined below and illustrated in Attachment II be considered at this time. The Planning Board will continue to invite certain individuals for specific issues as needed.

**New Members**

1. A landscape architect. Potential candidate - Mary Haque, ASLA, Associate Professor of Horticulture.

2. A civil engineer with preferred expertise in traffic and transportation. Potential candidates - J. E. Clark, Professor of Civil Engineering; or J. L. Josey, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering.

**Substitutions**

1. Superintendent of Planning and Engineering (university architect) for Director of the Physical Plant. The university architect is better trained to address the majority of issues that come before the board and can also represent Physical Plant interests. He normally serves as a member of the Building Committee.

**Deletion**

1. Director of Athletics. His interests can and should be represented by the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs.

These changes are consistent with the structural intent and needs of the Planning Board and your desire for additional faculty involvement. I will be happy to discuss this matter further at your convenience.
EXISTING MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURE

BUSINESS & FINANCE
- Vice President
- Vacant

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- Vice Provost
- Undergraduate Programs
- Jerry Reel

STUDENT AFFAIRS
- Assistant Vice President
- Nick Lomax

PUBLIC SERVICE
- Associate Director
- SC Ag. Experiment Station
- Ab Snell

ATHLETICS
- Director
- Bobby Robinson

FACULTY
- Vice President / President Elect
- Faculty Senate
- Joe Mullins

STUDENTS
- President Student Body
- Fred Richey

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
- Chairman Board of Trustees Planning Committee
- Dr. John J. Britton

ALUMNI
- Executive Director Alumni Affairs
- George Moore

PHYSICAL PLANT
- Director
- Walt Stone

ARCHITECTURE
- Professor
- Joe Young

CAMPUS PLANNING (non-voting)
- Campus Master Planner
- Mark Wright

CAMPUS PLANNING (non-voting)
- Assistant Campus Master Planner
- Lee Miller

Rotating Positions
PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURE

ADMINISTRATION AREA REPS.
BUSINESS & FINANCE
- Vice President
- Vacant

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- Vice Provost
- Undergraduate Programs
- Jerry Reel

STUDENT AFFAIRS
- Assistant Vice President
- Nick Lomax

PUBLIC SERVICE
- Associate Director
- SC Ag. Experiment Station
- Ab Snell

CONSTITUENT GROUP REPS.
FACULTY
- Vice President / President Elect
- Faculty Senate
- Joe Mullins

STUDENTS
- President Student Body
- Fred Richey

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
- Chairman Board of Trustees Planning Committee
- Dr. John J. Britton

ALUMNI
- Executive Director
- Alumni Affairs
- George Moore

EXPERTS
PHYSICAL PLANT
- Superintendent of Planning & Engineering
- Jerry Boyer, AIA

ARCHITECTURE
- Professor
- Joe Young, FAIA

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
- Professor
- Mary Taylor Hague, ASLA

CIVIL ENGINEERING
- Professor
- Ed Clark, PE or Larry Josey, PE

PROFESSIONAL ADVISOR
CAMPUS PLANNING
- (non-voting)
- Campus Master Planner
- Mark Wright

CAMPUS PLANNING
- (non-voting)
- Assistant Campus Master Planner
- LeeMiller

Rotating Positions
MEMO TO: Dr. A. W. Snell, Chairman
University Planning Board

THROUGH: Dr. L. A. Dyck, President
Faculty Senate

FROM: Cecil O. Huey, Chairman
Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Planning Board

DATE: June 2, 1986

SUBJECT: Committee Recommendations Regarding the Planning Board

You will find attached a report from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Planning Board. At the suggestion of the Senate President, Larry Dyck, the committee considered the purpose and function of the Board, the composition of the Board, and methods to improve communication with the Board. Accordingly, each of these items is addressed in the report. Specific recommendations are made with regard to each of them.

Although the committee had only a short period of time in which to work, these recommendations were carefully formulated and have been reviewed by several present and former members of the Board. There is general agreement that the decision making process with regard to campus development will be substantially improved if the recommendations are implemented.

/cc: Committee Members:
Dr. William Baron
Prof. Martin A. Davis
Dr. Thomas A. Lyson
Dr. Joseph C. Mullins
The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Planning Board was charged with conducting a review of the Planning Board with the aim of preparing specific recommendations concerning its composition, operation, and function. The committee met with the three past Senate representatives to the Planning Board and the Campus Master Planner, Mark Wright. This meeting served to acquaint the committee members with the current make-up of the Board and the operating procedures being followed. The committee also received a memo to President Lennon from the current Board Chairman suggesting changes in membership. In addition, individual members of the committee received information through contact with other interested individuals and faculty. The recommendations found below were drafted after that meeting and were subsequently reviewed by all of the individuals mentioned above.

At the suggestion of the Senate President, the committee directed its attention to the following three areas:

1. Purpose and function of the Planning Board,
2. Composition of the Planning Board, including the membership, procedures for selecting members, and lengths of terms for members,
3. Mechanisms for both gaining access to the Board and for disseminating information from the Board.

Accordingly, the recommendations given below are directed at these three areas.

**Purpose and Function of the Planning Board**

The Planning Board should facilitate the creation of a good physical environment on the campus to foster study and learning and to enhance life in the university community. The Board should deal with all aspects of land use, including planning, architectural design, landscaping, and transportation, to insure compatibility with the short and long term educational and financial goals of the university. The Master Plan, as developed and interpreted, should serve as a reference document to guide the Planning Board in considering the overall physical development of the campus. The Planning Board should endeavor especially to insure that design for future building projects fully reflects both programmatic needs and the constraints of the campus environment. To these ends the Board should clarify and refine its method of operation and expand its expertise to encompass the larger aspects of planning. The following measures are recommended in this regard:

1. Make a review of issues affecting the quality of design of the campus environment a formal part of the evaluation of proposed building projects.
2. Evaluate and periodically review the architectural design guidelines currently in use.

3. Review the design programs for any future building projects to assist architects in better understanding the campus setting and the programmatic needs of the building. The Board should also have the authority to require that any future building projects comply with the architectural guidelines referred to above.

4. Have the College of Architecture representative on the Planning Board be a permanent member with appropriate credentials in design.

Some of the additional recommendations given below bear on these same issues.

**Composition of the Planning Board**

The committee generally endorsed the recommendation of the current Planning Board chairman (see attachment). However, some additional changes were felt to be appropriate. These changes are as follows:

1. Remove the member of the Board of Trustees. Having a trustee serve on a committee that makes recommendations to the President, who serves at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees and who, in turn, makes recommendations to it, is fundamentally inconsistent with the purpose and function of either the Board of Trustees or the Planning Board.

2. Substitute the new Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources in the Public Service block of the proposed Membership Structure. This adjustment would result in a broader representation at the level of upper administrators on the Planning Board.

3. Have the faculty representative be chosen so that his term of office would span three years. The current practice of naming the Senate vice president to this position each year results in turnover that is too rapid for effective representation. The faculty representative should be named by the Senate and should be given the responsibility of maintaining the communication link between the Board and the Senate that now exists. Further consultation with the Senate may be required to determine how this representative should be selected.

**Mechanisms for Access to the Planning Board and for Dissemination of Information**

To insure adequate input on important issues, steps must be taken to develop a greater awareness of the Planning Board and of the matters that come before it. Currently the activities of the Planning Board are obscured from most individuals on the campus—a fact that contributes to the rather cynical view of Clemson's decision making process in general. The following actions are recommended:
1. Establish and publish a full description of the purpose, duties, procedures, and authority of the Board. Of special importance in this regard are procedures for dealing with new business items in Board meetings. A clear statement of procedures and responsibilities should help prevent the Board from being by-passed on issues within its purview and should insure adequate review of all items of business.

2. Place notices of meetings together with the meeting agenda in the Clemson University Newsletter and in the Tiger. This should provide adequate notice on matters to be considered and should help avoid the unpleasant surprises that shock the campus from time to time.

3. Establish a procedure for holding campus hearings on matters that have a campus-wide impact. These hearings should serve to keep the university community informed of issues of general importance. They should also insure that the Board receives adequate input from all viewpoints when important decisions are to be made.

4. Elect or appoint a secretary with responsibility for publishing abbreviated minutes of Planning Board meetings. Distribution of minutes of the Board meetings should substantially improve the general campus awareness of the actions of the Board. It should also reduce the number of instances in which decisions are made at other levels without input from the Planning Board.

5. Issue formal statements recommending either approval or disapproval of proposed building projects. These statements should describe in explicit terms the basis for the recommendation. Clear and definitive statements should help the Board assert an authoritative voice in the campus decision making process.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Max Lennon, President
FROM: A. W. Snell, Chairman, University Planning Board
SUBJECT: University Planning Board membership
Rationale and suggested changes

The University Planning Board ensures that the Campus Master Plan is used to guide the orderly and cohesive development of the campus. The board reviews any proposed changes in the physical environment for consistency with the Master Plan, examines any proposed change in the Master Plan, and makes recommendations to the president.

The intent of the board structure is to maximize input from and information to all university groups with the smallest membership possible. Members of the Planning Board can be categorized as belonging to one of three distinct groups:

1. Representatives of functional areas involved in campus planning and/or modification
2. Representatives of constituent groups, whose input is necessary and desired, affected by planning
3. Individuals with an area of expertise that can aid in evaluating physical ramifications of planning.

The majority of members serve as a result of their position. The Campus Master Planner is the professional advisor to the board and ex officio member. Attachment I illustrates the existing structure. Current board members are identified with their generic position.

Membership continuity is felt to be crucial to the successful evolution of the Master Plan. The complexity of issues addressed, their relationship to other issues, and the data base needed for evaluation requires experience with the plan and a broad base of knowledge. This consideration and the fact that many members serve by virtue of their position limits rotation.

The membership structure was reviewed last August by the board, but no substantive changes were recommended.
Based on your desire for more faculty representation and the need for additional professional input, it is suggested that membership changes as outlined below and illustrated in Attachment II be considered at this time. The Planning Board will continue to invite certain individuals for specific issues as needed.

New Members

1. A landscape architect. Potential candidate – Mary Haque, ASLA, Associate Professor of Horticulture.

2. A civil engineer with preferred expertise in traffic and transportation. Potential candidates – J. E. Clark, Professor of Civil Engineering; or J. L. Josey, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering.

Substitutions

1. Superintendent of Planning and Engineering (university architect) for Director of the Physical Plant. The university architect is better trained to address the majority of issues that come before the board and can also represent Physical Plant interests. He normally serves as a member of the Building Committee.

Deletion

1. Director of Athletics. His interests can and should be represented by the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs.

These changes are consistent with the structural intent and needs of the Planning Board and your desire for additional faculty involvement. I will be happy to discuss this matter further at your convenience.
EXISTING MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURE

BUSINESS & FINANCE
- Vice President: Vacant

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- Vice Provost Undergraduate Programs: Jerry Reel

STUDENT AFFAIRS
- Assistant Vice President: Nick Lomax

PUBLIC SERVICE
- Associate Director SC Ag. Experiment Station: Ab Snell

ATHLETICS
- Director: Bobby Robinson

FACULTY
- Vice President / President Elect Faculty Senate: Joe Mullins

STUDENTS
- President Student Body: Fred Richey

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
- Chairman Board of Trustees Planning Committee: Dr. John J. Britton

ALUMNI
- Executive Director Alumni Affairs: George Moore

PHYSICAL PLANT
- Director: Wall Stone

ARCHITECTURE
- Professor: Joe Young

CAMPUS PLANNING (non-voting)
- Campus Master Planner: Mark Wright

CAMPUS PLANNING (non-voting)
- Assistant Campus Master Planner: Lee Miller

Rotating Positions
PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURE

FUNCTIONAL AREA REPS.

BUSINESS & FINANCE
- Vice President
  - Vacant

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- Vice Provost
  - Undergraduate Programs
  - Jerry Reel

STUDENT AFFAIRS
- Assistant Vice President
  - Nick Lomax

PUBLIC SERVICE
- Associate Director
  - SC Ag. Experiment Station
  - Ab Snell

FACULTY
- Vice President / President Elect
  - Faculty Senate
  - Joe Mullins

STUDENTS
- President Student Body
  - Fred Richey

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
- Chairman Board of Trustees Planning Committee
  - Dr. John J. Brillon

ALUMNI
- Executive Director Alumni Affairs
  - George Moore

PHYSICAL PLANT
- Superintendent of Planning & Engineering
  - Jerry Boyer, AIA

ARCHITECTURE
- Professor
  - Joe Young, FAIA

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
- Professor
  - Mary Taylor Hague, ASLA

CIVIL ENGINEERING
- Professor
  - Ed Clark, PE or Larry Josey, PE

CAMPUS PLANNING (non-voting)
- Campus Master Planner
  - Mark Wright

CAMPUS PLANNING (non-voting)
- Assistant Campus Master Planner
  - Lee Miller

Rotating Positions
MEMORANDUM

TO: Max Lennon, President
FROM: A. W. Snell, Chairman, University Planning Board

In April, a plan for revising the composition of the Clemson University Planning Board was presented to you. The proposal was then submitted to the cabinet, the Faculty Senate, and to each member of the existing Planning Board. A number of suggestions regarding both membership and operating methods were received.

Attached is a report based on these suggestions. The revised plan as currently proposed is based on the principle that the Planning Board serves as a "jury" in a "checks and balances" system to assure university adherence to the University Master Plan. It was concluded that the voting membership should consist of individuals representing various university constituents and broad functional groups as well as adequate expertise to assure competent evaluation of proposed modifications or changes to the Master Plan.

The master planner would be a key individual in both planning and coordinating resource people. He would be a non-voting member of the planning committee. There would be other members with planning qualifications within the university, such as traffic and parking, landscaping, utilities, etc. who would serve as the resource people in the planning process as well as assisting the Planning Board when an evaluation is made. Procedures are being initiated to assure early input from all planners.

The report outlines the proposed membership as well as operating procedures to conform to the basic principle stated above. I will be glad to discuss further with you either modification or implementation of this plan.
Report to President Max Lennon
on
University Planning Board Structure

Proposed changes in the composition of the University Planning Board (Appendix A) were initially developed in April 1986. At your request, these ideas were presented to the President's Cabinet and circulated to the Faculty Senate and Planning Board members.

Comments have been received and deal with membership and methods to improve communication with the University community. The comments are summarized in Appendix B. Copies of all correspondence received are available in Room 104, Barre Hall.

Membership Recommendations

Based on comments received, a revised membership structure has been developed (Attachment 1).

The proposed revisions are, again, based on the concepts of maintaining a relatively small, primarily continuous membership that either (1) represents a broad functional area involved in planning, (2) represents a particular interest group, or (3) has a particular area of expertise that aids in evaluating physical ramifications of planning. The membership structure as now proposed reduces Planning Board membership from 13 to 12 members, two of which remain non-voting. Additionally, a representative of the University Newsletter will attend and report on all meetings. The Dean of Agricultural Research or the Associate Director of the South Carolina Experiment Station may serve if the Vice President/Vice Provost desires. The Physical Plant representative will be selected by the Vice President for Business and Finance. The concept of eliminating representation of individual University departments is maintained. The Planning Board also feels that representation of all executive areas is not required.

The Executive Director of Alumni Affairs and the Chairman of the Board of Trustees Planning Committee are no longer members. Other communication and procedural devices should suffice to keep these constituent groups informed.
Procedural and Communication Recommendations

The majority of the comments received are valid and should be implemented. Summary minutes will be published in the University Newsletter. Detailed minutes also will be maintained, and in addition to the President and Chairman of the Board of Trustees, copies will be sent to all Vice Presidents, the Executive Director of Alumni Affairs, and the Presidents of the Student and Faculty Senate.

Additional efforts will be made to invite appropriate resource people to Planning Board meetings. Whenever possible, planning briefs will be circulated two weeks prior to meeting dates to allow Board members additional time for review with constituent groups. In some instances, this will prove impossible and the University Administration will either have to accept a shortened review period or a delay in a project's schedule. Circumstances can be anticipated that would necessitate a campus district hearing, i.e., changes in the vicinity of the Agricultural Complex. Procedures for such "hearings" will be developed and will be the same as those for the campus-wide hearings that have been recommended.

Publishing agendas in the Newsletter and The Tiger are viewed as excessive. The members of the Planning Board should be sufficiently responsible to review planning briefs with their constituents. Additionally, summary minutes published in the University Newsletter will also outline future discussion topics. Interested individuals can contact the Campus Master Planning Office or other appropriate department if they would like to discuss upcoming issues.

Conclusion

The above-mentioned membership and procedural changes should not only enhance the involvement of and understanding of the campus community in physical changes to the environment, but also the quality of the end product. Greater administrative support is necessary to ensure all changes to the environment are channeled through the University Planning Board.
### Proposed Membership Structure #2

**FUNCTIONAL AREA REPS.:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS &amp; FINANCE</th>
<th>ACADEMIC AFFAIRS</th>
<th>STUDENT AFFAIRS</th>
<th>AGRICULTURE &amp; NATURAL RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td>(Assistant) Vice President</td>
<td>Vice Provost or Representative of Ag. Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David R. Larson</td>
<td>Undergraduate Programs</td>
<td>Jerry Reel</td>
<td>Ben Box or Ab Snell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTITUENT GROUP REPS.:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY SENATE</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>PHYSICAL PLANT</th>
<th>ARCHITECTURE</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE</th>
<th>CIVIL ENGINEERING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Representative (3 year term)</td>
<td>President Student Body</td>
<td>Selected by Vice President for Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Mullins</td>
<td>Fred Richey</td>
<td>Walt Stone, P.E. or Jerry Boyer, AIA</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Mary Taylor Hague, ASLA</td>
<td>Ed Clark, PE or Larry Josey, PE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPERTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS PLANNING (non-voting)</th>
<th>CAMPUS PLANNING (non-voting)</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY RELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Master Planner</td>
<td>Assistant Campus Master Planner</td>
<td>Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Wright</td>
<td>Lee Miller</td>
<td>Joyce Barrett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rotating Positions*
MEMORANDUM

TO: Max Lennon, President

FROM: A. W. Snell, Chairman, University Planning Board

SUBJECT: University Planning Board membership
Rationale and suggested changes

The University Planning Board ensures that the Campus Master Plan is used to guide the orderly and cohesive development of the campus. The board reviews any proposed changes in the physical environment for consistency with the Master Plan, examines any proposed change in the Master Plan, and makes recommendations to the president.

The intent of the board structure is to maximize input from and information to all university groups with the smallest membership possible. Members of the Planning Board can be categorized as belonging to one of three distinct groups:

1. Representatives of functional areas involved in campus planning and/or modification
2. Representatives of constituent groups, whose input is necessary and desired, affected by planning
3. Individuals with an area of expertise that can aid in evaluating physical ramifications of planning.

The majority of members serve as a result of their position. The Campus Master Planner is the professional advisor to the board and ex officio member. Attachment I illustrates the existing structure. Current board members are identified with their generic position.

Membership continuity is felt to be crucial to the successful evolvement of the Master Plan. The complexity of issues addressed, their relationship to other issues, and the data base needed for evaluation requires experience with the plan and a broad base of knowledge. This consideration and the fact that many members serve by virtue of their position limits rotation.

The membership structure was reviewed last August by the board, but no substantive changes were recommended.
Based on your desire for more faculty representation and the need for additional professional input, it is suggested that membership changes as outlined below and illustrated in Attachment II be considered at this time. The Planning Board will continue to invite certain individuals for specific issues as needed.

New Members

1. A landscape architect. Potential candidate - Mary Haque, ASLA, Associate Professor of Horticulture.

2. A civil engineer with preferred expertise in traffic and transportation. Potential candidates - J. E. Clark, Professor of Civil Engineering; or J. L. Josey, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering.

Substitutions

1. Superintendent of Planning and Engineering (university architect) for Director of the Physical Plant. The university architect is better trained to address the majority of issues that come before the board and can also represent Physical Plant interests. He normally serves as a member of the Building Committee.

Deletion

1. Director of Athletics. His interests can and should be represented by the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs.

These changes are consistent with the structural intent and needs of the Planning Board and your desire for additional faculty involvement. I will be happy to discuss this matter further at your convenience.
EXISTING MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURE

BUSINESS & FINANCE
- Vice President: vacant
- Vice Provost Undergraduate Programs: Jerry Reel

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- Assistant Vice President: Nick Lomax

STUDENT AFFAIRS
- Associate Director SC Ag. Experiment Station: Ab Snell

PUBLIC SERVICE
- Director: Bobby Robinson

ATHLETICS
- Director: vacant

FACULTY
- Vice President / President Elect: Joe Mullins

STUDENTS
- President Student Body: Fred Richey

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
- Chairman Board of Trustees Planning Committee: Dr. John J. Britton

ALUMNI
- Executive Director Alumni Affairs: George Moore

PHYSICAL PLANT
- Director: Walt Stone

ARCHITECTURE
- Professor: Joe Young

CAMPUS PLANNING (non-voting)
- Campus Master Planner: Mark Wright

CAMPUS PLANNING (non-voting)
- Assistant Campus Master Planner: Lee Miller

Rotating Positions
PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURE

BUSINESS & FINANCE
- Vice President: Vacant

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- Vice Provost Undergraduate Programs: Jerry Reel
- Assistant Vice President: Nick Lomax

STUDENT AFFAIRS
- President Student Body: Fred Richey

PUBLIC SERVICE
- Associate Director SC Ag. Experiment Station: Ab Snell

FACULTY
- Vice President / President Elect Faculty Senate: Joe Mullins

STUDENTS
- President Student Body: Fred Richey

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
- Chairman Board of Trustees Planning Committee: Dr. John J. Britton

ALUMNI
- Executive Director Alumni Affairs: George Moore

PHYSICAL PLANT
- Superintendent of Planning & Engineering: Jerry Boyer, AIA
- Assistant Campus Master Planner: Lee Miller

ARCHITECTURE
- Professor: Joe Young, FAIA
- Professor: Mary Taylor Hague, ASLA

CIVIL ENGINEERING
- Professor: Ed Clark, PE or Larry Josey, PE

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
- Assistant Campus Master Planner: Lee Miller

Rotating Positions
APPENDIX B

Summary of Comments Received on University Planning Board Structure

- Additions

Add a representative of the Vice President for Administration

In addition to the Superintendent of Planning and Engineering, add the Director of the Physical Plant and the Superintendent of Grounds and Landscape.

- Deletions

Board of Trustee member

- Substitutions

Maintain Director of Physical Plant in lieu of Superintendent of Planning and Engineering

A Faculty Senate representative who could serve a three-year term in lieu of the Vice President/President-Elect Superintendent of Landscape and Grounds in lieu of a faculty landscape architect

The Vice President/Vice Provost for Agriculture and Natural Resources in lieu of the Associate Director SCAES

- Other Comments

College of Architecture representative should be a permanent appointment and have appropriate design credentials. (Apparently, there is sentiment to change the selection procedure of this member.)

Communications

A representative from University Relations should attend and report on Planning Board meetings.
Involve or keep informed Dean, College of Architecture

Publish a full description of the purpose, duties, procedures, and authority of the Planning Board, especially those procedures dealing with new business.

Establish a procedure for holding campus hearings on matters that have campus-wide impact.

Place meeting notices and agendas in the Newsletter and The Tiger.

Elect or appoint a secretary with responsibility for publishing minutes of Planning Board meetings. (This could be the University Relations attendee.)

Issue formal statements recommending either approval or disapproval of proposed projects. Include clear justification for action.

Schedule work to expand input.

- Other Comments

Move Campus Master Planning Office to the Development Office. (This suggestion should be considered at the executive level.)

Evaluate and periodically update architectural design guidelines.

Review the design programs for any future building projects to assist architects in better understanding the campus setting.

Mechanisms for the latter two already exist.
PROPOSAL

PHYSICAL FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE

Purpose and Intent:

To establish a broad based, University wide committee to provide general oversight for all University physical facilities including land use and to vest with that committee limited executive decision authority to enhance day-to-day operations of physical facilities.

Function:

To study, formulate and recommend to the President general policies and procedures relating to physical facilities of the University and to prepare recommendations to ensure that the University's long range goals and objectives are achieved.

Responsibilities:

Formulate general policies to:

1. Establish priorities for physical facilities.
2. Insure conformity with the University Campus Master Plan.
3. Insure conformity with the University Landscape Master Plan.
4. Insure conformity of the University Communications and Electronic Data Transmission Master Plan as it relates to facilities.
5. Provide general direction and oversight for all new construction, renovation and remodeling of physical facilities. The committee would approve all remodeling and renovation projects that:
   a. require encroachment into areas not assigned to the department initiating the project,
   b. require relocation or removal of all systems that will permanently change the configuration of existing space,
   c. require encroachment into classrooms or general supporting space,
   d. require penetration of the existing building envelope (exterior doors, windows).
6. Provide general direction and guidance for scheduled and non-scheduled maintenance of physical facilities,
7. Provide direction in matters relating to utilization of academic, administrative and auxiliary space.
8. Provide general direction for other special circumstances involving physical facilities, i.e., shortage of domestic water, space utilization, asbestos, etc.
Committee Membership Structure:

- Vice President for Business and Finance - Permanent Chairman
- Assistant Vice President - Facilities Planning Management - Vice Chairman
- Vice Presidents - One representative would be appointed by each VP
- President of Faculty Senate
- Faculty - Three Representatives elected by the Faculty Senate.
- Student - Two Representatives (President of Student Body and Student Senate).
- Campus Planning Office - One Representative (Campus Master Planner)
- Physical Plant Division - One Representative (Division Director)
- Ex Officio - Chairperson of each sub-committee reporting to the Physical Facilities Planning Committee.

Sub-Committees:

1. Landscape and Site Development
2. Safety and Environmental Health
3. University Parking and Traffic
4. University Committee on Handicapped
5. Building Design and Construction (various committees as needed)
6. Utilities Systems Planning and Development
7. Space Utilization

PROPOSAL RATIONALE:

The proposed Physical Facilities Planning Committee will replace both the University Planning Board and the Commission on Physical Facilities of the President's Council. The committee shall assume the functions of both entities and shall include additional functions necessary for overall coordination of the varied aspects of physical facilities management. It is intended that this committee shall enhance the operation of the University Physical Plant Division, the University Master Planning Office, the University budget process and the various offices associated with space utilization, i.e. classroom scheduling.

The Committee's charge will be to:

- Determine, with adequate input from the various campus offices, the short and long range needs in the area of physical facilities.

- Establish, again with adequate input from the various campus offices, in an orderly and consistent manner a priority system for recognized University needs in the area of physical facilities.

- Assure that every effort is made to obtain adequate funding for recognized needs to include adequate and timely requests to appropriate state authority for bond funds and extensive research into federal and other alternative funding sources.
Assure timely, thoroughly researched submissions to state authority of both the Overall Permanent Improvements Program and the Annual Permanent Improvements Program.

Assure timely and well coordinated effort in the University's space utilization program including up-to-date inventories and equitable allocation of available classroom, laboratory, office and other functional space.
MEMO TO: Dr. L. A. Dyck, President  
Faculty Senate  

FROM: Cecil O. Huey, Chairman  
Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Planning Board  

DATE: September 19, 1986  

SUBJECT: Proposed Physical Facilities Planning Committee

The Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Planning Board met and discussed the proposal for a Physical Facilities Planning Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee does not endorse the proposal and urges you to voice our concern and to seek a delay in implementation of any changes. Given the information at hand, this committee would strongly advocate keeping the Planning Board, reorganized as proposed in Dr. Snell's memo and given the authority needed to insure compliance with the Master Plan, etc. Such an arrangement would insure a flow of information regarding planning issues, have a strong and informed faculty voice, and should possess the credibility necessary for such a body to function. This would not be the case with the proposed Physical Facilities Planning Committee, owing primarily to its size, composition, and combination of functions. However, the committee would agree to the proposed elimination of the Commission on Physical Facilities due to its inactivity. The basis for this position is further explained below.

1. Committee Size

The number of individuals comprising the committee is exceedingly large, especially if the ex-officio members are to be voting members. It is hard to conceive of such a large group executing a planning function. More likely it would function as most of the large commissions do now, probably much like the present Commission on Physical Facilities.

2. Committee Membership

The committee as proposed is top-heavy with upper level administrators. It would possess many of the defects of the old Planning Board as a result. One of the primary functions of the new Planning Board would be to provide the checks and balances required for campus decisions to be made with an appropriate degree of democracy and with significant faculty participation. This function would not exist under the proposed arrangement, given the majority of staff members.

While it may be argued that the various sub-committees include faculty members, it should be noted that most of those committees rarely meet and that their functions are unknown to most of the campus. Also, the chairs of several are staff members.
3. Dominance of Business and Finance Personnel

A very large component of the committee would consist of staff members from the Business and Finance Office, especially when the ex-officio members are included. It is hard to imagine a democratic process governing the business of the committee under such circumstances.

4. Lack of Faculty with Appropriate Technical Expertise

The proposed changes in the Planning Board would strengthen the faculty voice while insuring the availability of the necessary technical expertise. In contrast, the current proposal would bring expertise to the committee in the person of staff members only and would significantly dilute the faculty input.

5. Responsibilities of the Committee

It is absolutely essential that a group be given authority to require conformance with the University Campus Master Plan and with the University Landscape Master Plan and to enforce appropriate architectural standards. Such were the responsibilities of the new Planning Board as proposed. The list of responsibilities for the proposed committee is too long to allow thoughtful attention to any of them. Too many functions are combined. The committee would meet interminably if it attempted to deal effectively with all of the items listed.

6. Lack of Mechanism for Communication

There are no proposed means of keeping the campus informed as to issues coming before the committee. An effective, systematic procedure must be developed if the proposed committee is to have the credibility it needs. Without such a procedure committee decisions will probably be viewed with the same cynicism as have several in the recent past. The importance of this element cannot be overstated.

7. Indefinite Details of Organization

A number of questions remain with respect to details of the committee membership, method of operation, etc. For example, no terms of office are indicated, an item of importance for elected members. Also, the relationship of the sub-committees to the Physical Facilities Planning Committee is not indicated. Further, the actual responsibility and authority of the committee are not made clear. It seems hardly possible that action could be taken on the proposal until these issues are clarified.

The Ad Hoc Committee would welcome an opportunity to discuss this matter further with you and with Vice President Larson, if possible.

/rd

cc: Committee Members:
Dr. William Baron
Prof. Martin A. Davis
Dr. Thomas A. Lyson
Dr. Joseph C. Mullins
MEMO TO:  Dr. L.A. Dyck, President
Faculty Senate

FROM:  Cecil O. Huey, Chairman
Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Planning Board

SUBJECT:  Proposed Physical Facilities Planning Committee

The discussion with Vice President Larson concerning our response to the proposed Physical Facilities Planning Committee was very encouraging. We were delighted with his enthusiasm for making the proposed committee an effective and representative body and his commitment to a systematic consideration of planning issues. We feel that two items should be considered further, however.

First, it is imperative that proper attention be given to the impact of development projects on the physical environment of the campus. We would prefer that a separate, independent body be given an authoritative voice in the approval of all projects that have an effect on this environment. Such a committee would serve as a check on the proposed Physical Facilities Planning Committee. It may result in some delays in gaining approval of projects, but, in the view of this committee, such delays would be healthy when planning and architectural standards are at stake. In fact, any delay that occurs will be a manifestation of the need for such a committee. Conversely, there will be no delays at all if proposals from the Physical Facilities Planning Committee either reflect adequate attention to standards or are accompanied by compelling justification for variances.

A committee composed of the members proposed by Dr. Snell for the Planning Board would be ideal. It would have about the right mix of faculty and constituent group representatives and would possess the technical expertise to interpret and evaluate both standards and proposals. Reiterating a point from above, the committee would serve only as a check. It would not alter the fundamental responsibilities of the Physical Facilities Planning Committee as proposed.
An alternative would be to have a sub-committee charged with evaluating all proposals for conformance to the appropriate standards. If such an arrangement is to provide suitable safeguards, there must be a definite commitment to established standards. We fear, however, that the intimate relationship between the sub-committee and the parent committee would encourage the relaxation of the standards as a matter of expediency.

The second item of concern is the current plan to bring an architectural presence to the Committee by making the Dean of Architecture a member. The size of the committee would be reduced and the same purpose served if one of the faculty representatives comes from the College of Architecture. The Senate should be allowed to develop a systematic means of selecting faculty representatives to insure appropriate representation, adequate terms of service, etc. In doing so it could maintain an architectural representation.

Again this committee is encouraged by the response to our ideas so far. We hope that the ultimate arrangement will represent an effective means of planning for future development of the campus.

COH/jcs

cc: Committee Member:
Dr. William Baron
Prof. Martin A. Davis
Dr. Thomas A. Lyson
Dr. Joseph C. Mullins
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE

Purpose and Intent:

To establish a broad based, University wide committee to provide general oversight for all University physical facilities including land use and to vest with that committee limited executive decision authority to enhance day-to-day operations of physical facilities.

Function:

To study, formulate and recommend to the President's Staff general policies and procedures relating to physical facilities of the University and to prepare recommendations to ensure that the University's long range goals and objectives are achieved.

Responsibilities:

Formulate policies and recommendations to:

1. Establish priorities for Permanent Improvement projects.
2. Insure conformity with the University Campus Master Plan.
3. Insure conformity with the University Landscape Master Plan.
4. Insure coordination of efforts within the area of University telecommunications relative to facilities.
5. Provide general direction for construction, renovation, remodeling, maintenance, and utilization of physical facilities both above ground (buildings) and below ground (utilities and tunnels).
6. Provide general direction for other special circumstances involving physical facilities, i.e., shortage of domestic water, space utilization, asbestos, etc.

Committee Membership Structure:

Vice President for Business and Finance - Permanent Chairman
Assistant Vice President - Facilities Planning Management
(Vice-Chairman)
One representative appointed by the Vice President from the following areas:

Academic Affairs and Provost
Administration
Agriculture and Natural Resources
Institutional Advancement
Student Affairs
President of the Faculty Senate
Dean of the College of Architecture - Permanent Member
One representative from the Council of Deans selected by that body.
Three faculty representatives elected by the Faculty Senate.
(terms and criteria of appointment to be determined by Senate)
Two student representatives (President of the Student Body and
Student Senate).
One representative appointed by the Commission on Classified
Staff Affairs.

Technical Staff Representatives (non-voting)
One representative from the Campus Master Planning Office.
One representative from Physical Plant Division.

Ex Officio Representatives (voting)
Chairperson of each sub-committee reporting to the Physical
Facilities Planning Committee.

Sub-Committees:
1. Landscape and Site Development
2. Safety and Environmental Health
3. University Parking and Traffic
4. University Committee on Handicapped
5. Building Design and Construction (various committees as needed)
6. Campus Master Plan

Proposal Rationale:

The proposed Physical Facilities Planning Committee will replace both
the University Planning Board and the Commission on Physical Facilities of
the President's Council. The committee shall assume the functions of both
entities and shall include additional functions necessary for overall
coordination of the varied aspects of physical facilities management. It
is intended that this committee shall enhance the operation of the
University Physical Plant Division, the University Master Planning Office,
the University budget process and the various offices associated with space
utilization, i.e. classroom scheduling.

The Committee's charge will be to:

- Determine, with adequate input from the various campus offices,
  the short and long range needs in the area of physical facilities.

- Establish, again with adequate input from the various campus
  offices, in an orderly and consistent manner a priority system
  for recognized University needs in the area of physical
  facilities.
Assure that every effort is made to obtain adequate funding for recognized needs to include adequate and timely requests to appropriate state authority for bond funds and extensive research into federal and other alternative funding sources.

Assure timely, thoroughly researched submissions to state authority of both the Overall Permanent Improvements Program and the Annual Permanent Improvements Program.

Assure timely and well coordinated effort in the University's space utilization program including up-to-date inventories and equitable allocation of available classroom, laboratory, office and other functional space.

**Implementation Procedures:**

The Committee shall establish a regular scheduled meeting, time and place, on a monthly basis with a prepared agenda for each meeting. Minutes of each meeting will be prepared and distributed to the members as well as other designated faculty, staff, and students. 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.

9/29/86
The Committee on Admissions and Continuing Enrollment met September 18. Ron Nowaczyk substituted for me while I took part in the hearing process.

The Admission report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 1986</th>
<th>Freshmen app'1</th>
<th>rec'd</th>
<th>acc't</th>
<th>enrolled</th>
<th>mean SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rec'd</td>
<td>acc't</td>
<td>enrolled</td>
<td>mean SAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1986</td>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>acc't w/o SAT scores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 1986 Total enrollment 12,152
undergrad. 10,280
grad. 1,872

men 6,991
women 5,161

The Continuing Enrollment report;
In May 1986: 809 students ineligible to continue out of 9840 second semester enrollment
9.23% deficient vs. 7.38% deficient in May 1985

Of 980, 565 became eligible over summer.
215 approval of appeals committee
343 or 3.49% not eligible to continue.

Number deficient has more than doubled since new continuing enrollment policy in 1982.

Other business: Committee passed on to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies a proposal for admissions for Institute applicants.

J. LaTorre
The Drug and Alcohol Awareness Committee has met several times recently. The week of October 20 through 26 is National Alcohol Awareness Week. Student Life is sponsoring:

- alcohol awareness videos to run in the Loggia all week;
- poster campaign to cover campus;
- announcements at homecoming game;
- wrecked care involved in DUI and states in phantom parking lot;
- Redfern staff to talk on alcohol intoxication dangers;
- breathalyzers in dorms;
- speakers in dorms;
- party in Edgars;
- "I'm Driving" campaign at bars in area;
- cocaine speaker sponsored by athletic department;
- forum sponsored by Pan Greek.

J. LaTorre
State of South Carolina
Office of the Governor

PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR RICHARD W. RILEY
ON
SOUTH CAROLINA COLLEGIATE ALCOHOL AWARENESS WEEK

WHEREAS, research has shown that over 80 percent of college students drink alcoholic beverages; and

WHEREAS, current statistics indicate that between 15 percent and 20 percent of the students may be problem drinkers; and

WHEREAS, alcohol abuse poses a serious threat to the college student population through acts of vandalism and property damage, automobile and other types of accidents, lessening of academic performance, estrangement of social relations, creation of mental and physical problems and, in some cases, bodily injury, illness, and death; and

WHEREAS, for the past three years the resources of the American College Personnel Association, the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International, the Association of College Unions International, the National Association of Campus Activities, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the National Association of College and University Residence Halls, and the United States Student Association have joined with BACCHUS of the United States, Inc., to address the issues of alcohol use and misuse on the college campus; and

WHEREAS, national leaders in education, as well as representatives from state government, private industry, and foundations share this concern.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Richard W. Riley, Governor of the State of South Carolina, do hereby proclaim the week of October 20 - 26, 1986, as:

SOUTH CAROLINA COLLEGIATE ALCOHOL AWARENESS WEEK

for the purpose of calling attention to the problems of alcohol abuse on the American college campuses and the lack of resources available to adequately address these problems.

Richard W. Riley
The Joint City/University Advisory Committee met on October 6, 1986. The City Engineer, Harlow Brown, presented cost estimates for providing sewage service to the Clemson Heights area of Clemson.

Two alternatives were considered: 1) pumping the sewage to the Pendleton Treatment Plan or 2) connecting the Clemson Heights system to the University system. The second alternative would save the City $255,000 in capital costs and $2,400/year in pumping costs.

A committee was appointed to make recommendations to the President of Clemson University and the Mayor of Clemson.

J.C. Mullins
1. The Athletic Council is undergoing reorganization. The Council's ad hoc Committee to review and recommend action on reorganization consists of Stephen Wainscott, Chair from the College of Liberal Arts, Arlene Privette from the College of Nursing, Charles Fain from the College of Engineering, Lawrence Starkey representing IPTAY and Fred Richey representing the Student Government.

2. The Physical Facilities Committee proposed by Vice President Larson has been accepted by the President's Cabinet (see attached copy). The Committee will replace the Commission on Physical Facilities. The ad hoc committee of the Faculty Senate Chaired by Cecil Huey and charged with a review of the Planning Board is reviewing the faculty composition of the new committee.

3. The Office of Institutional Advancement has proposed two awards to be presented at graduation (see attached draft). A response to these awards was considered by the Senate Executive/Advisory Committee and is addressed by way of a Faculty Senate resolution under New Business.

4. The manner in which the university budget reductions are being addressed is described in the attached memo from Vice President Larson.

5. The Commission on Faculty Affairs discussed the Faculty Senate's recommendations to distribute the Teaching Evaluation Report to all academic departments for faculty review. After deliberation the Commission concluded that the report has already undergone major review and revision over the past 3-4 years and should be sent forward to the President's Council. The report is attached and all Faculty Senators are encouraged to share it with their colleagues. Should faculty in any group perceive significant difficulties, they should contact Larry Dyck prior to the October 31 meeting of the President's Council.

6. The President's Council approved a recommendation from the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research to eliminate the university-wide residency requirement for non-thesis Master's Degrees. This opens the way for greater use of instructional television and computer based network systems in the delivery of graduate courses.
7. On a trial basis College Deans are asked to budget funds for the University's contribution to all matching grants. This means the College Deans must anticipate funding requests when they submit their College's Budget Request to the Provost. Inform your colleagues to keep their Dean informed of anticipated needs for matching money.

8. A standing committee was formed to advise Dean Reel on all University sponsored Advanced Placement activities. The committee is chaired by John Kenelly and includes Doris Helms, Ed Gettys, John Wunder and Alan Schaffer.

9. The Provost has appointed an ad hoc committee, to be chaired by Dean Reel, to evaluate the organization of Continuing Education and related programs. I will serve as the Senate's representative.

10. I remind faculty that the University is in the midst of the United Way campaign. The University's goal is $50,000.

11. The university has formed a Telecommunications Committee to assess and recommend either the purchase of a new telephone system or continuing with the present arrangement. Senator Wayne Madison will represent the faculty on this committee.

12. Questions regarding prayer at university events caused the President's Cabinet to remind the university community that the University is non-sectarian and prayers, when incorporated into university events, should maintain a non-sectarian character.

13. A concept document titled Emerging Technology Development and Marketing Center has been drafted. The Research Committee will have an opportunity to evaluate its merits. In addition, the ways in which a University Research Foundation might assist researchers needs faculty input now! Contact E. P. Stillwell or Larry Dyck.

14. Discussion of a bonus for "Increased Instructional Productivity" continues among the College Deans and the Provost.
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITEE

Purpose and Intent:

To establish a broad based, University wide committee to provide general oversight for all University physical facilities including land use and to vest with that committee limited executive decision authority to enhance day-to-day operations of physical facilities.

Function:

To study, formulate and recommend to the President's Staff general policies and procedures relating to physical facilities of the University and to prepare recommendations to ensure that the University's long range goals and objectives are achieved.

Responsibilities:

Formulate policies and recommendations to:

1. Establish priorities for Permanent Improvement projects.
2. Insure conformity with the University Campus Master Plan.
3. Insure conformity with the University Landscape Master Plan.
4. Insure coordination of efforts within the area of University telecommunications relative to facilities.
5. Provide general direction for construction, renovation, remodeling, maintenance, and utilization of physical facilities both above ground (buildings) and below ground (utilities and tunnels).
6. Provide general direction for other special circumstances involving physical facilities, i.e., shortage of domestic water, space utilization, asbestos, etc.

Committee Membership Structure:

Vice President for Business and Finance - Permanent Chairman
Assistant Vice President - Facilities Planning Management (Vice-Chairman)
One representative appointed by the Vice President from the following areas:
   Academic Affairs and Provost Administration
   Agriculture and Natural Resources Institutional Advancement
   Student Affairs
President of the Faculty Senate
Dean of the College of Architecture - Permanent Member
One representative from the Council of Deans selected by that body.
Three faculty representatives elected by the Faculty Senate.
(terms and criteria of appointment to be determined by Senate)
Two student representatives (President of the Student Body and
Student Senate).
One representative appointed by the Commission on Classified
Staff Affairs.

Technical Staff Representatives (non-voting)
One representative from the Campus Master Planning Office.
One representative from Physical Plant Division.

Ex Officio Representatives (voting)
Chairperson of each sub-committee reporting to the Physical
Facilities Planning Committee.

Sub-Committees:
1. Landscape and Site Development
2. Safety and Environmental Health
3. University Parking and Traffic
4. University Committee on Handicapped
5. Building Design and Construction (various committees as needed)
6. Campus Master Plan

Proposal Rationale:

The proposed Physical Facilities Planning Committee will replace both
the University Planning Board and the Commission on Physical Facilities of
the President's Council. The committee shall assume the functions of both
entities and shall include additional functions necessary for overall
coordination of the varied aspects of physical facilities management. It
is intended that this committee shall enhance the operation of the
University Physical Plant Division, the University Master Planning Office,
the University budget process and the various offices associated with space
utilization, i.e. classroom scheduling.

The Committee's charge will be to:

- Determine, with adequate input from the various campus offices,
  the short and long range needs in the area of physical facilities.
- Establish, again with adequate input from the various campus
  offices, in an orderly and consistent manner a priority system
  for recognized University needs in the area of physical
  facilities.
Assure that every effort is made to obtain adequate funding for recognized needs to include adequate and timely requests to appropriate state authority for bond funds and extensive research into federal and other alternative funding sources.

Assure timely, thoroughly researched submissions to state authority of both the Overall Permanent Improvements Program and the Annual Permanent Improvements Program.

Assure timely and well coordinated effort in the University's space utilization program including up-to-date inventories and equitable allocation of available classroom, laboratory, office and other functional space.

Implementation Procedures:

The Committee shall establish a regular scheduled meeting, time and place, on a monthly basis with a prepared agenda for each meeting. Minutes of each meeting will be prepared and distributed to the members as well as other designated faculty, staff, and students. 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.

9/29/86
PROCEDURE FOR NOMINATION AND SELECTION OF GRADUATION AWARDS

Award: The Clemson University Award for Distinguished Achievement

This award is to be presented to an individual whose outstanding accomplishments in business, industry, research, government, or public service deserve special and public recognition. It is the University's way of extending high congratulations to a person for a singular achievement or a body of work.

No more than two distinguished achievement awards may be presented at a graduation ceremony.

Nominations for the award may come from any University constituency, Board of Trustees, students, faculty, staff, alumni, Clemson University Foundation, National Alumni Council, Board of Visitors, and others. Nominations must be in writing and should be submitted to the Vice President for Administration at least 90 days prior to the date of the graduation ceremony at which the award is to be presented.

The president of the University will appoint a three person committee to assist him with screening the nominations. The president will make his selections for the awards no later than 60 days prior to the graduation ceremony at which the award is to be presented.

Award: The John C. Calhoun Award for Outstanding Service to Education

This award is to be presented (annually? at each graduation?) to an individual whose high service to education has improved the lives of South Carolinians and other Americans. The individual receiving the award may or may not be professionally active in the field of education. He or she may be a private citizen or a public figure whose activities on behalf of education resulted in significant advancement for a group of individuals or for an entire school district, college, university, or state.

Nominations for the award may come from any University constituency, Board of Trustees, students, faculty, staff, alumni, Clemson University Foundation, National Alumni Council, Board of Visitors, and others. Nominations must be in writing and should be submitted to the Vice President for Administration at least 90 days prior to the date of the graduation ceremony at which the award is to be presented.

The president of the University will appoint a three person committee to assist him with screening the nominations. The president will make his selections for the awards no later than 60 days prior to the graduation ceremony at which the award is to be presented.
MEMORANDUM TO:  Dr. W. David Maxwell, Provost and Vice President-
Academic Affairs

Dr. Benton H. Box, Acting Vice President-
Agricultural and Natural Resources

Maj. Gen. Hugh J. Clausen, Vice President-
Administration

Dean Walter T. Cox, Acting Vice President-
Institutional Advancement

Mr. Manning N. Lomax, Acting Vice President-
Student Affairs

FROM:  David Larson
Vice President for Business and Finance

SUBJECT:  The Budget: Challenges, Assessment, Shortfall

Sept. 22, 1986

As predicted, the State Budget and Control Board has notified agencies
that due to more than $110 million in revenue shortfalls, we should be
planning now for a 2-4 percent agency reduction which will take effect in the
immediate future. To Clemson, this could mean that we would have to reduce
the University budget by almost $4 million. I know you share President
Lennon's and my concern that we accomplish this reduction fairly and with the
least possible disruption to programs and services.

Although State budgeting practices—including repeated across-the-board,
mid-year reductions—have been a subject of controversy and debate for some
time now, I believe that in lieu of any foreseeable changes in such practices,
Clemson must do more than simply continue to comply with State directives. We
must insure that such practices do not hamper our efforts to achieve the
institution's goals and objectives.

For example, I have been directed to work closely with each of you to
examine and revise Clemson's own budgeting and planning practices. We must
seek ways in which to build in flexibility and control so that we will be
better prepared not only to handle situations such as budget reductions but
also to carry out the University's strategic plans.

Thus, the purpose of this memo is: (1) to outline the budget challenges
that we face at Clemson University, (2) to outline the conceptual and action
frameworks necessary to address those challenges, assessing first where we are now and then identifying and establishing University-wide priorities, and (3) to outline necessary interim measures that will allow us to achieve the state-mandated reduction.

BUDGET CHALLENGES

Last June President Lennon made it clear to me that one of his top priorities is for the University to determine what cost containment measures can be effected in order to achieve a 3-5 percent or more reduction in the cost of operations. Now, added to that task, we face the state-mandated budget reduction. In addition, we need to assure ourselves that current operations are properly budgeted and managed. If we do not insure that we are starting from a proper baseline, we may find ourselves with a year-end deficit after making necessary reductions. Finally, we need to develop a series of budget policies that provide incentives for sound budget practices and improvements in productivity.

BUDGET ASSESSMENT

We are at a point now — both in the State and at the University — where our challenges have rendered virtually ineffective the traditional, incremental approach to budgeting. Years of incrementalism have, in fact, contributed to the problem of overappropriating some areas at the expense of others who — especially in light of rapid changes in the external environment and emerging priorities — may be more in need, or deserving, of resources.

Consequently, I propose that we must begin by making sure that we are operating with the proper baseline. During the next 90 days, we must make a complete reassessment of current 1986-87 operations and at the same time evaluate 1987-88 plans and requests to clarify University-wide priorities.

Once we have gathered and reviewed departmental requests, they will be summarized and presented in the form of decision packages to the President. To that end, each Vice President will be asked to recommend priorities based on a strong foundation of policies which provide the basis for sound management practices. Policies will be proposed for consideration on issues ranging from sponsored programs' indirect cost recovery and matching requirements, to guidelines on lapsed salaries, reclassifications, Physical Plant charges, and other incentives.

My staff is currently developing a draft of a Budget and Planning Guidance Manual which outlines the conceptual framework I propose to use to complete this budget assessment. It will be presented to you in the near future as a working document to elicit your reactions, ideas, and modifications.
To summarize the proposed assessment steps over the next 90 days, we will:
(1) begin by gathering and analyzing information to determine our 1986-87 baseline and 1987-88 needs, along with identifying resources and priorities,
(2) effect some interim measures (outlined below) to insure that expenditures will be controlled during the assessment period,
(3) having assessed and clarified our baseline and the resources available, established University-wide priorities and achieved a campus-wide reduction of 3-5 percent or more, we can lift the interim measures taken and implement the reductions in budgets identified during the review process, and
4) evaluate our 1986-88 plans and requests so that current programs can be enhanced or new programs initiated using funds generated by the assessment process.

While I realize that the 90-day assessment period will require extra time, attention and effort, I believe that given the challenges presented to us by the changing environment, we have little choice but to take some positive action now in order to move the institution forward in spite of budget cuts and other inevitable obstacles.

INTERIM MEASURES

After much thought and consideration, I believe the following interim measures — given that we have must take action before we can finalize our priorities — will insure that expenditures are constrained during the assessment period.

Filling Positions
With the exception of isolated emergencies which must be approved by President Lennon, effective immediately each Vice President will defer filling any vacant position until January 5, 1987. Since due to the November and December holidays, Personnel has traditionally issued a hold on filling vacant positions between November 1 and the beginning of the Spring semester, this simply moves that schedule forward by a few weeks. In the meantime whenever possible, needs for classified staff should be filled through temporary moves or transfers between departments or divisions. I will work closely with you to insure there is equitable approval between divisions of the emergency situations presented to President Lennon for his approval. Once our assessment is complete, we can then eliminate or allocate positions where necessary.

Reclassifications
Recognizing the importance of reclassification to the morale and productivity of the classified staff — especially as a way of rewarding hard work and outstanding performance — implementation of reclassifications will have to be suspended only temporarily. At least until our assessment allows us to determine the funds available for proceeding with appropriate reclassifications.

Equipment
Again, except in emergency situations, purchases of equipment should be deferred until further notice.

Supplies and Services
Departments are asked to impound expenditures by 10 percent of unencumbered balances as of September 30.

Travel
Departments are asked to impound expenditures by 20 percent of unencumbered balances as of September 30.

I would like to emphasize that the above measures are necessary given the immediate mandate — but temporary. Once the budget assessment has been completed, the interim steps will be lifted and the reductions identified by the budget review will be implemented.

Because I recognize that many of the ideas introduced here represent changes from past practice, I will be happy to arrange to meet with you and your staff at your convenience to explain the components of this budget program.

xc: President Max Lennon
Since teaching is the most important function performed at Clemson University, the faculty members need continually to make efforts to improve their teaching effectiveness. As a means to that end, the Commission on Faculty Affairs recommends that the faculty of each department within the university formalize methods of teaching evaluation for all faculty, not just those eligible for promotion or tenure. It is recognized that classroom activities are only part of the teaching process; such activities as advising, counseling, etc. must also be considered even though they are not considered to be in the realm of this report and therefore are not discussed.

In an effort to provide guidelines for the documentation of teaching effectiveness, the following model is offered; this model gives a matrix of teaching acts referenced to sources of data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation by:</th>
<th>Student Achievement</th>
<th>Senior Exit Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students(Grading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = Recommended
* = Alternate

The following recommendations are made to provide guidelines for the implementation of the model.

I. Recommendations for Evaluations by Students

A. Each department shall have a uniform student evaluation form(s), whether The Clemson University Student Evaluation of Instructors (CUSEI) form, or an alternative. Whichever form is used, it should be reviewed periodically for purposes of improvement.

B. The evaluation of instructors by students should be conducted every term so those with teaching loads that vary by semester will have adequate data.

C. Evaluation of instructors by students should be made mandatory for every member of the teaching faculty, regardless of rank or tenure status. This will enable the department to build a
representative and comprehensive data base for the form used. Each faculty member should provide his/her department head a summary of results.

II. Recommendations for Evaluations by Peers

A. Peers should review subject matter for currency and appropriateness. This could be accomplished through the following:

1. Peer review of syllabi, examinations, objectives, laboratory activities, teaching materials, etc.

2. Class visitations (see section C).

B. Peers should review the faculty member's techniques for evaluating students (grading policies and procedures). This may be accomplished by evaluation of examinations, course objectives, class projects, and syllabi.

C. Consideration might be given to peer evaluation of classroom techniques. The following guidelines are recommended:

1. Most faculty with the rank of assistant professor and above (including department head) should participate as reviewers;

2. A rotational system of visitor selection should be used in each yearly cycle;

3. Each course should be visited with the number of visits in any one calendar year being dependent upon employment/tenure status, academic rank, and perception of need;

4. Course instructors should provide observers with syllabi, outlines, lesson objectives, or any other pertinent material needed to evaluate the lesson;

5. A standard form for evaluation should be developed and used within each department or college for all observations.

III. Recommendations for Self Evaluation

A. Each individual faculty member needs to be conscientious in objectively evaluating his/her own effectiveness.

B. As part of the annual evaluation process, each faculty member should, in consultation with his/her department head, establish goals, devise a teaching plan, and submit a report at the end of the year.

IV. Recommendations for Evaluation by Student Achievement

Under certain conditions it may be possible to use actual student achievement to provide information on teaching effectiveness. The several possibilities include the following:
A. student examinations, projects, papers, etc. may be compared with course goals;
B. pre-test/post-test comparisons;
C. student performances in advanced courses; and
D. Senior exit interviews.

V. Recommendations for Senior Exit Interviews

Senior exit interviews or follow-up surveys may provide an alternate source of information about classroom technique and student evaluation. An interview form should be developed to standardize and categorize data for use in each specific departmental setting.

VI. General Recommendations on Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

A. Several sources of data (but not necessarily all) should be included in the process of documentation of teaching effectiveness.
B. Specific guidelines and instruments should be developed and/or adopted by each department to standardize the process of "Evaluation by Students."
C. All teaching faculty regardless of rank or tenure status should participate in the documentation process.
D. The faculty of each department should be responsible for the development of a comprehensive departmental plan for evaluating teaching effectiveness, both on an individual and on a collective basis.
President's Report Update  
(October 14, 1986)

1. The ad hoc committee on Continuing Education has been appointed by the Provost. Its representation is: Jerry Reel, Chair, Dee A. Evers, Thomas A. Oswald, Ralph D. Elliott, Robert E. Wright, William E. West, Ralph E. Knowland, Almeda Rogers, Ryan C. Amacher, Larry Dyck, Harry Durham and a representative from the Forest and Recreation area. The committee's charge is to recommend the structure of a College or Division of Continuing Education and its relationship to other units.

2. The Athletic Council met October 8, 1986. The principal item considered was the charge of the ad hoc Committee in view of President Lennon's comments at the previous meeting. It was concluded that the committee should provide the Council with recommendations on both the Council's representation and its responsibility. At present it is unclear if the Council is to assume the "Institutional Control and Responsibility" required by the NCAA or if the Council is advisory to the University Administration.

3. President Lennon will meet with the Faculty Senate Advisory/Executive Committee on October 23. If you or your colleagues have topics you would like addressed, please convey them to a member of the above group.

4. Because of major responsibilities to his department and college, Senator Stillwell has asked to be relieved of his responsibility as chair of the Research Committee. Senator Birrenkott will serve as the interim chair until the Advisory Committee makes a permanent appointment.

5. I attended a Clemson University sponsored Student Government Retreat on Saturday, October 10, 1986. Leaders within the student government (Student Senate) would like to meet with their counterparts in the Faculty Senate.

6. The Student Senate has endorsed a "walk" organized by the ESUBA Club of Daniel High School which calls attention to alcohol and drug abuse (see attached Student Senate Resolution). Organizers of the event have asked the Faculty Senate to support their efforts.
WHEREAS, the abuse of drugs and alcohol can provide a detrimental way of life, and

WHEREAS, the ESUBA Club of Daniel High School has as a purpose to "reverse" abuse and be of service to younger children, and

WHEREAS, the Joint City University Committee of Clemson, South Carolina, will sponsor a walk against the abuse of drugs and alcohol in a joint effort with the students of Clemson University, and

WHEREAS, the walk is sponsored by Clemson University through Alph Phi Omega, the school's service fraternity for October 26, 1986, at 2:00 PM which will finish in the Amphitheater, and

WHEREAS, the Student Senate represents the voice of the University students,

BE IT RESOLVED by Clemson University Student Senate in regular session the following:

THAT the Student Senate fully endorses the joint effort of Clemson University with the community of Clemson in ESUBA'S walk against abuse, scheduled Sunday, October 26, 1986, at 2:00 PM, starting in the Intramural Field across from Fike.

[Signature]
Senator

President of Student Senate

cc: Dr. Lennon
Dean Lomax
Dean Joy Smith
Fred Richey
The Tiger
Bonnie Stevens
Note: the resolution(s) below address certain aspects of the proposal on "Procedure for Nomination and Selection of Graduation Awards" (see item #3 in the President's Report).

RESOLUTIONS ON AWARDS

Whereas, the awards entitled "The Clemson University Award for Distinguished Achievement" and "The John C. Calhoun Award for Outstanding Service to Education" are presented to persons chosen by the President of Clemson University; therefore be it

Resolved, that the two awards be designated the "Presidential Awards," and be it further

Resolved, that one award be entitled the "President's Award for Distinguished Achievement" and the second be entitled the "President's Award for Outstanding Service to Education."

Whereas, the May commencement program is already too lengthy, therefore be it

Resolved, that the presentation of the awards listed above occur at ceremonies in August and/or December or at other special occasions of the university such as Honors and Awards Day.
RESOLUTION ON THE ANDERSON HMO FOR RESIDENTS OF CLEMSON AND ITS PICKENS COUNTY ENVIRONS

Whereas, Clemson University and the State of South Carolina provide insurance benefits for the well-being of their employees, and

Whereas, the State Insurance Program offers state employees the option to select either the traditional Group Health Plan or a plan that uses Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs), and

Whereas, the city of Clemson and its Pickens County environs are in a unique geographical location that is not serviced by either the HealthAmerica plan or the Companion HealthCare plan which contracted to provide HMO care to Greenville and Pickens Counties, and

Whereas, the Anderson Health Plan is licensed by the Insurance Board to service Anderson County, Oconee County and a section of Pickens County that includes the city of Clemson, and

Whereas, the Anderson Health Plan has been approved to offer its benefits to South Carolina State Employees in Anderson and Oconee Counties, and

Whereas, all physicians in the city of Clemson are associated with the Anderson Health Plan, and

Whereas, the two thirds of all Clemson University Faculty and the more than 1,600 total Clemson University employees who live in the city of Clemson and its Pickens County environs are at present excluded from accessible HMO services, and

Whereas, a special appeal to the South Carolina Retirement System for an exception that would allow the Anderson Health Plan to provide service to state employees in the Clemson/Pickens County area was rejected, and

Whereas, the State of South Carolina has not fulfilled the spirit of its responsibility to provide HMO health benefits to the high density of State Employees in the Clemson region, be it therefore

Resolved, that Faculty Senate encourage the University Administration and other influential parties to aggressively lobby the Budget and Control Board to have the Anderson Health Plan approved as an official provider of HMO benefits to State Employees in the Clemson/Pickens County area for FY 86-87.