1990

Faculty Senate Minutes, April 1990 Meeting

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

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The minutes of March 13, 1990, were approved as distributed.

3. **Committee Reports**

   a. **Senate Committees**

   - **Policy Committee.** Senator Luedeman presented the monthly report of the Policy Committee (Attachment A). He said the Provost did not approve the Procedures for the Evaluation of Deans (FS90-3-1 P). The Provost, however, will try to increase faculty involvement in the evaluation of deans. The annual report of the Policy Committee is attached (Attachment B).

   - **Research Committee.** Senator Young reported the Provost and the University Counsel are giving further study to several items of concern in the Revised Policy on Research Ethics (FS90-2-3 P). When the study is completed, a report will be made to the Faculty Senate. The annual report of the Research Committee is attached (Attachment C).

   - **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Kosinski called attention to the monthly report of the committee (Attachment D). He added the Provost rejected the Resolution Regarding Proposed Courses Which Lack College Sponsorship (FS90-3-3 P) because the *Faculty Manual* states proposed courses shall be reviewed by the collegiate faculties, rather than the nine college curriculum committees as stated in the resolution. The University Curriculum Committee is the ultimate authority in approving proposed courses. The Provost would be more friendly toward a future resolution which mentioned collegiate faculties.
Senator Milstead pointed out a course proposed by a non-collegiate area is a different issue from an interdisciplinary course. She requested that the committee give consideration to the two separate issues.

Senator Hogan presented the Scholastic Policies Committee Report on Excellence in Teaching and Advising at Clemson University (Attachment E).

The annual report of the Scholastic Policies Committee is attached (Attachment F).

Welfare Committee. The work of the committee is summarized in the annual report (Attachment G).

b. University Commissions and Committees

Senator Young reported the Commission on Graduate Studies is considering a proposed agreement regarding patents for graduate students. The commission approved a motion raising the minimum salary for graduate assistants to $5.00 per hour ($2610 per year).

4. Senate President's Report. President Halfacre called attention to the President's Report (Attachment H). He said the Selection Committee for the Centennial Professorship has received 26 nominees.

5. Old Business.

a. Report from ad_hoc Committee to Study Faculty Senates at Other Universities. Senator Dunn reported seven responses to the questionnaire sent from the committee to sixteen land-grant universities. In the coming year a new ad_hoc committee will study the responses to determine if changes regarding committee structure, tenure of officers, and membership size should be made in Clemson's Faculty Senate.

b. MacDonald Scholarship/Fellowship Funds. Senator Dunn said in 1986 the MacDonald Endowment gave the University $90,000. Part of the endowment specified the Faculty should be the agent to decide how the money would be distributed.

Initially the Senate determined 2/3 of the funds would be applied to undergraduate scholarships; 1/3 to graduate fellowships. Later the Senate directed 3/4 of the funds for
undergraduate scholarships and 1/4 for graduate fellowships. Funding, however, has continued as originally specified by the Faculty Senate, and the money has been allocated through 1993. As soon as the new Senate Standing Committees are formed, the issue will be referred to the appropriate committee for study.

c. Scholastic Policies Committee Report on Admissions Exceptions for Scholarship Athletes. Senator Kosinski presented the report (Attachment I) and moved acceptance. Discussion followed regarding procedures and structure of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee and the Admissions Exceptions Committee. Senator Kosinski outlined reforms President Lennon has instituted in the athletic admissions process and the President's efforts to raise ACC and NCAA admissions standards for athletes. Concerns were expressed regarding academic achievement and accountability of scholarship athletes.

Senator Gaddis said the Admissions Exceptions Committee is making progress in strengthening admissions standards for scholarship athletes. The Scholastic Policies Committee chose to prepare the report rather than a resolution because the Administration is moving toward a single admissions standard for all students.

Senator Louderback called for the question. The call was seconded. The Scholastic Policies Committee Report on Admissions Exceptions for Scholarship Athletes (FS90-4-1 P) (Attachment I) was approved unanimously.

6. Presentation to Mrs. Cannon, Retiring Staff Secretary. President Halfacre presented a plaque of appreciation to Margaret K. Cannon, Faculty Senate Staff Secretary since 1988.

7. Remarks of outgoing Senate President Halfacre. President Halfacre expressed appreciation to Senators Coulter, McGuire, Young, Hammond, Pivorun, Ryan, Stringer, LeBlanc, Kosinski, Gaddis, and Madison, whose terms have expired. President Halfacre also recognized Senator Kennedy, who will be on sabbatical leave next academic year. He expressed appreciation to Vice President Dunn, Secretary Murr, and the chairs of the standing committees.

President Halfacre commended the Senate for adhering to guidelines he had set at the beginning of the year, i.e., to be true representatives of the Faculty, to debate objectively issues
brought to the Senate and accept decisions of the Senate, and to place the Senate above individual feelings.

President Halfacre introduced the new officers of the Faculty Senate: Secretary Kenneth R. Murr; Vice President/President Elect John K. Luedeman; and President B. Allen Dunn, who received the President's gavel.

8. Remarks of Senate President Dunn. President Dunn expressed gratitude to outgoing President Halfacre for exemplary service and presented him a plaque of appreciation from the Faculty Senate.

President Dunn stated, "The 1990s are proving to be a very exciting time for higher education." He said programs, methods, and results are being thoroughly evaluated, and no one is more critical of higher education than Faculty. At Clemson the Senate is the Faculty's focal point for making views known and seeing that actions are taken. The commitment of Faculty Senators is critical to continued success of the Senate. President Dunn called upon continuing Senators and new Senators to recommit to the ideals of the program of Faculty Senate.

He urged Senators to be proactive rather than reactive, continue to represent the collegiate faculties well, and set up mechanisms to give the collegiate faculties information as it comes through the Faculty Senate. President Dunn urged Senators to help create the proper environment in working with the Administration. He said, "The Administration is working, as we are working, to make this the best University possible."

President Dunn introduced the new members of the Faculty Senate: Senators Brittain, Wallace, Wells, Brune, Waddle (returning), Rogers, Liburdy, Bridgwood, Baron, Rice, Conover, Sabin, Lucas, Rollin, Willey, Lyle, Wetsel (returning), Hare, Ruppert, Dieter, and Waldvogel.

President Dunn recognized Senator John Luedeman, Vice President/President Elect of the Faculty Senate; and Senator Kenneth R. Murr, Secretary.

b. Report from the ad hoc Committee to Study the University Postal Delivery Service. Senator Zehr presented the committee report (Attachment J) and moved acceptance. He said the major problems with the University Postal System are insufficient personnel, low pay, and the inadequate funds for
additional full-time personnel. Senator Zehr urged Senators to circulate the report, which contains suggestions for improving efficiency until sufficient funds are allocated for more effective post office operation.

Senator Young suggested the committee list suggestions for improving efficiency on posters to be placed in campus mail rooms.

Concerns were expressed regarding slow delivery of overnight and express mail. Discussion followed regarding the possibility of only one delivery per day to the departments and returning to Federal delivery system for first class mail.

President Dunn requested the committee to take the comments under advisement and report to the Faculty Senate.

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

Kenneth R. Murr, Secretary
Margaret K. Cannon, Staff Secretary

Senators absent: J. Hammond, A. Madison (E. Hare attended), E. Pivorun, R. Schalkoff, J. Zanes.
Attachment A

April Report of Policy Committee

1. We discussed a letter from J. A. Chisman concerning the central assignment of classroom space and a reply from B. J. Skelton. While such central assigning of classroom space places a burden on some departments, we decided to refer this to the Policy Committee of next year's Faculty Senate. We suggest a survey to decide if such problems are wide spread.

2. We discussed a letter from Holley Ulbrich, President of the Clemson AAUP, to Provost Maxwell concerning violations of procedures in departmental bylaws and the faculty manual. We suggest that the AAUP have a panel discussion on this problem and invite open testimony on this problem at a Policy Committee meeting of next year's Senate to determine if this problem is wide spread of merely local.

3. We discussed a reply from Provost Maxwell concerning the Faculty Senate Resolution concerning Faculty Development Funds. Senator Luedeman will discuss Provost Maxwell's reply with the Provost. It is noted that Provost Maxwell did not comment on our request for an increase in these funds.

John Luedeman, Chair

April 2, 1990
The following items were discussed and the following actions were taken:

1. The Policy Committee formulated a resolution deploring the selling of complimentary copies of textbooks which was approved by the Senate and Provost.

2. The Policy Committee formulated a resolution that the payment of salary adjustment monies be paid effective 1 July for twelve month faculty and 15 August for nine month faculty. The Senate approved this resolution and so did the Provost. This resolution assisted vice-president Larson in gaining approval from the Budget and Control Board to pay these adjustment monies to the faculty in the last paycheck of the contract year.

3. The Policy Committee formulated a resolution concerning the Athletic Department's decision to dedicate parking on the Rugby Field as IPTAY parking without going through the Traffic and Parking Committee as prescribed in the Faculty Manual. The Athletic Department has agreed to abide by University Policy and the Faculty Manual in the future.

4. The Policy Committee formulated suggestions on "proper uses" of faculty development funds and requested that these funds be raised from $50 per faculty member to $150 per faculty member and listed as line items in the collegiate and department budgets. Provost Maxwell disagreed with this resolution.

5. The Policy Committee formulated a policy on the evaluation of Academic Department Heads which details an informal evaluation after the first two years and a detailed formal evaluation every three years thereafter. This policy was approved by the Senate, revised after discussion with the Association of Academic Department Heads and consequently approved by the Association of Academic Department Heads. This Policy is now being considered by the Council of Academic Deans.

6. The Policy Committee formulated a policy on the evaluation of Academic Deans similar in nature to that of evaluation of Department Heads. Provost Maxwell thanked us for our concern but does not accept this resolution. His comments can be summed up by his sentence "I do not believe that the Provost should be circumscribed or directed with respect to the Provost's execution of the review process."

7. The Policy Committee formulated a resolution stating that "any viewing of student evaluations by the department administration without the express permission of the faculty member or a statement in the department guidelines that the department administration may view these evaluations as a part of the faculty evaluation process is a violation of the Faculty Manual." This resolution was approved by the Provost and distributed to the College Deans.

Committee Members
John Luedeman, Chair
Edwin Coulter
Francis McGuire
Jeri Milstead
Robert Schalkoff
Gerald Waddle
John Zanes
YEAR END REPORT

FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

During the 1989-90 academic year, the Faculty Senate Research Committee has addressed a number of issues and concerns as follows:

Issue: Policy on Research Ethics

Action: A Policy on Research Ethics was approved by the Faculty Senate in December 1989. The policy assures that Clemson University has in writing procedures for handling incidences of scientific misconduct and for protecting high standards of research ethics. It also preserves eligibility of Clemson for research grants from government agencies which require a written policy on scientific misconduct and research ethics. Revised Policy on Research Ethics No. FS90-2-3 P was approved by the Faculty Senate in February 1990.

Issue: College Policies for Return of Indirect Costs

Action: A report was submitted to the Faculty Senate in December 1990. The report concluded from analyses of survey data that the variability among colleges on allocation of indirect costs results from varying budgetary procedures that are generally unique to the individual college for sound reasons. Consequently, it is prudent for modifications to be handled at the individual college levels rather than at the university level.

Issue: URGC and Provost Award Procedures

Action: At Vice President for Research Gogue’s request, the committee discussed current procedures for awarding URGC and Provost Awards. Issues of selection criteria, review procedures and accounting were addressed with Dr. Gogue and within the committee. A consensus emerged not to alter selection criteria and review procedures. Although the review procedure is an extensive time commitment for one reviewer from each college twice annually, these reviewers do not appear to be dissatisfied or to want a change at this time. The committee recommended that the halftime commitment of one clerical staff in the VP for Research’s office be removed by delegating this responsibility to each award recipient’s department. The University Finance Office has agreed to do this.
Issue: Allocation of CHE Formula Funds for Graduate Students

Action: The committee concluded that the presence of these funds at the department level becomes obscure under the new block-funding procedures. Therefore, the specific identity of these funds must be negotiated between the department heads and their deans.

Issue: Library Services During Holidays

Action: Cooperative efforts between the Library and the committee resulted in the availability of do-it-yourself literature searching 4 days of every week this year with the exception of 3 days during the week of December 24-30, 1989. During inter-session periods, the Library is now opened until 8:00 pm on at least 2 weekday nights and on Saturday and Sunday. Do-it-yourself searching is available on these weekday nights after 6:00 pm and on Saturday and Sunday.

Issue: Postdoctoral Status - Privileges and Benefits

Action: A survey is being formulated to be mailed to peer institutions to learn how postdoctoral privileges and benefits are being handle. No reportable results yet.

Committee Members
Roy Young, Chair
Doyce Graham
Joseph Hammond
Russell Marion
Ed Pivorun
John Ryan
W. C. Stringer
Eldon Zehr
Scholastic Policies Committee
Report of the April Meeting

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on March 27. The main items discussed were admissions exceptions for scholarship athletes and awards for excellence in teaching and advising.

On athletic admissions, Senator Kosinski reported on a conversation which he, Senator Halfacre and Senator Dunn had had with President Lennon on March 21. After lengthy discussion of this conversation and the data the committee has collected, the committee arrived at a series of recommendations on athletic admissions. These are in the attached committee report.

Senator Hogan presented his final report (attached) on awards available for excellent teaching and advising at Clemson. The Committee expressed concern at the large number of departments who did not respond to the survey, and some committee members pointed out that departmental administrations were apparently unaware of awards which did exist and which faculty in their departments had received. However, the committee thanked Senator Hogan for his work and asked him to prepare a series of recommendations based on his report.

Robert Kosinski
Chairman
REPORT ON EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND ADVISING
AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

The attached memo was sent out to all Department Heads, Deans, and Directors of Instruction. The following is a compilation of the responses that were received.

Number of Colleges represented by responses 8 (89%)
Number of Departments represented by responses 30 (56%)

Total number of awards at the University level
Teaching 1
Advising 1

Total number of awards at the College level
Teaching 2 (25%)
Advising 0

Total number of awards at the Departmental level
Teaching 3 (11%)
Advising 0

Total number of awards at the Regional level
Teaching 3
Advising 0

Total number of awards at the National level
Teaching 7
Advising 0

FINDINGS:

Many more awards exist than the ones included in the above figures. Those chosen for inclusion focused on awards given exclusively for teaching or advising. Other awards, such as the University's Class of '39 Faculty Award for Excellence, use innovation and achievement in teaching and advising as only a few of its criteria for evaluation. Instances of this occurred at the Departmental through the national levels.
The Burtner Award is the only award for advising within the University.

There is very little, if any, recognition for innovation and achievement in teaching and advising at the College and Departmental levels.

Much of the existing recognition for teaching and advising does not take into consideration the junior faculty members who have made significant progress in these areas.

Recognition is often given on a yearly basis. Only in a few situations is the time period longer.

Recognition for innovation and achievement in teaching and advising can come in many forms, including time allocations, equipment allocations, and monetary allocations.

Recognition should be made as public as possible.

It is very difficult to provide quantitative documentation for many aspects of teaching and advising.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Colleges and Departments should make themselves aware of recognitions for innovation and achievement in teaching and/or advising that may already exist at the University, regional, and national levels.

Colleges and Departments should establish appropriate recognitions of innovation and achievement in both teaching and advising where they do not already exist.

Recognitions for innovation and achievement in teaching and advising should include junior faculty members that have made significant progress in these areas.

Deans, Department Heads, and Heads of Instruction should encourage faculty members to submit nominees for appropriate recognition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Forest and Recreation Resources</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Parks, Recreation, &amp; tourism Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Forestry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Parks, Recreation, &amp; tourism Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Languages</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Performing Arts</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Philosophy &amp; Religion</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Political Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Sociology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Professional Development &amp; Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Sciences</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Biological Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology Program</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Chemistry</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Computer Science</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Earth Science</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Microbiology</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Professional Development &amp; Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

? No response.

x Response given at the College level.

1 Number of awards at a given level.
Scholastic Policies Committee
Report for the 1989-1990 Senate Year

The main issues considered by the Scholastic Policies Committee in 1989-1990 were reform of the General Education Requirements, implementation of the new continuing enrollment policy, moving the last day to drop without record, courses without college sponsorship, admissions procedures for scholarship athletes, and awards available for excellence in teaching and advising.

After a study of our current General Education Requirements (GER), the Committee concluded that the GER is often being used to satisfy narrow departmental curriculum agendas rather than to promote general education. In October, we sent a set of suggested revisions to a subcommittee of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee which is examining reform of the GER. We suggested that the GER be limited to courses which are open to a wide variety of students and which are designed as an overview of a subject rather than as a specialized treatment for majors. We briefly considered implementing a true core curriculum, but decided that this idea was impractical for Clemson. As of late March, the subcommittee has not replied to our suggestions.

In October, the Registrar presented a revised plan for implementation of the new continuing enrollment policy. The plan proposed that on 15 May 1990, the new policy (with the exception of December checks) would apply to all students admitted previous to that date. The full new policy (including December checks) would apply to students admitted after 15 May 1990. The Committee approved this plan and the Registrar proceeded with its implementation.

In order to make use of class space freed by students who drop courses, in December the Committee proposed a resolution which advocated moving the last day to drop without record to one day before the last day to add a class. This resolution was passed by the Senate.

In February, we persuaded Dr. Farrell Brown to find a sponsoring department and college for GS 800, a course on grant proposal preparation which lacked college and departmental sponsorship. Both this course and a previous "homeless" course, University 101, were approved by the University Curriculum Committees without any input from college curriculum committees. Therefore, in March we proposed a resolution which called attention to the sections of the Faculty Constitution which state that University Curriculum Committees may act only on curriculum proposals which either originate with the collegiate faculties or which have been reviewed by them. This resolution was also passed by the Senate.

From November to March we investigated the procedures by which scholarship athletes are admitted to the University. Scholarship athletes who do not meet the normal admissions requirements of their colleges are admitted under NCAA guidelines, which are far lower than Clemson's normal admissions
requirements. On March 21, Senators Halsey, Dunn and Kosinski discussed the problem with President Lennon. As a result, the Committee decided to recommend that the University must clarify its athletic admissions policy and the role of the Admissions Exceptions Committee, and that while for the present the best policy is to seek nationwide and conference-wide increases in admissions standards through the NCAA and ACC, our ultimate goal should be one set of admissions standards for all students. These recommendations were submitted as a committee report to be accepted by the Senate.

Finally, we sent questionnaires to all departments and colleges asking if they knew of departmental, college, University or national awards for excellence in teaching and advising. This survey disclosed a surprising lack of awards in many disciplines, but it was also obvious that some departments were unaware of awards which existed in their fields. We submitted a series of recommendations based on this report.

Committee Members
Robert Kosinski, Chairman
Leo Gaddis
David Grigsby
Paula Heusinkveld
Robert Hogan
Joseph Louderback
Alan Madison
Alston Steiner
Senate Welfare Committee Report, 1989-90

Issues considered were:

Tuition reductions for faculty spouses/children: Surveys have been sent to the schools in the Oklahoma survey and are still being analyzed.

Retirement benefits, including the conversion of some sick leave to annual leave for retirement purposes: Status unclear, but tied into all other spending and so unlikely to pass this legislature.

2.0 vs 1.7 percent of annual salary per credit hour for summer school pay: Currently in limbo - awaiting consideration by Budget and Control Board. Presently being advocated only by Clemson, without support from USC.

Merit raises for classified staff: Passed a resolution to this effect. Position endorsed by SCEA. HUGO has created a problem with this and other raises.

Dedicated equity raises for faculty: Currently under study with the active support of President Lennon. Merit raise looks like 4%.

Health insurance system improvements: Present system was studied by Senate; benefits appear to be comparable to those in most industry plans, but the contribution by the state appears lower. Changes appear unlikely.

25 year retirement benefit: Currently before legislature. A strong campaign has been mounted against this.

Day care for faculty and staff dependents: Many complications encumber this, including staffing problems and probable opposition from local providers of this service.

Parking during football games: Discussed at length with athletic department. Athletic director agreed to have all IPTAY parking proposals reviewed by the CU Parking Committee.

Fence around football practice field: Athletic department agreed to keep it open during weekdays during hours of most demand by faculty and staff.

Pregnancy leave for female faculty: Still under study. Concern has been expressed about the inequity of allowing a faculty member to obtain sick leave with little difficulty unless the source of sickness is her giving birth.

Making available retirement plans other than the state plan for present faculty members: Not possible at this time because it violates the intent of offering TIAA/CREF to new faculty and because it would be seen as a threat to the financial solvency of the retirement program.

Pre-tax medical deductions: Under study for next year; some kind of implementation seems possible next year; making available less money than has been paid in would violate present state laws.

Committee Members
W. J. Kennedy, Chair
Gerald Carner
Gerald Christenbury
John M. Harris
Samuel T. Ingram
Janet LeBlanc
Peter Loge
Carl Thompson
SENATE PRESIDENT’S REPORT
APRIL 1990

1. The following items have been approved by the Academic Council (Attachment A):

1) Change in wording of Graduate School Announcements.

2) Change in Residence Requirements for master’s degrees.

3) Teacher Evaluation Form for graduate courses. The results of the first year’s evaluation will not be distributed but will be used to test validity.

4) Minimum graduate assistantship rate.

2. The current Admissions Report (Attachment B) indicates the incoming freshman class in the Fall of 1990 will be smaller than the previous year’s freshman class.

3. Senator Doyce Graham has been elected Chair of the Grievance Board.

4. The annual meeting of the Clemson Chapter of the Association of University Professors will be a joint meeting with the Clemson Chapter of South Carolina State Employees’ Association on Thursday, April 26, at 7:30 p.m. in the Strom Thurmond Center. The topic will be “Our State Retirement System: Where Is It Headed?” Speakers will be Purvis Collins (Director, S. C. Retirement System), Russell Mann (Vice President for Business & Government Relation, S. C. Chamber of Commerce), and Mary Greene (Government Relations Specialist, S. C. Education Association).

5. A Faculty Senate ad_hoc Committee to Study the University Postal Delivery Service has been appointed. The members are Senator Eldon Zehr (Chair), Librarian Deana Astle, and Senator Paula Heusinkveld.

6. A Faculty Senate ad_hoc Committee to Study On-Campus Parking has been appointed. The members are Senator Paula Heusinkveld (Chair), Senator Sam Ingram, and Senator Hallman Bryant.
The Provost's Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits Committee has recently received the data from Oklahoma State. The committee has begun meeting to evaluate this data and has begun work on distribution of monies in the Faculty Salaries Enhancement Program.
Items Approved at March 9 Meeting of
the Commission on Graduate Studies and Research
and Endorsed by the Council of Academic deans

1. Change in wording of Graduate School Announcements, p. 46 to
clarify ambiguity and to bring policy and practice into agreement.
(See attached)

2. Change in Residence Requirements for master's degrees, p. 58 of
Announcements. (See attached)

3. Teacher Evaluation Form for graduate courses.
All structured graduate courses are to be evaluated. Use of a
University-wide form (attached) is mandatory for the Fall Semester of
1990, with validity studies to be conducted shortly thereafter. The
outcome of these studies will determine the future of the form.
During the period of testing, or on a permanent basis, departments may
elect to use a different but common evaluation form.

4. Effective July 1, 1990 a minimum graduate assistantship rate is
established commensurate with $5 per hour. Thus, minimum stipends
are as follows, with continuous gradations between the limits of 10
and 30 hrs/wk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10 hrs./wk.</th>
<th>20 hrs./wk.</th>
<th>30 hrs./wk.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic year</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td>$4000</td>
<td>$6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual year</td>
<td>$2600</td>
<td>$5200</td>
<td>$7800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The probationary status will remain in effect until nine additional semester hours of graduate credit have been attempted. Students who fail to remove the probationary status as prescribed are subject to academic dismissal and will not be permitted to continue in the Graduate School without the recommendation of the program coordinator and written approval of the Graduate School. Withdrawal from a course while on probation will not be allowed unless prior approval is obtained from the Graduate School. Any unauthorized withdrawal will be considered as an unsatisfactory academic performance.

ACADEMIC REGULATIONS

Permanent Academic Records

The student's permanent academic record is a historical record of the student's academic progress. It is maintained in the Registrar's Office and contains personal identifying information, grades and credits. Where appropriate, statements of a corrective nature, withdrawals, suspension for failure to meet academic standards, suspension for disciplinary reasons and graduation data are added.

Academic Standards

Most graduate courses are graded on an A-B-C-F scale. Thesis and dissertation research and several other graduate courses are graded on a pass/fail basis. These courses are not included in the academic average; however, the grade is placed on the student's permanent record. Only credit hours for which a grade of pass is achieved apply toward the number of credit hours required for the degree. The accumulation of grades of pass in thesis or dissertation research does not imply completion of the research, but indicates satisfactory progress only.

A minimum grade of C must be made on all course work to obtain graduate credit. The graduate student must maintain a cumulative B average in all graduate-level courses (500-level or above). In addition, the graduate student must maintain a cumulative B average in all courses including undergraduate courses but excluding those taken on a pass/fail basis. See "Enrollment on a Pass/Fail Basis," page 49. Students who fail to meet these requirements become ineligible for graduation and are placed on academic probation. Those who remain on probation for two consecutive semesters will not be permitted to continue a graduate program without the written approval of the graduate dean.

The cumulative B average requirements described above apply independently to graduate degrees sought at Clemson University; that is, the grade point ratio computation begins anew after the student has completed the first degree. The only exceptions are those instances in which a doctoral degree is pursued after completion of a master's degree in the same major.

A grade lower than the specified minimum can be raised to count toward an advanced degree only by repetition of the course. Reexamination is not permitted.

A graduate student must understand that he or she can be dropped from the Graduate School at any time for failure to maintain an adequate academic status.

Final Examinations in Graduate Courses

Graduate work by its nature varies widely between disciplines in the specifications required in course work. It is expected that the evaluation of graduate work be based upon a number of observations, presentations, tests, papers, and/or other measures. The final evaluation should also include an examination at the conclusion of the course which in most cases will be written but may take on other forms.
There are no University-wide residence requirements for a master's degree. However, individual degree programs may establish such requirements which will be described and publicized for all prospective masters' degree candidates in the particular program.

DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

Master of Business Administration, Master of City and Regional Planning, Master of Education, Master of Engineering, Master of Fine Arts, Master of Forestry, Master of Industrial Education, Master of Nutritional Sciences, Master of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management, and Master of Professional Accountancy.

MASTER'S DEGREE

Residence Requirements
To receive the Master of Science or Master of Arts degree, the student must complete at least nine semester hours of graduate credit on the Clemson University campus during one academic semester or two consecutive summer sessions of the program.
Alternatively, the student may complete at least 15 semester hours of graduate credit including up to six credit hours of research (691) on the Clemson University campus during a continuous 12-month period. The residence requirements for professional master's degrees are determined by the colleges offering the degree.

Time Limit
All course work which is to be credited toward any of the master's degrees must have been enrolled in and completed within six calendar years prior to the date on which the degree is to be awarded. When recommended by the student's advisory committee and approved by the graduate dean, as many as six semester hours of course work completed outside the six-year limit may be validated by written examination. Such examinations will be under the direction of the department regularly offering the course or courses for which the student seeks validation. Course work completed outside the six-year time limit at an institution other than Clemson University may not be transferred to Clemson or validated for graduate credit.

Course Work Required
The total number of graduate credits required for the degree shall be determined by the student's advisory committee, consistent with the specific program guidelines and Graduate School policy. These credits constitute the core of the student's Graduate Degree Curriculum (Form GS2) and will appear on the form at the location entitled REQUIRED COURSES (GRADUATE LEVEL ONLY). Undergraduate deficiencies will be listed at the designated location. Supplemental courses, carrying undergraduate or graduate credit and chosen to broaden the student's academic experience, are not required on Form GS2. However, if a listing is desirable, such courses will be listed as departmental requirements at the designated location.

The Graduate School requires each degree program to consist of a minimum of 30 semester hours of graduate credit with at least 12 semester hours, exclusive of thesis research credits, in the student's major discipline. A minor, if chosen, shall consist of at least six semester hours in that area.
You are being asked to evaluate your instructor and the course on a number of factors that relate to effective teaching. The information you give will be used by your instructor to improve his/her effectiveness as a teacher. Please think carefully about each answer, be as accurate and as candid as you can.

PLEASE PLACE INSTRUCTOR'S FIVE DIGIT CODE NUMBER HERE.

Indicate your responses to the following statements by blackening the appropriate space on your answer sheet. Use a soft lead pencil (preferably No. 2). Do not use an ink or ball point pen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(SA)</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART ONE.

1. The instructor has helped me take new perspectives on the course material. SA A N D SD
2. The instructor has stimulated my interest in the subject matter of this course. SA A N D SD
3. The instructor treated the students with respect. SA A N D SD
4. The instructor made it clear what was expected of the student. SA A N D SD
5. The instructor graded fairly. SA A N D SD
6. The instructor increased my understanding of the subject. SA A N D SD
7. The instructor improved my ability to evaluate material on my own. SA A N D SD
8. The instructor was interested in the subject of this course. SA A N D SD
9. The course was presented in a logical sequence. SA A N D SD
10. The instructor covered an appropriate amount of material for this course. SA A N D SD
11. The amount of time required for assignments was reasonable. SA A N D SD
12. The assignments contributed to my understanding of the course material. SA A N D SD
13. The instructor was knowledgeable and current in the subject area of this course. SA A N D SD
14. The instructor provided adequate opportunities for discussion. SA A N D SD
15. The instructor was available for extra help. SA A N D SD
16. The instructor was well organized and prepared for class. SA A N D SD
17. The instructor enjoyed teaching this course. SA A N D SD

PART TWO.

Please provide discussion answers to the following questions.

1. What suggestions do you have to improve the content of this course?

2. What did you like most about this course?

3. What did you like least about this course?

4. What suggestions do you have to improve the instructor’s teaching?
## ADMISSIONS REPORT
March 30, 1990

### 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>I/S</th>
<th>O/S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest &amp; Rec. Resources</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>I/S</th>
<th>O/S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest &amp; Rec. Resources</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transfers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted (Active)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits Paid</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Transfer Acceptances by College (Active)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest &amp; Rec. Resources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATUS OF FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

FS89-10-3 P  RESOLUTION ON THE EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT HEADS
The Faculty Senate requests that each Department Head be evaluated by the Dean beginning with fifth year of his or her administrative service and continuing every third year thereafter. The Dean shall solicit the opinions of all permanent faculty and a representative of classified employees regarding areas of concern. The Dean shall summarize these views in reports to the Department Head and the Provost. New Department Heads should receive an informal evaluation within the first two years of service. The Provost has approved the resolution.

FS89-12-3 P  RESOLUTION ON MOVING THE LAST DATE FOR STUDENTS TO DROP COURSES WITHOUT RECORD
The Faculty Senate recommends that the Administration move the first drop date to one day before the last day to add a class. The resolution has been forwarded to the Provost.

FS90-2-1 P  RESOLUTION ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS.
Resolution requests that Faculty Development Funds of $150.00 per faculty member be listed as a line item in the budget of each college. The funds are to be transmitted to each department as a line item in that department’s budget and received by each faculty member for the purchase of items appropriate for increasing the scholarship of each faculty member exclusive of travel or increasing departmental collections except with
the consent of the individual faculty member. The Provost does not accept the resolution. See attached letter.

**GUIDELINES FOR DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS.** The report states Faculty Development Funds are to be spent for professional memberships, monographs appropriate for professional/scholarly activities, and continuing education programs. The funds are not to be used for travel or departmental collections except with the approval of the individual faculty member. The Provost does not accept the resolution. See attached letter.

**REVISED POLICY ON RESEARCH ETHICS.** The revised policy incorporates suggestions from the Senate, Professor Jonathan Black, and University Counsel Ben Anderson. The revised policy has been forwarded to the Provost.

**PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF DEANS AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY.** The report states the Deans and the Director of the Libraries shall be evaluated every five years. The Provost shall authorize the selection of the evaluation group for the relevant college. The report outlines the duties to be considered by the evaluation group. The Provost, after consulting with any additional persons he chooses, shall make an evaluation and forward it with the group findings to the President. The Provost does not accept the report. See attached letter.

**RESOLUTION ON DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBER'S TEACHING.** Any viewing of student evaluations by the department administration without the express permission of the faculty member or a statement in the department guidelines that the department administration may view these evaluations as part of the faculty evaluation process is a violation of the Faculty Manual. The Provost approved the resolution.
RESOLUTION REGARDING PROPOSED COURSES WHICH LACK COLLEGE SPONSORSHIP. No University Curriculum Committee should approve a course which lacks college sponsorship, and which has not been approved by one of the nine College Curriculum Committees. The Provost does not accept the resolution. See attached letter.

RESOLUTION ON FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA DISCLOSURE. The Senate recommends that the administration require department heads and deans to reveal to faculty members the system that is used to measure their performance. The Provost does not accept the resolution. See attached letter.

April 3, 1990
Scholastic Policies Committee
Report on Admissions Exceptions for Scholarship Athletes

Since November, 1989, the Scholastic Policies Committee has been investigating the admissions procedures for scholarship athletes. In Fall of 1989, 102 freshman and transfer scholarship athletes enrolled at Clemson. However, 61 of these students (60%) could not meet the normal admissions standards for their chosen colleges. This was true of about 50% of the scholarship athletes in most sports, but in football, 23 out of 25 (92%) could not meet normal academic standards. These "admissions exceptions" students were referred to the Admissions Exceptions Committee, but it has been University policy that any scholarship athlete who meets minimum NCAA guidelines (SAT of 700 or ACT of 15, plus high school GPR of 2.0 on a set of core courses) is eligible for admission to the University.

On March 21, Senator Halfacre, Senator Dunn and Senator Kosinski met with President Lennon to discuss athletic admissions exceptions. The purpose of this report is to summarize the findings of the Committee which were reported to President Lennon, to summarize his response to them, and to give our recommendations on this issue.

The Committee has three major concerns about athletic admissions exceptions:

First, the "admissions exceptions" scholarship athletes are admitted with markedly weaker academic credentials than most other Clemson enrollees (see attached table). In Fall of 1989, only 5% of all Clemson enrollees had a combined SAT score below 800; almost 50% of the 61 admissions exceptions scholarship athletes had SAT's less than 800. Less than 3% of all Clemson enrollees were in the lowest 40% of their high school classes; this was true of 41% of the admissions exceptions scholarship athletes. The median predicted GPR for the admissions exceptions scholarship athletes for whom the Admissions Office computed a PGPR was 1.68. For a hypothetical scholarship athlete who barely met NCAA standards (SAT of 700 and 10th percentile in high school class), PGPR would be about 1.20. Note that these statements apply only to admissions exceptions scholarship athletes, not to all scholarship athletes.

Our second concern related to the unclear origin of the policy admitting scholarship athletes under minimum NCAA guidelines. Although the policy has been in force for years, it appears that it was never formally approved by the Board of Trustees (although the Board certainly knows of its existence). Also, we could not find any place that the policy has ever been written down. All instruction about its implementation appears to have been transmitted verbally.

Finally, we think that the policy puts the faculty on the Admissions Exceptions Committee in an awkward position. On the one hand, they have been
told that they may review and make individual admissions recommendations on all applicants, athletes included. But on the other hand, they are also told that it is University policy that any scholarship athlete meeting minimum NCAA guidelines is eligible for admission. To the best of our knowledge, no scholarship athlete meeting all NCAA requirements has ever been refused admission. Therefore, the role of the Admissions Exceptions Committee as evaluator of the academic promise of the scholarship athletes seems unclear.

In his response to our concerns, President Lennon told us of the reforms he had instituted in the athletic admissions process since he took office. He also emphasized the advantages of seeking nationwide and conference-wide increases in admissions standards through the NCAA and the ACC rather than making unilateral changes in standards ourselves.

The Scholastic Policies Committee was in general agreement with the proposition that a uniform increase in standards by the ACC and the NCAA was a better solution than unilateral change by Clemson, and we realize that the problem of a double standard for athletic admissions probably will not be resolved for a long time. However, we believe that there are some steps which the University can take now:

First, the exact admissions policy for scholarship athletes should be written down and approved by appropriate bodies (possibly the Board of Trustees). Specifically, what rights and privileges does meeting NCAA guidelines give to a scholarship athlete applicant? Does it give him/her automatic admission? Or does it give provisional eligibility for admission provided that the applicant has no unusual academic weakness? If so, who will be the judge of the applicant’s academic qualifications and what standards will they use?

Second, the duties of the Admissions Exceptions Committee in the case of scholarship athletes need to be clarified. This recommendation and our first recommendation are intimately related.

Third, as a general principle, the University should not admit students who, by the University’s own predictors, have little chance of graduating. This is why we have our regular admissions standards. However, the usual predictors may be inaccurate for athletes because, due to the commendable efforts of the Athletic Department, in many cases athletes have a superior academic support environment (access to tutors, etc.). Another "special admission" category, the STEP students, also have access to more counseling and academic support than the average student. In both these cases, the University should develop predictors which take this unusual academic support into account. If the support is effective, then perhaps it could be figured into the predicted GPR equation and athletes and STEP students who are now ineligible for "normal" admission could be admitted under regular predicted GPR standards. On the other hand, if it is disclosed that this extra support makes little difference, then admission of these students has to be reexamined since it
seems that they are at serious risk of never graduating.

Fourth, the University should maintain and increase pressure on the NCAA and the ACC to raise admission standards for athletes.

Fifth, the ultimate goal of University policy should be to work towards a single admission standard for all students.

The Committee would like to request that this report be accepted by the Senate.

Robert Kosinski
Chairman
## SAT Scores and High School Class Standing
**Clemson Enrollees--Fall 1989**

Lightface figures = total number of students in a category

Bold, underlined figures = admission exception scholarship athletes (NCAA admission guidelines)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HS Percentile Rank</th>
<th>&lt; 800</th>
<th>800's</th>
<th>900's</th>
<th>1000's</th>
<th>1100's</th>
<th>1200's</th>
<th>1300's</th>
<th>&gt; 1400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 90%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest 10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In some cases, the SAT scores of scholarship athletes had to be estimated from ACT scores. An ACT of 15 was assumed to be equivalent to an SAT of 700; each ACT point above or below 15 was assumed to be 20 SAT points above or below 700.
Report of the ad hoc University Postal System Committee
April 11, 1990

Committee members: Deana Astle; Paula Heusinkveld; Eldon Zehr, Chair.

Purpose: Prompted by complaints of delays in mail delivery on and off campus, the Clemson University Faculty Senate appointed an ad hoc committee to study the operation of the University postal delivery system. The objectives of the committee were to present those in charge of the postal system specific complaints about inefficient mail delivery, find out where problems existed, and formulate recommendations that would assist faculty and staff in cooperative efforts with the postal delivery system to improve mail service.

Background: Prior to 1981, the University Post Office operated as a substation of the United States postal system. In 1981, Clemson University assumed responsibility for operation of the post office on campus, and it now operates independently of the U.S. postal system except for a cash contract that permits the university system to sell stamps and offer other services. Employees who operate the University post office are employees of Clemson University and the State of South Carolina - their salaries and benefits are not derived from federal government funds.

Clemson University currently employs ten full-time permanent persons, including a recently hired assistant to the postmaster, and five full-time temporary persons in the university postal system. Before November 1, 1989, nine full-time persons, and five full-time equivalent student positions handled the mail on campus. The increase in staff to its present number was prompted by rising complaints about mail delays in 1989.

Approximately 40,000 pieces of mail per day are handled by the university postal system; 12,000 of these are metered mail charged to the individual departments. Until November 1, 1989, one person handled all of the metering of mail; now two individuals handle this responsibility. Metered mail increases in volume to nearly 18,000 pieces per day in late summer and early fall. Three employees stationed in the Johnstone Hall location are not involved in mail sorting and delivery -- they serve university student mailboxes, sell stamps, and handle routine matters associated with the post office operation.

Because crowding of facilities in Johnstone Hall became acute in 1989, mail sorting and delivery personnel were moved recently to a location at the Clemson Shopping Center in Clemson. Inefficiencies of operation obviously result from this separation into two locations, but overall efficiency is improving due to relief from overcrowding.
Sources of Problems. To identify sources of problems, the committee met with James M. Fowler, Supervisor of Delivery; Katrina Skelton, University Postmaster; Lydia K. Whisenant, Director of Information Support Services; and Richard C. Gray, Associate Vice President for Information Management. We learned that the University postal system is struggling with a number of problems related to rapid growth of Clemson University and the accompanying volume of mail.

One major problem is that despite an increase in the number of full-time employees in 1989, the postal system is overwhelmed with the volume of mail relative to the number of employees. Although the situation has eased in recent months, overtime work still is essential to keep up with the volume of mail entering the delivery system. Metering machines are overloaded; they are not designed for the large number of letters and parcels they now handle. The five full-time temporary positions are limited to six months each, and employees holding those positions must be laid off for two weeks and then rehired.

Temporary positions mean no benefits and no job security. Temporary and permanent positions have a much lower pay scale than comparable positions in the federal postal system. Employee morale suffers and so does retention of employees. There is little immediate prospect of adding enough permanent employees or of improving salaries to retain competent people. Even with these deficiencies, the postal system is operating at a deficit of about $18,000 per year. Additionally, expansion of University offices to off-campus locations such as the apparel and computer centers near Pendleton add to complexities of mail pick-up and delivery.

Attempts to Address Problem Areas. Employees of the University postal system give serious attention to complaints of unsatisfactory mail service. They perform duties clearly not in their job descriptions to expedite efficient service. Specific instances of unsatisfactory mail delivery that were brought up during the interviews were acknowledged forthrightly and the postal employees' attempts to deal with the problems were explained. Obviously, strong efforts are being made to provide efficient mail service under the constraints of operation. However, no one could assure us that problems would not continue to crop up until the problems listed previously are dealt with effectively.
2. Do not mix metered mail originating from two or more departments. Doing so requires sorting into the various departments for billing purposes.

3. Be sure that addresses are correct and complete.

4. Promptly notify the post office of changes in name or address on campus. Do not assume that the post office is informed immediately of such changes.

5. Consider whether once daily pick-up and delivery of mail at a centralized location in each building would be acceptable.

6. A centralized location in each building for mail pick-up and delivery would improve efficiency.

C. Other administrative units

1. Changes in office locations should be reflected promptly in changes of address.

2. For bulk mailings especially on campus, sort mail by intended departments -- not alphabetically by individual names. Large savings in time and more rapid delivery will result.

3. Establish central locations for pick-up and delivery.

Concluding remarks. The University postal system is operating under severe budgetary and personnel constraints. Limitations to the quantity and quality of service it can provide are likely to continue for the foreseeable future. Individuals and administrative units can help alleviate some of the pressure by being careful to use correct, complete addresses and presorting mail to the extent possible. When problems arise, describe them as fully as possible and refer them to the proper individuals (usually the postmaster) so that problems can be addressed effectively.

The University Administration can provide additional assistance beyond supplying necessary funds and personnel. The United States postal system offers training sessions to assist in streamlining operations and oversight of personnel. The new location that provides additional space offers opportunities to improve efficiency and make use of the services available from outside the university. The staff of the postal service should take advantage of these services to the extent possible, and the
Administration should support, and perhaps insist upon, such participation. The frequent serious delays in mail service experienced during the past year must not be allowed to continue.