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

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated December 13, 1994, were approved as written.

3. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Committee Reports**

   **Welfare Committee.** Senator Lois Lovelace Duke stated that she will meet with the administration of Fike Recreation Center and representatives of the Classified Staff Commission regarding the increase of fees.

   **Finance Committee.** Senator Roger Doost shared with the Senate information regarding fund revenues, E&G Budget Expenditures, and comparisons of revenues with different institutions (Attachment A).

   **Policy Committee.** Senator Ron Thurston stated that this Committee has now collected enough documentation to continue work on guidelines for tenure and professional ethics.

   **Research Committee.** Senator David Leigh stated that there was no report.

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Webb Smathers stated that there was no report.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**

   1) Senate Alternate Jerry Waldvogel reported that he and Senator Smathers are members of a committee to look at service learning on campus, chaired by Larry Allen. The Senate was asked to forward opinions as to: what service learning on campus is; under which area one thinks service learning will fall; should Clemson University be involved in service learning; and/or is Clemson University already doing service learning.

4. **President's Report - President Owens announced that Robbie Hughes (Nursing) and Alan Schaffer (Liberal Arts) have been appointed as Grievance Counselors; and reminded the Senate of procedures for elections for the offices of Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary which will be held in March. President Owens expressed that he had done his best as a member of both the Screening and Selection Committees and explained the campus visitation schedule of the four presidential candidates. The Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee is the designated group to whom collected, written data on the candidates should be sent, and urged the Senate to contact trusted colleagues about each candidate. The Executive/Advisory Committee will then forward a consensus recommendation to the Board of Trustees. President Owens informed the Senate that based on his experience during the search process, he plans to propose changes to the procedure to select the President of Clemson University (Attachment B). Discussion followed.
5. **Old Business**
a. Senator Hassan Behery questioned the status of a resolution on salary equity submitted by the Finance Committee.

6. **New Business**
a. The Advisory Committee submitted nominees for the Grievance Board, and the floor was opened for additional nominations. There being none, Senator Dale Linvill moved to close nominations (which was seconded), and the election of four members to the Grievance Board was held by secret ballot. Gordon Halfacre (Agricultural Sciences), Bob Hogan (Architecture), Ken Murr (Library), and Eric Skaar (Engineering) were elected.

7. **Adjournment.** President Owens adjourned the meeting at 4:04 p.m.

David Leigh, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Senators absent: S. Lewis (N. Ferguson attended), J. Rathwell, J. Flanigan, C. Isbell, S. Amirkhanian, P. Smart (M. Oglesby attended), R. Williams (J. Waldvogel attended)
### SCHEDULE OF CURRENT FUND REVENUES BY SOURCE
Last Ten Fiscal Years

For the Year Ended June 30.
(amounts expressed in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Fund Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>$60,320</td>
<td>$57,859</td>
<td>$57,065</td>
<td>$51,055</td>
<td>$49,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Appropriations</td>
<td>10,220</td>
<td>11,674</td>
<td>11,968</td>
<td>11,539</td>
<td>12,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
<td>122,841</td>
<td>121,562</td>
<td>118,277</td>
<td>123,710</td>
<td>117,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>30,452</td>
<td>28,497</td>
<td>25,577</td>
<td>19,723</td>
<td>16,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>21,684</td>
<td>22,020</td>
<td>22,147</td>
<td>19,335</td>
<td>16,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Grants and Contracts for Auxiliaries</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>1,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Income</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services of Educational Activities</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>2,769</td>
<td>1,999</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>2,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services of Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>58,586</td>
<td>58,374</td>
<td>60,297</td>
<td>55,127</td>
<td>43,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and Systems Development Fees</td>
<td>4,404</td>
<td>4,692</td>
<td>5,005</td>
<td>4,677</td>
<td>4,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>4,546</td>
<td>5,543</td>
<td>6,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Fund Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$321,532</td>
<td>$316,093</td>
<td>$308,633</td>
<td>$295,622</td>
<td>$272,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Year Ended June 30.
(percent of total current fund revenues)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Fund Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Appropriations</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Grants and Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Grants and Contracts for Auxiliaries</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Income</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services of Educational Activities</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services of Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and Systems Development Fees</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Fund Revenues</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clemson University Financial Statements.
SCHEDULE OF CURRENT FUND EXPENDITURES AND MANDATORY TRANSFERS BY FUNCTION

Last Ten Fiscal Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$77,884</td>
<td>$78,109</td>
<td>$78,750</td>
<td>$73,498</td>
<td>$69,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>61,138</td>
<td>62,333</td>
<td>56,055</td>
<td>51,979</td>
<td>49,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>43,509</td>
<td>44,804</td>
<td>44,815</td>
<td>46,980</td>
<td>44,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>20,650</td>
<td>18,422</td>
<td>18,105</td>
<td>18,034</td>
<td>17,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>7,060</td>
<td>6,979</td>
<td>6,898</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>6,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>16,656</td>
<td>16,414</td>
<td>15,434</td>
<td>15,774</td>
<td>14,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance of Plant</td>
<td>17,716</td>
<td>16,804</td>
<td>16,054</td>
<td>16,029</td>
<td>16,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>10,543</td>
<td>10,539</td>
<td>9,991</td>
<td>9,045</td>
<td>8,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>54,964</td>
<td>53,631</td>
<td>57,794</td>
<td>51,650</td>
<td>41,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Fund Expenditures</td>
<td>310,120</td>
<td>308,035</td>
<td>303,896</td>
<td>289,839</td>
<td>270,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Fund Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td>6,625</td>
<td>6,132</td>
<td>5,197</td>
<td>4,508</td>
<td>3,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Fund Expenditures and Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td>$316,745</td>
<td>$314,167</td>
<td>$309,093</td>
<td>$294,347</td>
<td>$274,277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Year Ended June 30,
(amounts expressed in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance of Plant</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Fund Expenditures</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Fund Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Fund Expenditures and Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clemson University Financial Statements
## Analysis of Educational and General Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Research-Departmental</th>
<th>Extension &amp; Public Service</th>
<th>Academic Support</th>
<th>Less Library</th>
<th>Net Academic Support</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Student Services</th>
<th>Institutional Support</th>
<th>Operation &amp; Maintenance</th>
<th>Less Utilities</th>
<th>Total E &amp; G Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY94</td>
<td>$75,693,709.00</td>
<td>$12,349,164.00</td>
<td>$3,522,698.00</td>
<td>$17,806,564.00</td>
<td>$6,193,495.00</td>
<td>$11,613,069.00</td>
<td>$6,193,495.00</td>
<td>$6,972,392.00</td>
<td>$16,106,272.00</td>
<td>$17,623,418.00</td>
<td>$6,622,742.00</td>
<td>$151,470,331.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.97%</td>
<td>8.19%</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>7.67%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>10.83%</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY93</td>
<td>$75,484,181.00</td>
<td>$12,200,365.00</td>
<td>$3,146,495.00</td>
<td>$15,499,686.00</td>
<td>$6,070,379.00</td>
<td>$9,429,307.00</td>
<td>$6,070,379.00</td>
<td>$6,864,744.00</td>
<td>$15,939,094.00</td>
<td>$16,659,777.00</td>
<td>$5,913,661.00</td>
<td>$146,769,763.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.43%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>10.56%</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
<td>10.86%</td>
<td>11.35%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY92</td>
<td>$76,964,143.00</td>
<td>$10,987,114.00</td>
<td>$3,474,938.00</td>
<td>$15,539,378.00</td>
<td>$5,857,426.00</td>
<td>$9,681,952.00</td>
<td>$5,857,426.00</td>
<td>$6,847,848.00</td>
<td>$15,178,393.00</td>
<td>$16,006,838.00</td>
<td>$5,520,265.07</td>
<td>$145,915,694.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.75%</td>
<td>7.53%</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>10.65%</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>6.64%</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>10.97%</td>
<td>3.78%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY91</td>
<td>$71,815,285.89</td>
<td>$10,644,120.04</td>
<td>$3,993,748.86</td>
<td>$15,959,251.47</td>
<td>$5,624,648.95</td>
<td>$10,334,602.52</td>
<td>$5,624,618.95</td>
<td>$6,803,106.55</td>
<td>$15,543,220.61</td>
<td>$16,026,025.92</td>
<td>$5,489,454.94</td>
<td>$141,557,344.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.73%</td>
<td>7.52%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>11.27%</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
<td>10.98%</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY90</td>
<td>$68,308,853.89</td>
<td>$10,295,185.23</td>
<td>$4,239,163.47</td>
<td>$15,358,487.77</td>
<td>$5,335,649.18</td>
<td>$10,202,836.59</td>
<td>$5,335,649.18</td>
<td>$6,763,866.85</td>
<td>$14,504,696.59</td>
<td>$16,569,979.61</td>
<td>$5,122,684.99</td>
<td>$121,709,065.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.90%</td>
<td>7.52%</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
<td>11.35%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>7.15%</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
<td>4.94%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>11.19%</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY89</td>
<td>$62,048,202.68</td>
<td>$9,462,770.10</td>
<td>$3,993,748.86</td>
<td>$15,358,487.77</td>
<td>$5,335,649.18</td>
<td>$10,202,836.59</td>
<td>$5,335,649.18</td>
<td>$6,763,866.85</td>
<td>$14,504,696.59</td>
<td>$16,569,979.61</td>
<td>$5,122,684.99</td>
<td>$121,709,065.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.75%</td>
<td>7.59%</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
<td>11.35%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>7.15%</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
<td>4.94%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>11.19%</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This table represents the percentage breakdown of educational and general expenditures for fiscal years FY94 to FY89. Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.*

**Please note:** Data for 1994 was obtained by fax from Cindi Hadlock in Accounting Services at 12:28/M on 11/22/94. Prior year data was compiled from the corresponding year's Financial Report Supplemental Schedules.
## Analysis of Educational and General Expenditures

### FY94 vs FY93 vs FY92 vs FY91 vs FY90 vs FY99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY94</th>
<th>FY93</th>
<th>FY92</th>
<th>FY91</th>
<th>FY90</th>
<th>FY99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$75,693,709.00</td>
<td>$75,484,181.00</td>
<td>$75,964,143.00</td>
<td>$71,815,295.89</td>
<td>$68,308,853.89</td>
<td>$62,048,202.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>49.97%</td>
<td>51.43%</td>
<td>52.75%</td>
<td>50.73%</td>
<td>49.90%</td>
<td>49.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research-Departmental</td>
<td>$12,349,164.00</td>
<td>$12,220,365.00</td>
<td>$10,987,114.00</td>
<td>$10,644,412.04</td>
<td>$10,295,185.23</td>
<td>$9,462,770.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>8.15%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>7.53%</td>
<td>7.52%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Public Service</td>
<td>$3,522,698.00</td>
<td>$3,146,495.00</td>
<td>$3,474,538.00</td>
<td>$3,993,746.86</td>
<td>$4,239,163.47</td>
<td>$1,656,524.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>$17,806,564.00</td>
<td>$15,499,686.00</td>
<td>$15,539,378.00</td>
<td>$15,959,251.47</td>
<td>$15,388,177.77</td>
<td>$15,396,477.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>10.56%</td>
<td>10.65%</td>
<td>11.27%</td>
<td>11.35%</td>
<td>12.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Library</td>
<td>$6,193,495.00</td>
<td>$6,070,379.00</td>
<td>$5,857,426.00</td>
<td>$5,624,648.95</td>
<td>$5,335,649.18</td>
<td>$4,912,512.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Academic Support</td>
<td>$11,613,069.00</td>
<td>$9,429,307.00</td>
<td>$9,681,952.00</td>
<td>$10,334,602.52</td>
<td>$10,202,834.50</td>
<td>$10,483,965.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>7.67%</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
<td>6.64%</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>7.15%</td>
<td>8.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$6,193,495.00</td>
<td>$6,070,379.00</td>
<td>$5,857,426.00</td>
<td>$5,624,648.95</td>
<td>$5,335,649.18</td>
<td>$4,912,512.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$6,972,392.00</td>
<td>$6,864,744.00</td>
<td>$6,847,848.00</td>
<td>$6,803,106.55</td>
<td>$6,763,666.85</td>
<td>$5,572,728.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
<td>4.94%</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>$16,406,272.00</td>
<td>$15,939,094.00</td>
<td>$15,178,393.00</td>
<td>$15,543,220.61</td>
<td>$14,594,696.50</td>
<td>$15,701,727.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>10.83%</td>
<td>10.86%</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>12.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>$17,623,416.00</td>
<td>$16,659,777.00</td>
<td>$16,066,838.00</td>
<td>$16,026,025.92</td>
<td>$16,569,970.61</td>
<td>$14,579,112.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>11.35%</td>
<td>10.97%</td>
<td>10.13%</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>11.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Utilities</td>
<td>$6,622,742.00</td>
<td>$5,913,661.00</td>
<td>$5,520,265.07</td>
<td>$5,489,454.94</td>
<td>$5,327,269.73</td>
<td>$5,222,684.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>4.03%</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>$11,000,674.00</td>
<td>$10,746,116.00</td>
<td>$10,486,572.93</td>
<td>$10,056,700.98</td>
<td>$11,242,709.48</td>
<td>$9,356,277.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
<td>7.19%</td>
<td>7.44%</td>
<td>8.22%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$6,622,742.00</td>
<td>$5,913,661.00</td>
<td>$5,520,265.07</td>
<td>$5,489,454.94</td>
<td>$5,327,269.73</td>
<td>$5,222,684.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>4.03%</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship &amp; Fellowship</td>
<td>$1,056,116.00</td>
<td>$955,421.00</td>
<td>$917,042.00</td>
<td>$771,995.36</td>
<td>$568,033.11</td>
<td>$291,522.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total E&amp;G Expenditures</td>
<td>$151,470,331.00</td>
<td>$146,769,763.00</td>
<td>$145,915,694.00</td>
<td>$141,557,344.70</td>
<td>$136,878,086.52</td>
<td>$124,709,065.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Does not include transfers and other deductions)

**Please Note:** Data for 1994 was obtained by fax from Cludi Hadlock in Accounting Services at 12:28 PM on 11/22/94. Prior year data was compiled from the corresponding year's Financial Report Supplemental Schedules.
### Clemson and Comparison Institutions Without Land Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Clemson</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Comparison Institution</th>
<th>Comparison Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clemson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clemson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exp.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXHIBIT 1

### Clemson and Comparo Institutions with Land Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Louisiana State</th>
<th>U of Maryland</th>
<th>University of Texas</th>
<th>U of Virginia</th>
<th>U of Washington</th>
<th>U of Wisconsin</th>
<th>West Virginia</th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson State</td>
<td>U of Maryland</td>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td>U of Washington</td>
<td>U of Wisconsin</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$512,085,168</td>
<td>$171,402,367</td>
<td>$210,706,249</td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue

- Tuition Fees
- Federal Appropriations
- State & Local Appropriations
- Rev. Other Grants & Contracts
- Rev. Private Gifts & Grants & Contracts
- Gifts & Bequests
- Rev. Sales & Service Activities
- Rev. Auxiliary Enterprises
- Rev. Student Services
- Rev. Other Sources

### Expenditures

- Instruction
- Research
- Public Service
- Academic Support
- Student Services
- General Administration
- Operations-Maintenance of Plant
- Scholarships & Fellowships
- Student Financial Aid
- Investment Income
- Gift Income
- Capital
- Hospital

### Total Revenue & Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$512,085,168</td>
<td>$512,085,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Sources

- Tuition Fees
- Federal Appropriations
- State & Local Appropriations
- Rev. Other Grants & Contracts
- Rev. Private Gifts & Grants & Contracts
- Gifts & Bequests
- Rev. Sales & Service Activities
- Rev. Auxiliary Enterprises
- Rev. Student Services
- Rev. Other Sources

### Expenditures

- Instruction
- Research
- Public Service
- Academic Support
- Student Services
- General Administration
- Operations-Maintenance of Plant
- Scholarships & Fellowships
- Student Financial Aid
- Investment Income
- Gift Income
- Capital
- Hospital

### Total Revenue & Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$512,085,168</td>
<td>$512,085,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue

- Tuition Fees
- Federal Appropriations
- State & Local Appropriations
- Rev. Other Grants & Contracts
- Rev. Private Gifts & Grants & Contracts
- Gifts & Bequests
- Rev. Sales & Service Activities
- Rev. Auxiliary Enterprises
- Rev. Student Services
- Rev. Other Sources

### Expenditures

- Instruction
- Research
- Public Service
- Academic Support
- Student Services
- General Administration
- Operations-Maintenance of Plant
- Scholarships & Fellowships
- Student Financial Aid
- Investment Income
- Gift Income
- Capital
- Hospital

### Total Revenue & Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$512,085,168</td>
<td>$512,085,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
President's Report Jan 95

Presidential Search

I have done my best (1 out of 15; 1 out of 6)
Note who is there and who is not there
4 academics

Campus visitation

Saturday-Sunday: Curris
Sunday-Monday: O'Brien
Monday-Tuesday: Marx
Wednesday-Thursday: Fleming
Friday morning: Board Meeting:
Friday afternoon late: press conference with the president designate

Small groups will meet with the person according to a schedule. I understand there will also be an open meeting for each candidate.

I have designated the members of the Executive/Advisory Ctee to be the faculty group interviewing each candidate. The Advisory Ctee consists of an elected representative from each FS college group. The executive ctee consists of committee chairs.
Evaluation

Integrity & Leadership you must collect data and evaluate each in comparison to the others. (every thing is relative)

If you have a friend -- someone you can trust -- at one of these institutions call and ask about the candidate. (If you don’t know someone, perhaps a colleague does and could make a call)

1. integrity (straightforwardness and honesty)
2. leadership
does he respect faculty as professionals?
does he really care about faculty? ___
About students? ____
inclusive of faculty in the decision process?
make the hard decisions?
is he fair in his dealings
does he inspire confidence in people
has he built a campus environment of collegiality and civility. (as opposed to antagonism, dissonance, conflict)
3. Would you hire him?

Channel typewritten comments (separate page for any one candidate) to a member of the advisory ctee. Besure to include the candidate’s name and your name.

The Executive/Advisory Ctee will get composite information, recommendations to the Board
1. **Class of '39 Award for Excellence.** Cecil Oates Huey, Jr., Professor of Mechanical Engineering and this year's recipient, was honored at a ceremony during which congratulatory remarks were given by President Philip H. Prince, Dr. T. L. Senn of the Class of '39, and Faculty Senate President Walt Owens.

2. **Call to Order.** President Owens called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

3. **Approval of Minutes.** The General Faculty and Staff Minutes dated December 21, 1994 were approved as written. The Faculty Senate Minutes dated January 10, 1995, were also approved as written.

4. Gregory M. Pickett, Associate Professor of Marketing, was introduced by President Owens. Dr. Pickett explained the reasoning of and responded to comments and questions regarding the "Clemson Partners Survey", a project developed by the Office of Development, which he helped design. Some Faculty Senators strongly believe this survey contains a negative slant towards faculty (Attachment A).

5. **Committee Reports**

   a. **Committee Reports**

      **Welfare Committee.** Senator Lois Lovelace Duke stated that she had met with Jim Pope concerning the increase in Fike Recreational Center fees. Mr. Pope explained that the reason was due to the decrease of the Student Affairs budget. Senator Duke announced that the Clemson University AIDS Task Force will bring the AIDS quilt to campus on August 30 & 31 and September 1 & 2, 1995. Interested volunteers should call Phil Howard at 656-1655. The final analysis of salary data was submitted (Attachment B) with a brief explanation that effective raises exclude faculty who moved from nine to twelve month status or from twelve to nine month status. Senator Duke also noted that those in Category U3 - unclassified - non-academic (paid on an annual basis and including vice presidents) did exceedingly well compared to the rest of the faculty and staff.

      **Finance Committee.** Senator David Swanson explained the new State law provisions for early retirement buyouts (Item #1 of Committee Report). Senator Roger Doost then submitted and briefly discussed the Report from this Committee (Attachment C).

      **Policy Committee.** Senator Ron Thurston stated that this Committee has considered the following: change of responsibilities of the Scholarships and Awards Committee; policy for awarding tenure for faculty who transfer to Clemson from a tenure track position; possibility of developing an ethics policy for faculty and administrators; development of a Faculty Senate policy regarding the release of sensitive information to the press; and the Computer Misuse Policy (Attachment D). (Comments are to be forwarded to any member of the Policy Committee.)

      **Research Committee.** Senator David Leigh stated that there was no report.
Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Webb Smathers informed the Senate of the following: students have gone on record as opposing the current Honor Code; the manner of Clemson University accreditation may change; possibility of using Fall/Spring Break or Reading/Dead Days to make up missed classes due to inclement weather; and asked the Senate to forward to him individual options of preference regarding updating the drop-add procedure (Attachment E).

b. University Commissions and Committees

1) Facilities and Planning Committee - Deborah Barlow submitted and explained the Report to the Faculty Senate dated February 14, 1995 (Attachment F).

2) Athletic Council - Senator Smith reported on: a problem with banners being towed over Death Valley; NCAA rule change regarding admission of student-athletes; question of student-athletes earning $1500 per year; increased ticket sales for baseball team; and the GPA for the basketball team has risen to 2.14.

3) Senator Ken Murr announced the signing of an agreement among OCLC and participants in a Reciprocal Faculty Borrowing Program.

4) ad hoc Safety Committee - Senator Dale Linvill stated that this Committee is working on guidelines in the areas of fire and safety.

6. Old Business (None)

7. a. Presentation of Slate of Officers. President Owens presented the 1995-96 Slate of Officers from the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate:

- Vice President/President-Elect: Ron Thurston (Agricultural Sciences)
- Secretary: Roger Doost (Commerce & Industry)

The floor was opened for additional nominations for each office. Senator Fran McGuire nominated Senator Pat Smith (Liberal Arts) for Vice President/President-Elect, which was accepted by Senator Smith. Motion was made and seconded to close nominations for each office; vote was taken, and nominations were closed.

b. Oral Statement from Nominees - Oral statements were presented to the Senate by each candidate seeking the office of Vice President/President-Elect.

8. New Business

a. Senator Thurston made a motion from the Policy Committee to bring to the floor a “Resolution to Change the Responsibilities of the Scholarships and Awards Committee” for consideration. Vote was taken and was unanimously passed. Following discussion, Senator Thurston made a motion that this resolution be adopted by the Faculty Senate for inclusion into the Faculty Manual. Vote was taken and passed (FS95-2-1 P) (Attachment G).

b. Senator Leigh presented the “Resolution Welcoming Dr. Curris” from the Executive/Advisory Committee to the Faculty Senate for consideration. During discussion, Senator Marvin Dixon submitted friendly amendments to the resolution, one of which was accepted. Discussion followed.
Senator Dixon moved that proposed resolution be modified as he designated, which was seconded. Discussion followed. Call to Question was stated and vote was taken and passed. Senator Dixon moved acceptance of the resolution that includes changes to the Executive/Advisory Committee resolution designated by him. Motion was seconded. Vote was taken and failed (7 yes; 14 no; 3 abstentions). Discussion followed on original resolution submitted by the Executive/Advisory Committee with minor word additions. Call to Question was stated, vote was taken and passed. Vote was taken to accept amended "Resolution Welcoming Dr. Curris" and passed unanimously (FS95-2-2 P) (Attachment I).

9. Executive Session. Senator Steve Stevenson made a motion that the Faculty Senate go into Executive Session to discuss a personnel matter which was seconded; vote was taken, and passed. Following discussion, it was moved and seconded to come out of Executive Session. Vote was taken and passed.

10. President’s Report President Owens announced that nominees for the Honorary Degree Committee are to be forwarded to the Provost; and that the Faculty Senate had received an anonymous donation to its Operating Account. President Owens then submitted his President’s Report dated February 14, 1995 (Attachment J).

11. Adjournment. President Owens adjourned the meeting at 6:36 p.m.

David Leigh, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Senators absent: J. Rathwell, H. Behery (M. LaForge attended), S. Barbary, J. Flanigan, S. Amirkhanian, R. Williams, G. Powell (J. Waldvogel attended)
CLEMSON PARTNERS SURVEY

Clemson University is changing. Those of us with an important stake in Clemson hope and expect this change will lead to an even more competitive educational institution. Clemson recognizes the key role each of you plays in making Clemson the kind of place it is today. To help Clemson better serve its students, alumni and friends, we are asking that you take a few minutes to respond to several questions below. Your input is important in shaping Clemson University's future. Please let us know how you feel about the direction Clemson is taking and whether our stewardship of your support is appropriate by completing this survey. All responses we receive will be held in strict confidence. Thank you very much for your help!

CLEMSON'S CHANGING FACE

Please answer the questions in this section by placing a check (✓) in the space that best represents your opinion or by responding briefly in the space provided. This section deals with your general feelings and attitudes toward Clemson University.

1. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

- I feel Clemson University's future is bright. □ Strongly Agree □ Strongly Disagree □ Don't Know
- The new administrative changes made in the University are very positive. □ □ □ □ □
- The four new colleges created by consolidating existing colleges are a bad idea. □ □ □ □ □
- I feel I understand why so much change is necessary at Clemson. □ □ □ □ □
- Clemson faculty are overpaid for the work they perform. □ □ □ □ □
- A degree from Clemson is worth more than ever before. □ □ □ □ □
- Clemson is doing a good job educating students. □ □ □ □ □
- The emphasis Clemson places on service to South Carolina, basic research and education is about right. □ □ □ □ □
- Clemson truly values the gifts I make to the University. □ □ □ □ □

2. If you were describing Clemson to a friend who knew nothing about our University, what would you emphasize?

3. What single change would you implement at Clemson if you had the power to do so?

SUPPORT FOR CLEMSON

Many non-profit organizations fail to ask their supporters why they give, if their gifts are being used well and whether their generosity is really appreciated. The following questions deal with these issues. Please respond to each of the questions on the back by checking (✓) the appropriate space or by briefly answering the question in the space provided.

(over)
4. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

- Clemson University makes me feel as if my contributions and support are appreciated.

- I fully understand who benefits from the money I donate to Clemson.

- I am dissatisfied with how Clemson appears to be using contributions I make to the University.

- It is inappropriate for Clemson students to telephone me to request my annual gift to the University.

- I intend to make a gift to Clemson University in the future.

5. Many Clemson University supporters make annual contributions to several worthwhile causes. Please list the three most important causes that you support with your tax-deductible gifts. A response in blank number “1” indicates that you feel it is the most important giving opportunity that you support, while a response in blank number “3” suggests that the organization is the third most important recipient of your gifts. Also, please check (✓) the time of year during which you usually donate to each of the causes you identify below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 3 Recipients</th>
<th>Time of Year Gift Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. __________________</td>
<td>Jan.-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. __________________</td>
<td>Jan.-March</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What percent of Clemson’s budget do you think comes from the South Carolina Legislature? _________ %

7. Over the years, Clemson University has changed the name of its annual giving program several times. Currently it is called “The Clemson Fund”. This name supersedes the name “Loyalty Fund”.

- Were you aware that “The Loyalty Fund” name had changed to “The Clemson Fund”?  Yes  No

- Do you feel better donating to a Clemson giving program called:

  ☐ The Clemson Fund  ☐ The Loyalty Fund  ☐ Name makes no difference

8. Are you getting back from Clemson what you expect to receive when you make a contribution?  Yes  No

Please explain

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

This concludes the Clemson Partners Survey. Thank you very much for your time and response. If you have any questions concerning this project, please feel free to contact Mr. Jack McKenzie at (803) 656-3861 for further information.
Summary of raises across campus based on status (U1,U2,U3,C1,C2,T1) and Salary Range, i.e. Below 50K and 50K and Up.

NOTE: These data exclude ALL persons who changed percent appointment, changed from 9 to 12 month, changed from 12 to 9 month or did not work in one of the two years of the study.

NOTE: Raises in dollars or percent are all EFFECTIVE raises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>95 Sal</th>
<th>Raise $</th>
<th>Raise %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U1 Avg</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>49454</td>
<td>2485</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1 Min</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>-16923</td>
<td>-50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1 Max</td>
<td>131000</td>
<td>18519</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1 Below 50K</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>36723</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1 50K and Up</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>64209</td>
<td>3010</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2 Avg</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>57837</td>
<td>3340</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2 Min</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>-13420</td>
<td>-16.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2 Max</td>
<td>134000</td>
<td>22739</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2 Below 50K</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>36570</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2 50K and Up</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>71315</td>
<td>4087</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3 Avg</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>41233</td>
<td>2447</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3 Min</td>
<td>7308</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3 Max</td>
<td>115343</td>
<td>24139</td>
<td>47.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3 Below 50K</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>34104</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3 50K and Up</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71931</td>
<td>5172</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Avg</td>
<td>2316</td>
<td>23888</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Min</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>-11614</td>
<td>-46.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Max</td>
<td>70000</td>
<td>13720</td>
<td>62.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Below 50K</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>23209</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 50K and Up</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55984</td>
<td>2579</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Avg</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17574</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Min</td>
<td>10152</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Max</td>
<td>27738</td>
<td>2848</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Below 50K</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17574</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 50K and Up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 Avg</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13562</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 Min</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 Max</td>
<td>38500</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 Below 50K</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13562</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 50K and Up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 26, 1995

FINANCE COMMITTEE - These items are submitted for Senate’s deliberation:

1. State law’s new provisions for early retirement buyouts:
   - PAY 42% PER YEAR FOR 5 YEARS BUYOUT
   - PAY 46% PER YEAR FOR 4 YEARS BUYOUT
   - PAY 50% PER YEAR FOR 3 YEARS BUYOUT
   - PAY 54% PER YEAR FOR 2 YEARS BUYOUT
   - PAY 58% PER YEAR FOR 1 YEAR BUYOUT

This item is being submitted for faculty information and Welfare Committee’s deliberations.

2. WE LIKE TO RAISE THESE QUESTIONS REGARDING RESTRUCTURING:
   - ACCORDING TO THE PRESIDENT (BEFORE NOV. 1), THE PURPOSE OF RESTRUCTURING WAS TO DO THINGS BETTER. IS COMBINING OF COLLEGES INTO 4, PARTICULARLY COMBINING COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY, NURSING, EDUCATION, MILITARY SCIENCE, AND SOME DEPARTMENTS FROM LIBERAL ARTS "DOING THINGS BETTER"?
   - ACCORDING TO THE PRESIDENT (AFTER NOV. 1), THE PURPOSE OF RESTRUCTURING WAS TO SAVE MONEY TO ENHANCE OUR TEACHING BASE? WHERE IS THE MONEY SAVED AND WHERE IS IT GOING?

According to President’s letter of January 16, 1995 to the Board of Trustees, over 3 million dollars will be diverted from administration to academics and additional money will be saved by having department heads and their assistants teach, etc.

Is this presumed saving the result of not hiring unneeded positions or actual reduction in force? What positions are these that are being cut and saved? Which department heads that did not used to teach will start teaching now? Is this the result of restructuring or just a change in command structure? Some departments just got a directive that their teaching loads would go up by 50%. Is this a change in priorities or would you attribute this to restructuring?

3. ON THE ISSUE OF RESOLUTION ON SALARY INEQUITY:
   Since the original resolution was printed in detail in an issue of INSIDE CLEMSON and other newspapers; and because in a letter dated November 30, 1994 to President Prince, among a host of other issues, the concern of many faculty on salary inequity was elaborated upon; and particularly because President Prince has promised to look carefully at all raises above the $50,000 salary level, the Finance Committee feels that passing a resolution at this time on this matter could be counter-productive and does not favor the issuance of such a resolution.

4. We have received basic information on salaries for the 93/94 academic year. The condensed summary of this data is enclosed. Based on this information, 39% goes to faculty salaries; 24% is extension salaries; and 37% is non-faculty salaries (administration and operations) - an amount almost equal to total teaching faculty’s salaries. This, we thought, was the primary question that we wanted to address dealing with the university’s administrative bloat.

Respectfully submitted for Faculty Senate’s deliberation and review.

Roger K. Doost, Chair
Finance Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE_ACCT</th>
<th>TYPE_ACCT_DESC</th>
<th>sumexp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>43982079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>RESEARCH</td>
<td>21990677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>RESEARCH-AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION</td>
<td>13378459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>RESEARCH-AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION</td>
<td>117510.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>EXTENSION &amp; PUBLIC SERVICE</td>
<td>4593069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>EXTENSION &amp; PUBLIC SERVICE-COOPERATIVE AGR</td>
<td>18367204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>EXTENSION &amp; PUBLIC SERVICE-REGULATORY SERVICE</td>
<td>3816851.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ACADEMIC SUPPORT</td>
<td>11347892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>STUDENT SERVICES</td>
<td>3680489.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>12819447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PLANT</td>
<td>9125868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>12473704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>13385878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169079130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary (000)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (000)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>65,973</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>40,273</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Admin.</td>
<td>12,074</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support (Grants)</td>
<td>11,348</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>12,819</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maint.</td>
<td>9,126</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>13,386</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169,079</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximate Breakdown  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Other Costs</td>
<td>113,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Univ. Costs</td>
<td>316,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we have discussed by phone, attached is a revised version of the DCIT Computer Misuse Policy, approved by the Computer Advisory Committee at our January, 1995 meeting. A prior revision of this policy (basically the 'revised version' shown on the page, less the handwritten changes) was originally sent to the Senate probably two years ago, by my predecessor, Russ Marion. As best I could determine, in consultation with Ms. Stearke, the handwritten suggested changes were made at the Senate -- by whom we could not determine.

So, what I have done, as chair of the Computer Advisory Committee, was to resubmit this policy the CAC. We adopted it, with the 'networks, facilities' phrase added. This will now be the DCIT Misuse policy.

I now submit this newly adopted version to you for consideration by the Senate. I understand that this policy may (or should?) be inserted into the Faculty Manual, with Senate approval. Doing so will bring the Misuse Policy in the Faculty Manual into consonance with the DCIT policy.

I will be happy to try to answer any questions you or the Senate may have.
This is the present DCIT Computer Misuse Policy:

Use of University computing resources (including account numbers, interactive terminals, data storage media, other peripherals, microcomputer systems and software) for computing activities other than those authorized by the University is strictly prohibited.

If the need for other uses develops, you must obtain the appropriate authorization in advance. Unauthorized duplication or alteration of software licensed by the University is strictly prohibited. In addition, use of resources other than those authorized by the University is regarded as a criminal act (theft), which will require restitution for any theft of computing resources and for any cost incurred by the University due to such misuse.

In any investigation of misuse of computing resources, the University reserves the right to inspect, without notice, the contents of computer files, regardless of storage medium, and system output, such as computer printout.

This is a revised version:

Use of University computing resources (including account numbers, interactive terminals, data storage media, other peripherals, microcomputer systems and software) for computing activities other than those authorized by the University is strictly prohibited.

If the need for other uses develops, you must obtain the appropriate authorization in advance. Unauthorized duplication or alteration of software licensed by the University is strictly prohibited. In addition, use of resources other than those authorized by the University is regarded as a criminal act, and may result in criminal prosecution. The University will require restitution for any theft of computing resources and for any cost incurred due to such misuse.

In any investigation of misuse of computing resources, the University reserves the right to inspect, without notice, the contents of computer files, regardless of storage medium, and system output, such as computer printout.

Note: The only changes are in the second paragraph. **Adopted** 1/12/1995 by Computer Advisory Committee
MEMORANDUM TO: Deans and Department Heads
THRU: J. V. Reel
FROM: Stan Smith
SUBJECT: Procedural Questions Related to New Registration Plans

Records and Registration is currently preparing materials on new registration procedures for distribution to academic departments and faculty members on March 1. Members of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies raised a registration procedural question at their February 10 meeting that needs to be resolved before the new materials are distributed.

One feature of the new process is the elimination of drop/add slips. They will be replaced by the on-line registration procedures at the beginning of the term. The question to be resolved is how many days students should be permitted to add a class on-line once classes begin. Students' use of the on-line system to drop a course has not raised any questions.

Three alternatives were discussed. The alternatives are described below in relation to the 1995 fall semester. Proportionate dates would be used for spring semester and summer sessions. The calendar and date periods immediately below should assist in understanding the three alternatives.

August 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

August 22, 23
August 24, 25, 28, 29, 30
August 31- Sept. 6

Registration days
First week of classes
Second week of classes

-Continued on Reverse Side-
#1 Fall Semester. Adds: Through **August 23** students and teaching department (via Departmental Management of Course Data System) can use on-line system for adds. **August 24-September 6** teaching department only can use on-line system for adds. After September 6, students come to 104D Sikes to resolve enrollment corrections and request addition of a new class.

#2 Fall Semester. Adds: Through **August 25** students and teaching department (via Departmental Management of Course Data System) can use on-line system for adds. **August 28-September 6** teaching department only can use on-line system for adds. After September 6, students come to 104D Sikes to resolve enrollment corrections and request addition of a new class.

#3 Fall Semester. Adds: Through **August 30** students and teaching department (via Departmental Management of Course Data System) can use on-line system for adds. **August 31-September 6** teaching department only can use on-line system for adds. After September 6, students come to 104D Sikes to resolve enrollment corrections and request addition of a new class.

The approximate number of course **adds** occurring during these time periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Course Adds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 22-23</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 24-25</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 28-30</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 31-September 6</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please consider this matter, mark your departments preference, and return this form to Stan Smith, Records and Registration, 102 Sikes by February 23. Commission members have a meeting scheduled on February 24 to specifically discuss this issue. Their names are listed below. Your representative would be interested in your thoughts and he/she can provide additional information on the discussion that occurred at the Commission meeting February 10.

Person
Dept. Name _____________ Expressing Preference _____________ Date _______

SBS:dck

cc: Members of Commission on Undergraduate Studies

William Barron  Trey Dubose  Roger Rollin
Wes Burnett  William R. Fisk  Webb Smathers
Joseph Culin  Eleanor O. Hare  Brian Suber
Jo Ann Deeken  David Nicholas  Deborah Switzer
David Detrich  Lauretta I. Park  Scott Turner
Alison Drews-Bryan  Cheryl Rainey
REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE
February 14, 1995

DEBORAH BARLOW, Faculty Senate Representative
to the FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE

There were five major items on the agenda of the January 18, 1995 meeting:
1. Subcommittee Reports
2. Fort Hill Steam Line
3. Master Plan Update
4. Satellite Dish Policy
5. Project Updates

I'd like to briefly summarize each and then present a request for the Senate's consideration.

Subcommittee Reports
Access and Accommodations for Individuals with Disabilities -- In the absence of Kim Alexander, Shirley Davis reported that the transition plan for ADA compliance of campus facilities had been completed. I have a copy of that plan if any of you would like to review it. I can be reached at X-3932 or at "dbarlow."

Landscape Committee -- Andy Anderson presented plans for the Fort Hill steam line which brings us to item #2 on the agenda.

Fort Hill Steam Line
Andy Anderson presented a map of Fort Hill upon which three different possible steam-line layouts were indicated. After a brief discussion which included the effect of the various layouts upon the trees and buildings currently in situ, the Committee opted for the layout which caused the least harm to the indigenous trees while maintaining reasonable costs.

Master Plan Update
Gerald Vander Mey presented the current Master Plan for the University, which is configured around a projected student enrollment of 23,000. I'd like to review the other two agenda items and come back to this.

Satellite Dish Policy
Gerald Vander Mey presented that policy of which I have copies if you are interested. In general, the policy prohibits the installation of satellite dishes below a certain size or in locations other than those specified and approved by the Campus Master Planning Office. The policy was designed to prohibit students from hanging the newly available smaller dishes from their dormitory windows and the like. The Committee approved the policy.

Project Updates
Mark Wright presented an overview of active campus construction projects. In
particular, we discussed the New Student Center, the traffic changes that would occur as a result of that site development and that of the golf course, and the overwhelming need for a Central Energy Facility.

I'd like to return briefly to the Committee's review of the Master Plan and focus on the traffic and parking component of the plan. This component has been planned, according to Mr. Vander Mey, to (and I more or less quote the minutes here) "improve roadway systems, add approx. 3,500 additional parking spaces, create new parking structures; develop a shift in the types of parking; and gradually shift parking away from the inner core of campus to the outer areas." I have the greatest concern about the first and last items—the so-called improved roadway systems and the shift of parking to outlying areas of campus.

During my brief, and, I must admit, somewhat distant, perusal of the plan I could not perceive any roadway or parking structure that was in any way closely attached to the main Library building. Being a Librarian, I, of course, noticed this first and foremost, but I am sure that, given more time to study the plan, I could have found several other heavily-used buildings throughout campus in which this same situation held true.

The Library situation, however, does exemplify my concerns that these changes will have a serious impact on both the mobility-handicapped population of the campus and the employees at large. Obviously, the mobility-handicapped will be presented with greater accessibility problems to any building where this situation arises. The planners submit that the shuttle-bus service would be enhanced as these changes were made, but even so, shuttle drops which are even as close as 50-100 yards away present this population with excessive accessibility difficulties.

All of us should have concerns about when these shuttles will run— that is what hours of the day and with what frequency. According to this plan there will come a day when there will be little or no parking in central campus and faculty, staff, and students alike will be reliant on said shuttle. All of us have probably made adjustments to our schedules in order to assure ourselves of better parking and there will probably be many of us that will be able to function quite well with additional adjustments. This sort of inconvenience is to be expected on any campus this size. However, it is important for us to keep in mind that with reliance on the shuttles or foot or bicycle modes of transport, there will likely be an increase in the probability that a faculty member will be late for a class or an important meeting, or that facilities such as the bookstore or the library may not open as schedule all because of a missed bus.

The larger issue, however, is that of security. Although crimes like beatings, rapes, and robberies are not the issue on this campus that they are on some, I am concerned that the lack of traffic and corresponding activity on our "campus-of-the-future" and the increased vulnerability of individuals waiting on bus stops or walking to distant parking lots will eventually create a sort of breeding-ground for these sorts of unwanted activities.

I believe it is incumbent upon this representative body to consider these risks and, if called for, express these concerns to the planners and administrators of this institution. Thank you for your time.
RESOLUTION TO CHANGE THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SCHOLARSHIPS AND AWARDS COMMITTEE

FS95-2-1 P

Whereas, The Scholarships and Awards Committee unanimously recommended that the responsibilities of this Committee be revised to read as follows:

The Scholarships and Awards Committee formulates and recommends policies and procedures relating to scholarships, awards and grants-in-aid. It approves nominees for collegiate scholarships and approves policies and procedures for the awarding of University-wide scholarships. The committee also serves as an appeals body for scholarship, award and athletic grant-in-aid recipients.

Whereas, The Faculty Senate Policy Committee voted (5 for, 1 against) to accept the recommended changes in the responsibilities of the Scholarships and Awards Committee for incorporation into the Faculty Manual:

Resolved, That it is recommended that the Faculty Senate adopt this resolution of change in the responsibilities of the Scholarships and Awards Committee.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on February 14, 1995
RESOLUTION WELCOMING DR. CURRIS

FS95-2-2 P

Whereas, Dr. Constantine W. Curris has been named the Thirteenth President of Clemson University by the Board of Trustees;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate of Clemson University, the legally constituted body representing the Faculty of Clemson University, on behalf of the Faculty, hereby congratulates and welcomes “Deno” Curris as the successor to President Phil Prince; and be it

Further Resolved, That the Faculty Senate pledges its cooperation with and support of Dr. Curris in his future efforts to advance Clemson University and its mission, which have always been and continue to be the Senate’s chief aims; and be it

Further Resolved, That the Faculty Senate looks forward to working closely with Dr. Curris in an atmosphere of collegiality, mutual respect, close communication, and common goals; and be it

Further Resolved, That the Senate welcomes and encourages Dr. Curris’s presence at its future meetings as a resource person and colleague.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on February 14, 1995
Concert featuring Elton John and Billy Joel

Assuming sale of $50K tickets, the margin will be

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\$115,000} & \quad \text{to} \quad \text{\$200,000} \\
-50,000 & \quad -50,000 \\
\text{Net} & \quad \text{65,000} \quad \text{150,000}
\end{align*}
\]

for bond service

will go to student use.

**Budget cut** being considered by the House Ways and Means Ctee: 5% of appropriation would take a 9% increase in tuition to offset it (considered out of the question)

House is also considering not appropriating the "nonrecurring funds" for higher education. That would be another 5%.

**Student Senate** has passed a resolution that the honor code in Engineering be dismantled. One Whereas indicates that there has been little student interest in a new code nor has there been a desire by student leaders to create such a code.

**The FS past presidents** met with President Prince on 8 Feb. It was recommended that two committees be established. One Ctee is to update the Faculty Manual. Ctee includes: Joe Mullins, Roger Rollin and Bob Waller. The second committee to recommend restructuring certain councils, commissions and committees of the University. Ctee to be include:

- one senior member of the faculty, chosen by the President of the FS, the VP of the FS, and the Provost.

- four faculty members, each elected from separate new colleges by the Senate Exec/Adv Ctee or the Senate (?)

- one Alumni Prof selected by the Alumni Professors

- one named prof selected by the named profs.

- one undergraduate student, chosen by the student senate

- one grad student, chosen by the Grad Student Assn.
Participants (continued)

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Southern Methodist University
University of Southern Mississippi
University of Southwestern Louisiana
State University of New York at Albany
State University of New York at Buffalo
State University of New York, College of Environmental Science & Forestry
Stevens Institute of Technology
Syracuse University
Temple University
Tennessee Technological University
University of Tennessee at Knoxville
Texas A&M University
Texas Christian University
Texas Tech University
The University of Texas at Arlington
The University of Texas at Austin
The University of Texas at Dallas
Texas Woman's University
University of Toledo
University of Toronto
Tufts University
Tulane University
University of Tulsa
Utah State University
University of Utah
Vanderbilt University
University of Vermont
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Wake-Forest University
Washington State University
University of Washington
Washington University in St. Louis
University of Waterloo
Wayne State University
West Virginia University
Western Michigan University
University of Western Ontario
The College of William & Mary in Virginia
University of Windsor
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Wichita State University
Wright State University
University of Wyoming
York University

PARTICIPANTS

RECIPROCAL FACULTY BORROWING PROGRAM

as of November, 1994

University of Alabama at Birmingham
University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa
University of Alberta
The American University
Andrews University
Arizona State University
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
Ball State University
Biola University
Boston College
Boston University
Bowling Green State University
Brandeis University
Brigham Young University
University of British Columbia
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Riverside
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara
Carleton University
Carnegie Mellon University
Case Western Reserve University
The Catholic University of America
University of Chicago
University of Cincinnati
The Claremont Colleges
Clark-Atlanta University
Clark University
Cleveland State University
Colorado State University
University of Colorado at Boulder
The University of Connecticut
Dalhousie University
University of Delaware
University of Denver
University of Detroit Mercy
Drake University
Duke University
The inaugural conference presented by the Academy for Scholarly Publishing at the College of Charleston will focus on how to get published in the academic arena. Featured presenters include representatives from ACADEME, American Geophysical Union, Wiley, University Press of Virginia, W. W. Norton, Springer-Verlag, Routledge, Annual Reviews, Association of American Publishers, and successfully published faculty. Topics range from how to begin and get organized, making contacts, and preparation of manuscripts to negotiations and current trends in scholarly publications. This is an ideal professional development event for both aspiring and seasoned authors!

Individual Proposal/Abstract Review

Participants who would like to have either proposals or manuscripts reviewed may do so through this section, which will pair faculty authors with reviewers from trade and/or academic presses, or with faculty reviewers in appropriate disciplines. Submissions may be in any of the following forms: (1) journal articles, in complete or partial draft if under twenty pages, or excerpted if longer; (2) book proposals, including outline and sample of text; (3) completed books (submit only summary description, table of contents, and one representative chapter). An additional fee of $35 will be charged for this section. Proposals/manuscripts must be received by February 10, 1995.

Charleston, SC

Set on the campus of the College of Charleston, founded in 1770, in historic downtown Charleston, South Carolina, the conference takes place in a setting renowned for its beauty and history. Only a few minutes' walk from campus are opportunities for tours of architecturally and historically significant homes, carriage rides, exciting shopping and unique dining experiences at many superb restaurants and cafes.

Accommodations

Special conference hotel rates are available. Reservations must be made by Jan. 26 to guarantee these special rates. 1-800-426-7666, group rate SCH. Hampton Inn Historic District
345 Meeting Street (2 1/2 blocks away)
Charleston, S.C. 29403 · (803)723-4000
$59.00/night, single or double per room
(complimentary continental breakfast)
1. **Call to Order.** President Owens called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated February 14, 1995, were approved as corrected.

3. **Election of Officers.** The Advisory Committee brought forward its slate of candidates for Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary. The floor was opened for additional nominations. There being none, elections were held by secret ballot. Ronald J. Thurston was elected Vice President/President-Elect and Roger K. Doost was elected Secretary.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Committee Reports**
      - **Welfare Committee.** Senator Lois Lovelace Duke stated that copies of salary data will soon be available in the Library and the Faculty Senate Office for those making under $50,000. Senator Duke asked that senators inform her of any matters this Committee may need to consider before the conclusion of this year.
      - **Finance Committee.** Senator Roger Doost submitted and explained the University Cost Summary for 1993-94 (Attachment A).
      - **Policy Committee.** Senator Ron Thurston submitted this Committee’s report (Attachment B) and mentioned an additional item under examination by the Policy Committee regarding the conflict of interest concerning research projects by faculty.
      - **Research Committee.** Senator David Leigh noted that the Research Committee was working on the Financial Disclosure Policy generated by the Research Division. After explaining to the Senate proposed changes to the policy, Senator Leigh asked for a Sense of the Senate which resulted in the affirmation that it was a reasonable proposal. This Committee is also reviewing the Master Plan of the University and the potential of increasing the size of the University to 23,000 students.
      - **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Webb Smathers stated that this Committee has discussed the students’ perception of the Engineering Honor Code. He stated that the students are opposed to the Engineering Honor Code, but not necessarily to a University Honor Code. Senator Smathers also informed the Senate that the students have put forth an Academic Advising Proposal. This Committee will meet at 9:00 a.m. on April 5th in 223 Barre Hall.

b. **University Commissions and Committees**

5. **President’s Report.** President Owens briefly discussed the President’s Report dated March 6, 1995 (Attachment C) and the President’s Report dated March 14, 1995 (Attachment D). President Owens announced that a bill had been introduced to the House of Representatives by Representative Witherspoon regarding higher education and tenure. During discussion, it was
decided that President Owens would appoint a Select Committee to examine this issue.

6. **Old Business**
   a. Senator Thurston, Chair of the Policy Committee, made a motion to bring forth for adoption a revised resolution regarding credit for service towards tenure for faculty hired within the University. This resolution was brought before the Senate in 1993-94. The floor was opened for debate, and it was noted that two-thirds vote would be necessary because this resolution would require a [Faculty Manual](#) change. Vote was taken and resolution passed (Attachment E) (FS95-3-1 P).

7. **New Business**
   a. Former Faculty Senate President Larry Bauer submitted the Report of the Faculty Senate Select Committee to Reapportion and Restructure the Faculty Senate. It was recommended by Senator Rollin that each item be considered individually by the Senate. Both friendly amendments and an unfriendly amendment were made to the Report. All friendly amendments were accepted by Dr. Bauer, however, one amendment was not passed by the Senate. Items 1, 6 and 7 did not require action by the Faculty Senate; however, Items 2-5 and 8 were voted on and passed. The Faculty Senate accepted all recommendations of this Committee including amended recommendations (Attachment F).

   President Owens thanked Dr. Bauer and members of the Select Committee for their excellent work.

   Senator Rollin moved that "Further Modification of Draft II" by the committee chaired by Robert A. Waller to revise the Constitution, be submitted to the Senate for acceptance, which was seconded. Motion to table was made and was seconded.

8. **Adjournment.** President Owens adjourned the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

   [Signature]

   David Leigh, Secretary

   [Signature]

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Senators absent: S. Lewis (N. Ferguson attended), J. Rathwell, D. Swanson (M. LaForge attended), S. Amirkhanian, M. Dixon, K. Murr (M. Foster attended), S. Stevenson (J. Waldvogel attended), R. Williams
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A/C</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Salaries</th>
<th>Benefits &amp; Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$43,982</td>
<td>$8,047</td>
<td>$52,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>$21,991</td>
<td>$2,715</td>
<td>$24,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>$65,973</td>
<td>$10,762</td>
<td>$76,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$13,378</td>
<td>$2,429</td>
<td>$15,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$118</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$4,593</td>
<td>$917</td>
<td>$5,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$18,367</td>
<td>$4,488</td>
<td>$22,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$3,817</td>
<td>$893</td>
<td>$4,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Extension</td>
<td>$40,273</td>
<td>$8,750</td>
<td>$49,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>$11,348</td>
<td>$2,498</td>
<td>$13,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$3,680</td>
<td>$822</td>
<td>$4,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Institution Supp.</td>
<td>$12,819</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
<td>$15,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Operation &amp; Maint</td>
<td>$9,126</td>
<td>$2,558</td>
<td>$11,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Departmental Adm.</td>
<td>$22,429</td>
<td>$5,917</td>
<td>$28,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Auxiliary Enterp.</td>
<td>$13,378</td>
<td>$3,575</td>
<td>$17,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Student Enterp.</td>
<td>$9,126</td>
<td>$2,558</td>
<td>$11,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Total Salaries</td>
<td>$169,079</td>
<td>$34,230</td>
<td>$203,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Salaries</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Departmental Adm.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Auxiliary Enterp.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Operation &amp; Maint</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Senate Policy Committee
Hassan Behery, Marvin Dixon, John Huffman,
Ken Murr, Patricia Smart, Roger Rollin
Ron Thurston, Chair

Report of the Policy Committee

The following items of business are currently being considered by the Policy Committee:

1. Misuse policy for the university computer system
2. Sponsoring a forum on ethics issues
3. Recommending guidelines to be followed concerning how the senate or its committees will release sensitive material to the news media
4. Determining a fair policy for offering faculty credit for time spent in tenure-track positions at other institutions before being offered a tenure-track position at Clemson University.

As you will recall, item No. 4 was the purview of the 1993-94 Senate Policy Committee. This committee drafted a resolution which the Senate ratified. The resolution was worded as follows.

The tenure probationary period for a full-time, regular faculty member shall not exceed seven years. Included within this period can be the faculty member's full time tenured or tenure-track service at other four year colleges or universities (hereinafter known as "eligible service"). The exact amount of credit towards tenure is negotiated at the time of appointment and is included in the written contract. If the candidate has one to two years eligible service, the employment offer must include full credit for this service. If the candidate has three or more years of service, the employment offer must include credit for three years of service. However, the candidate may refuse any or all credit towards tenure or can ask for additional credit not to exceed an amount equal to the candidate's eligible service. Agreements for immediate tenure or for a probationary period of two years or less shall be reviewed in accordance with a department's regular tenure peer-evaluation process.
Note: This resolution was sent back to the Policy Committee by the Provost. The Provost objected to having to include a specific amount of credit toward the tenure probationary period in the employment offer.

The Policy Committee has decided that the offer of a specific number of years toward the tenure probationary period is fair. The reason for this decision is that only quality faculty should be offered tenure-track positions, and offering specific credit for their service in tenure-track positions elsewhere is fair and may even serve as an incentive for attracting highly qualified faculty to Clemson University. Therefore, the Policy Committee submits the following resolution for adoption by the Faculty Senate. This resolution is essentially the same as was ratified by the 1993-94 Senate, with minor emendations.

Whereas, offering specific credit for service in tenure-track positions at 4-year colleges or universities is fair and may even serve as an incentive for attracting highly qualified faculty to Clemson University, Therefore,

Be it resolved that the following guidelines be accepted as policy for determining how credit toward the tenure probationary period will be given to faculty being hired at Clemson University who have served in tenure-track positions at other four year colleges or universities:

The tenure probationary period for a full-time, regular faculty member shall not exceed seven years. Included within this period can be the faculty member's full time tenured or tenure-track service at other four year colleges or universities (hereinafter known as "eligible service"). If the candidate has one to two years eligible service, the offer of employment must include full credit for this service. If the candidate has three or more years of service, the offer of employment must include credit for three years of service. However, the candidate may refuse any or all credit towards tenure or can ask for additional credit not to exceed an amount equal to the candidate's eligible service. The exact amount of credit towards tenure is negotiated at the time of appointment and is included in the written contract. Agreements for immediate tenure or for a probationary period of two years or less shall be reviewed in accordance with a department's regular tenure peer-evaluation process.
Clemson University Faculty Senate
President's Report
March 6, 1995

I faxed President-elect Curris the resolution of congratulations, welcome and cooperation that we passed unanimously at the February meeting.

Budget (See Enclosure)
The SC House Ways and Means Committee is proposing a 2-1/2 % cut in the '96 budget for higher education and another 2-1/2 % cut in '97. Most other state agencies are being told to reduce their budget by 5% in 1996. It is my impression that the House Leadership and the Governor are committed to the plan.

For the last two years, as a member of the South Carolina Conference of Faculty Chairs, I and other Faculty Senate Presidents have met with key legislators in an attempt to convince them of the need for increased funds in the classrooms and laboratories of our universities. Together we prepared position papers and argued for these things on behalf of the welfare of our students, realizing that higher education plays a crucial role in the economic development of our state and in the improvement of our quality of life. We did this as a proactive project, not as a reaction to the proposed 5% cut. But the mood in Columbia has changed significantly! (I understand that the closest vote on these cuts in the House Ways and Means Committee was 16-8.)

Debate on the Appropriations Bill began today (Monday). Several members of the House of Representatives plan to introduce amendments to exempt higher education from the cuts. (K-12 is exempted.)

But if the cuts pass, we will need to work together to reduce University expenditures in ways that minimize the negative impact on our students in the classroom and the laboratory, and, of course, on our extension clients.

Under state law, it is not possible at present to reduce salaries of people in the same position, so that is not an option. The restructuring we have just gone through should move a few people (former deans) to the classroom, but the costs in salaries remain. And it is obvious that the cuts would necessitate changes far greater than we have seen so far, to reduce our operating costs.

Here are some ways that I have heard suggested by various people to deal with the cut:
- Faculty positions currently vacant may remain unfilled.
- Use part-time faculty.
- Merge departments.
- Initiate a buyout, similar to the one of two years ago.

Clearly, this is a vital concern to those of us who are directly involved in teaching, research, and service.

More will follow.

A recent report on ADA Compliance estimates that it will take $4.5 million to bring the University into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities
Act. Obviously, this further complicates our budget picture. The report details all of the changes necessary. A copy is in the FS office.

Plans for the **Golf Course Inn** are proceeding. (See enclosure.) The planning team is putting together a financing package and the hope is to break ground in the next six months and have the facility operational by January 1997.

I have received complaints from students and parents concerning the administration. Some of these were settled last semester. One related to alleged retribution against a student. Acting with the advice of the Executive/Advisory Committee, I had the matter investigated. The matter has been rectified.

There appears to be a move to rush through a **Master Plan** for increasing enrollment to **23,000 students** and to make Clemson a **pedestrian campus**. I've been told that the administration wishes this to go to the Board this month. I believe that we need to discuss these issues at the March meeting. I have referred this matter to the Research Committee and asked the Committee to conduct an investigation forthwith and to have a report ASAP.

Senator Roger Rollin wrote a nice piece on **what professors do**. It was published in the Columbia *State* and the Anderson *Independent*. But the Greenville *News* declined to print it. My counterpart at USC-Columbia reports many positive comments from the faculty at her institution.

Remember the **reception** scheduled for Tuesday, April 11, 1995.

Walt Owens
Faculty Senate President
Clemson University  
Projected Educational & General Budget  
FY 1995-96  
(Changes Only)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Appropriations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease) in Formula Appropriation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Gov't's Veto FY 94-95 (Raise funding)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises, Merit &amp; Fringe Benefits (Est Bonus @ 2.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease) in State Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Decisions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment - FY95-96 (2460 Fr/860 Tafts)/C Scholars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease) from Academic Decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recoveries - Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Credit Program Savings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Increase (Decrease) in Revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIXED COSTS:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandatory Costs of Compensation (Effective October 1):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise &amp; Merit, Fringe - State/CU (Est Bonus @2.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualize savings FY 94-95 (optional raise cancelled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefit Rate increases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities/Utilities Cost:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;O, Utilities, &amp; Grounds on New Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Mandatory Compensation Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities/Utilities Cost:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;O, Utilities, &amp; Grounds on New Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Facilities Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fixed Costs**

**REVENUES NET OF FIXED COSTS:**

**ADD FEE INCREASE: (orig est 3.4%)**

**REVENUES & FEE INCR NET OF FIXED COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCENTIVE BUDGET PROGRAM:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Matching Funds (Research and Public Serv.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost EEO Set-Aside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Incentive Budget Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER (ALLOCATIONS)/EXP REDUCTIONS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Funding for Strategic Planning initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapture of EPSCOR Match funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To fund additional service courses FY 94-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA Share of TWET FY 1994-95 deficit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Systems - Univ Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Other Allocations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL INCENTIVES/ALLOCATIONS**

**SURPLUS/DEFICIT**

**DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET REDUCTIONS:**

**SURPLUS/DEFICIT**
Clemson University
Projected Educational & General Budget FY 1995-96
OFF-THE-TOP ISSUES

- Enrollment funding
- Summer School Funding
- Fire Department (+/- $50,000)
- Capital Campaign
- Conference Center Equipment

Subtotal

Provost Issues:
- English as a Second Language
- Add'l Minority Faculty Allocation
- Financial Support for Greenville Programs
- Campus Networking (1st of 4yr commitment)
- Admissions funding
- "A Look Inside Clemson" Minority Program

Subtotal Provost Issues

TOTAL OF THE TOP ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REVISED OF</th>
<th>FINAL FY 96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 1995-96</td>
<td>ORIG PROJN</td>
<td>ADJUSTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment funding</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer School Funding</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department (+/- $50,000)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Campaign</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Center Equipment</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$785,000</td>
<td>$785,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Issues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td>$22,656</td>
<td>$22,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add'l Minority Faculty Allocation</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support for Greenville Programs</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Networking (1st of 4yr commitment)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions funding</td>
<td>178,989</td>
<td>178,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A Look Inside Clemson&quot; Minority Program</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Provost Issues</td>
<td>$411,645</td>
<td>$411,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OF THE TOP ISSUES</td>
<td>$1,196,645</td>
<td>$1,196,645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20-Feb-95
What do professors do, exactly?

By Roger B. Rollin

Most Americans value higher education and want their children to go to college. But because higher education is a vast, complex phenomenon, many of us don’t know what to think when it comes under attack.

And under attack it has been, as state financial support for it dwindles and we hear grumblings about people like me, professors, who are said to not work hard enough or are overpaid.

In this article, I want to respond briefly to the latter allegations. For us it’s a privilege to be able to do such gratifying, useful work. But we do have to smile when people tell us how lucky we are to have three months off every year! To be sure, there are some professors who only garden or whatever during their (unpaid) summers, but in my whole career I can only recall a few.

Another thing I did on my summer “vacation” last year was to join a number of my fellow professors in dozens of committee meetings where plans to restructure my university were formulated. In the academic world this is called “service” and all professors are expected to do it — to help develop university policies, plans and procedures and to do outreach, offering our expertise to the public. These duties can take up a lot of faculty time and energy. But a university is not at its heart like most businesses, run from the top down. Its operations depend heavily upon faculty expertise and involvement.

In spite of what you may have heard, the vast majority of professors devote the lion’s share of their time to teaching. Skilled teachers make it look easy, but teaching college is like giving nine 50-minute speeches a week, to highly critical audiences. Behind each of these “speeches” lie four years of college and four or more years of graduate work, plus anywhere from one to four or more hours of preparation — because knowledge is constantly changing and so are our classes, no two of which are identical in character. Professors also teach when they advise students and coach them, design assignments for them, and evaluate their tests and papers. For most of us teaching is the most strenuous thing we do, but also the most gratifying.

By this time it may seem as if we professors have a rather strange kind of job, part of our work is very public, part quite private. Some of it is done in classrooms and meeting rooms but a lot of it is done in labs and libraries and home offices. We work widely varied schedules and with considerable autonomy. However, our work is probably as extensively evaluated as anyone’s — by our students, informally every day and formally each semester, by our fellow professors serving on personnel committees and on editorial boards of professional conferences and journals, and by our supervisors (department heads and deans).

Moreover, our work can never really be done because we can never be perfect teachers, never know enough about our fields, never do enough research and writing. Which is why most of us work nights and weekends and, yes, during those summer “vacations.” (Studies indicate we work on an average of 50 to 60 hours a week.)

But “professor” is an honorable title in an honorable profession that contains some of the finest people I’ve ever known. I feel lucky to have spent 35 years working with them and with all those college students; thousands and thousands of them, for whom just maybe I’ve been able to do a little good.

Roger B. Rollin, William James Lemon Professor of Literature at Clemson University, has taught college for 34 years.
Clemson University Faculty Senate

President's Report

14 March 1995

Library Card. It is possible now to obtain a card that will allow you to use libraries beyond the Clemson campus. See Teresa Alexander (Cooper Library)

Faculty Performance Management System. You may have read in the newspapers about a new method of tabulating faculty work. The instrument in draft form is entitled Faculty Performance Management System. It was presented to the Council of Deans at a February meeting by David Fleming, of the Office of Institutional Research.

The instrument is undergoing revision by a committee composed of the following people:

- Bill Fisk, Associate Dean, College of Education
- Hoke Hill, Acting Department Head, Experimental Statistics
- Carl Helms, Professor of Biological Sciences
- Ron Moran, Associate Dean, Liberal Arts
- Henry Pate, Acting Head, Industrial Education
- Debra Jackson, Head, Health Sciences
- David Allison, Assoc. Prof., Architectural Studies
- Jim Davis, Prof (and former Head), Accountancy
- Russell Brown, Head, Civil Engineering

It is my understanding that David Fleming asked the deans for suggestions for people to serve on this committee and added some others who had worked on this process earlier.

I call your careful attention to this instrument. I am concerned that of the nine members, so few have carried a full teaching/research/extension load in recent times.

The use of Schedule Change Form (Drop/Add) has been discontinued. Students will use the on-line registration system to drop and add courses. Town Meetings for comments, discussion, and question/answers about new registration procedures will be

3:00 PM Tuesday 28 Mar 95
3:00 PM Wednesday 29 Mar 95

at Vickery Auditorium. It is for Advisors, Schedule Coordinators, and other interested persons.
Legislative information. My reading of the environment in Columbia is that there is a great deal of determination (particularly in the House and with the Governor) to proceed with the 5% cuts in budgets (2 1/2% for each of the next two years for higher ed). I believe that it would be foolish not to give some thought to planning for such a cut, so as to minimize the impact on the student and the teacher/researcher/extension agent in the trenches.

In the November/December 1993 issue of Academe there are two excellent articles, beginning on page 12. One is entitled "Budget Cuts and Shared Governance: A Faculty Member’s Perspective," and another entitled "Budget Cuts and Shared Governance: An Administrator’s Perspective."

These focus on the fiscal crisis at the University of Maryland, College Park, which had its state funding cut 20% within 18 months. Both writers comment on how much Faculty Senate, academic departments, and deans were involved in the process. The planning committee was made up mostly of non-administrative faculty, but included some deans and department heads and a few students. The plan had to clear the planning committee, then Faculty Senate. Thereafter it had approval of the president and the Board of Regents. Twenty-nine degree programs, seven departments, and one college were eliminated by the plan.

I met with representatives of a faculty committee from Winthrop University. As you will see from the handouts, they have seen their salary raise money used to reward administrators, far more than faculty. This committee is doing something like an operational audit. They are trying to find out where their money is going. Their Board of Trustees has not cooperated with them. The committee asked the Board to appoint a member to serve on the committee; it declined. The press, however, has been supportive. The faculty asked CHE to appoint a member to serve on the committee. Up against pressure from the Board, however, CHE declined to have a staffer serve, but it has provided data to the committee. A full set of documents and newspaper clippings are available in the FS office.

The Clemson University Financial Plan, February 1995 is very interesting. Beginning on page 11 is a brief account of “Restructuring and Reengineering at Clemson University. . . .” The brief history notes the strong role of the Board of Trustees throughout the process. I’ll have copies placed in the FS office and the library.
RESOLUTION ON CREDIT FOR SERVICE IN TENURE-TRACK POSITIONS

FS95-3-1 P

Whereas, offering specific credit for service in tenure-track positions at 4-year colleges or universities is fair and may even serve as an incentive for attracting highly qualified faculty to Clemson University;

Resolved, That the following guidelines be accepted as policy for determining how credit toward the tenure probationary period will be given to faculty being hired at Clemson University who have served in tenure-track positions at other four year colleges or universities:

The tenure probationary period for a full-time, regular faculty member shall not exceed seven years. Included within this period can be the faculty member's full time tenured or tenure-track service at other four year colleges of universities (hereinafter known as "eligible service"). If the candidate has one to two years eligible service, the offer of employment must include full credit for this service. If the candidate has three or more years of service, the offer of employment must include credit for three years of service. However, the candidate may refuse any or all credit towards tenure or can ask for additional credit not to exceed an amount equal to the candidate's eligible service. The exact amount of credit towards tenure is negotiated at the time of appointment and is included in the written contract. Agreements for immediate tenure or for a probationary period of two years or less shall be reviewed in accordance with a department's regular tenure peer-evaluation process.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate on March 14, 1995.
Committee Members:
Larry Bauer, Chair
Carolyn Brown
Lois Lovelace Duke

Steve Melsheimer
Roger Rollin
Ron Thurston

The Select Committee to Reapportion and Restructure the Faculty Senate presents the following recommendations in view of the undergoing restructuring of the university (Item 1 does not require Senate action, since it simply calls for following the Faculty Constitution. However, Items 2-7 require changes to the Faculty Constitution that should be voted on at the May meeting of the University Faculty):

1. The Faculty Senate should be reapportioned as specified in the Faculty Manual on Page 57:
   
   “Whenever a new college is established, the allocation of seats shall be obtained in the February following official establishment.” The spring 1995 elections should be held as normal, and the Senate reapportioned during February 1996 according to the new college structure. Data provided by the Provost’s Office indicates that if apportionment were done now, the numbers in the new colleges would be:

   Agriculture, Forestry, & Natural Resources 10
   Engineering Sciences & Textiles 9
   Business, Education & Nursing 8
   Architecture, Arts, & Humanities 7
   Library 1

2. Composition of Faculty Senate Advisory Committee: The wording in the Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University in Article II, Section 5 on Page 59 of the Faculty Manual should be changed to (changes in italics):

   The Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee shall be composed of the officers of the Faculty Senate, the senator from the library, and two members from each college elected by the delegation of that college prior to the April meeting. (The remainder of the paragraph is unchanged.)
3. Composition of the Grievance Board: The wording in Article II, Section 5 on Page 60 of the Faculty Manual should be changed to (changes in italics):

The Grievance Board. The Grievance Board shall consist of nine members selected from the ranks of tenured Full and Associate Professors who are present or former members or alternates of the Faculty Senate. (The sentence “Board members shall all be from different colleges.” should be replaced by:) These shall consist of a representative from the library and two representatives from each college (The remainder of the paragraph is unchanged.)

4. The wording in Article II, second paragraph of Section 2 on Page 57 of the Faculty Manual should be changed to (new language in italics):

Any member of the Faculty may be eligible for membership on the Faculty Senate, except department chairs, school directors, deans, provost, vice provosts, president, vice presidents and others with primarily administrative duties.

This reflects the majority of the committee. A minority opinion is that all with faculty rank should be eligible for election to the Faculty Senate. An opinion was also expressed that if administrators are to be excluded from eligibility, the wording “...except those with primarily administrative duties,” should not be changed.

5. The following should be deleted from Article II, Section 2 on Page 58 of the Faculty Manual:

..., with each college having at least one member and no college having more than twenty-five percent of the total representation of the Senate. If the ratio of faculty members in a college to the total number of faculty members in the University exceeds twenty-five percent, that college is assigned eight Senate members. The remaining Senate seats are allocated on the ratio of the number of faculty members in each of the remaining colleges to the total number of members of the Faculty in remaining colleges. The above ratios are multiplied by the number of unallocated seats.

and be replaced by:

“...Senate seats shall be allocated according to the ratio of the number of members of the Faculty in a college to the total number of members of the Faculty in the University. Each college shall have as many seats as are in the nearest whole number when its ratio was multiplied by thirty-five, provided each College has at least one representative. For the purposes of this calculation, the Library is considered a college.”
6. The following should be deleted from the last sentence of Article II, Section 2 on Page 57 of the Faculty Manual:

(....and all other provisions of this Article,....) so that the sentence now reads:
For the allocation of Senate seats, the librarians shall be considered as a faculty representing a college.

7. The committee suggests the membership on the curriculum committees, Article IV, be reviewed in light of the new college alignment.

8. The following should be added to Article II, Section 2, 6th Paragraph, Page 57 of the Faculty Manual:

“Each college, except the Library, shall elect two alternates on a yearly basis; the Library shall elect one. Alternates may twice succeed themselves. An alternate shall have the status of a full member at any Senate meeting attended in the stead of a regular member.”
Behind closed doors

The Winthrop University Board of Trustees conducted public business behind closed doors last week. In so doing, we believe they violated the spirit, if not the letter, of the law.

The state Freedom of Information Act requires that governing bodies of public institutions such as Winthrop conduct their business in the open. Exemptions from the law, such as discussions about contracts or the hiring or firing of an employee, are few and specifically defined in the law.

The trustee board met in two executive sessions on Friday to discuss "personnel matters," according to board chairman Bob Thompson. On Saturday, Winthrop trustees again met behind closed doors on the first day of a two-day retreat.

Following that meeting, Thompson announced the board had discussed initiating an "independent third-party review" of the school’s finances. That proposal then was unanimously approved by the board in a perfunctory public meeting.

All the discussion leading up to that vote would appear to fall under the category of public business. Although Thompson said Saturday’s executive session was called to discuss contractual matters, there was no contract on the table, only the proposal that a consultant be hired.

This meeting took place after the board voted Friday not to appoint a member to serve on a special faculty committee, whose purpose also is to review Winthrop’s finances. Saturday’s action by the board was, in effect, a response to the decision by faculty members to pursue their own review. Thompson said he hopes the review by an independent consultant will open channels of communication and ensure that the board hears from all parts of the university.

But the reluctance of the board to discuss its decision openly seems contradictory to its expressed goal of opening channels of communication. Given the nature of the issue and the importance it has to both the university and the community at large, we think a public meeting was called for.

The public is entitled not only to know the result of the board’s discussions but also to observe the process by which the board makes decisions about public matters.

Rather than alleviating concerns, going behind closed doors may have heightened them. We hope board members will take that into...
Salaries raise concerns
Wintthrop professors question pay hikes at time of budget cuts

By Reginald T. Dogan
The Herald

Students taking final exams aren't the only people looking for answers at Winthrop University this week.

Some irate professors want to know how several administrators received raises as high as 17 percent while the average faculty salary raise was 4 percent.

"There is a lot of faculty concern about salaries and how they are being determined," sociology department chairman Jack Tucker said. "People are questioning whether or not raises are based on merit."

The questions started after Wintthrop released the 1993-94 job titles and salaries for professors, coaches and administrators. On Friday, a graphic was sent anonymously to Winthrop professors. It named six administrators who received salary increases totaling nearly $42,000.

Kathryn Holten, executive assistant to the president, received at least a $8,000 raise, or 17.4 percent, boosting her salary to $54,000. Holten's 1993-94 salary was between $42,000 and $45,999.

Salaries under $50,000 are shown in $4,000 ranges. Other administrators' salaries included in the graphic were:

SALARY

December 2, 1994

Patricia Conner, Winthrop's vice president for finance and control board, said no one's salary increase was submitted to the board for approval.

Dent for academic affairs, said about 20 percent of the raises were above what administrators think are more important than faculty salaries.

The faculty is not required to second-guess decisions they get compensation. Higher-status professors may get raises above the average. The university, on the other hand, decided to only raise salaries of professors and at least 7 percent.

The questions started after Wintthrop distributed the 1993-94 job titles and salaries for professors, coaches and administrators.

While some administrators were receiving raises totaling nearly $42,000, the average faculty salary raise was 4 percent.
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Salaries spark Winthrop unrest
Friday meeting to address inequities in staffs pay

By DAN HUNTLEY
Staff Writer

ROCK HILL — The Winthrop University faculty will meet Friday to discuss increasing unrest about inequities in salaries between faculty and administrators.

Some faculty, however, say their concerns go beyond dollars and cents and center on the performance of school president Dr. Anthony DiGiorgio.

"Faculty morale is at the lowest point it's been in the decade I've been at Winthrop," said associate education professor Steve Million. "The faculty has serious concerns about the direction this university is taking under DiGiorgio's leadership."

In recent weeks, a series of anonymous communications about salary discrepancies has circulated on campus — some from a group called "The Winthrop Committee of Correspondence." Others came from a student known only as "The Gingerbread Man," who claims responsibility for posting "Impeach DiGiorgio" fliers last week.

According to the committee, which gathered its data from the S.C. Higher Education Statistical Abstract, raises for Winthrop administrators ranged from a 20.5% increase to $66,086 for a Winthrop vice president of finance to a 30.77% increase to $85,000 for a vice president of academic affairs over the last 6 years. DiGiorgio's salary rose 29.98% to $87,919. Meanwhile, an average associate professor's salary rose 6.69% to $37,326.

Some administrators have questioned the accuracy of some of the anonymously distributed data, but Winthrop officials have not specified which data they believe to be wrong.

"We're looking forward to being able to discuss these concerns in a straightforward manner on Friday," said Winthrop spokesman Ray Jones. "... One of the problems about anonymous communications is trying to address information that may be taken out of context, or later proven to be wrong."

Winthrop junior Janet Brindle, who plans to attend Friday's meeting, said most students side with the faculty.

"There's a general sympathy with the faculty because it's a fact they are underpaid," said Brindle, editor of the student paper, The Johnsonian. In recent weeks, a series of anonymous communications have surfaced about "President's policies, actions and decisions."

The faculty meeting is at 2 p.m. at Johnson Hall, with a student campus rally in support of the teachers scheduled at the same time.
FACTORY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

NAME: _____________________________ TERM: _____________________________

DEPARTMENT: __________________________ COLLEGE: __________________________

INSTRUCTION:

Course Contact, Preparation, and Grading:
A.1 Undergraduate and Graduate lecture contact hours (incl 600 level):
A.2 Lab contact hours (graduate and undergraduate):
A.3 Directed Studios, Special Projects, Selected Topics (variable crd.) 0.33 HPW per U/G cr. hr.
A.4 Adjustment for team teaching
   (Total HPW allocated not to exceed those for one instructor, mutually agreed by faculty involved)
A.5 Telecampus (A.1) x 2 (only for portions on telecampus)
A.6 Off-Campus (not on overload) (A.1) x 1.5 (only for off campus courses)
A.7 Class preparation time add (1.5 HPW for each lecture contact hour, 1 HPW for each lab contact hour, and for 800 level and above add 2.0 HPW) (for different courses, not multiple sections)
A.8 Off campus course (not on an overload basis) add travel hours
A.9 Honors course add 1.5 HPW per stand alone section
A.10 Course evaluation and grading (7.5 HPW per contact for undergraduate (lecture or lab), 1.0 HPW/lecture contact for other honors and 4/600 level courses, and 1.5 HPW for Grad. lecture or lab contact, 1.6 HPW per contact hr. for writing across the curriculum courses)
A.11 Practicum / Internship
A.12 Multimedia Preparation (A.1) X 2

A" SUBTOTAL

B. INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT:

B.1 Additional preparation time (add 1.0 HPW/per lecture hour for each course taught first time or not in three years)
B.2 Course development:
   New course wide (multiple sections) textbook with revised syllabus (add 0 - 20 HPW)
   Requires extra time for grading (projects, etc.) (add 1.0 HPW)
B.3 Instructional development:
   FTE - instructional support (lab coordinators) (add 0 - 10.0 HPW)
   Significant dev of new instructional approaches (add 0 - 5.0 HPW)

"B" SUBTOTAL

C. GRADUATE COMMITTEE/RESEARCH SUPERVISION (GS 2 must be completed)

C.1.1 Master Committee Chair - (2.6 HPW w/t: .2 w/o/t) per student (Limit 3 semesters)
C.1.2 Master Committee Member - (0.2 HPW w/t: .1 w/o/t) per student (Limit 3 semesters)
C.2.1 Ph.D. Committee Chair - 2.0 HPW per student*
C.2.2 Ph.D. Committee Member - 0.2 HPW per student*
C.3 Preparation of dept wide oral or written graduate exams (0.2HPW)

"C" SUBTOTAL

STUDENT ADVISING (only students directly assigned may count)

D.1 Number undergraduate student advisees: _____ x 0.05
D.2 Number graduate student mentorship (without committee appointments) _____ x 0.08
D.3 Student Organizations (not CO), credit as assigned (max = 0 - 1.0 HPW for all groups)
D.4 Assigned recruiting activities (add 0 - 3.0 HPW)
D.5 College Advising activities: coordinators (add 0 - 3.0 HPW)
D.6 Academic unit advising activities coordinators (add 1.0 HPW)

"D" SUBTOTAL

E. ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES: (PAID FROM 1-49)

E.1 Director (add 0 - 40.0 HPW)
E.2 Chair (add 0 - 20.0 HPW)
E.3 School Coord/Program Coord (add 1.0 - 10.0 HPW)
E.4 Other Administrative duties (add 1.0 - 40.0 HPW)
E.5 Performance coordinator (add 1.0 - 40.0 HPW)

"E" SUBTOTAL

INSTRUCTION TOTAL
**Research and Scholarly Endeavors:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Scholarly Endeavors (faculty publications / performances / compositions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Books written (scholarship, creative, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 Books edited, annotative, bibliography, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 Major text, chapter of book, or scholarly book, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4 Creative monograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5 Article/essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6 Poems, short stories, book reviews, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.7 Proposal reviews / program reviews, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.8 Exhibits / Performances (music / theater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.9 Compositions / arrangements (music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.10 Faculty research on 1-30 with publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not applicable to those with 1.0 FTE on 1-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.11 Papers presented on state or regional level; refereed &amp; non-refereed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.12 Papers presented or invited at national &amp; international meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.13 Journal reviews / proposal reviews / program reviews, refereed &amp; non-refereed (depending on level of involvement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Research (sponsored research)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1 External funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2 Major external funding (greater than 50K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3 Major external funding (10-50K, regardless of year in force or no cost extension approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4 Minor external funding (less than 10K/year) (includes Provost Award, Sigma XI) (add 3.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5 Administration of grants (multiple PI) grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7 For each minor (less than 10,000) proposal submitted - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.8 New faculty member - first year set-up (add 1.0 - 10.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.9 Return to research from teaching or administration OR change in research direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.10 Professional Practice (Peer Review)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Official Committee Assignments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Standing committee and commissions, credit as assigned (0.1 - 1.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 Faculty Senate, or as assigned: (1.0 HPW, except for FS Pres - 5.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 Ad Hoc Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Professional Development, Professional Service, and Public Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1 National Societies: Officer (add 0 - 2.0 HPW), Committee Chair (add 0 - 1.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2 Regional Societies: Officer (add 0 - 1.5 HPW), Committee Chair (add 0 - 0.5 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3 State Societies: Officer (add 0 - 1.0 HPW), Committee Chair (add 0 - 0.5 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4 Editorial Positions: Journal Editor (add 0 - 2.0 HPW), Editorial Board (add 0 - 1.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5 Total hours cont'd instruction for semester. (max = 0 - 10.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6 Public Service (University - associated), credit as assigned (max = 0 - 10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7 Additional professional activities, credit as assigned (max = 4.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total HPW for Semester**

**Previous Semester Workload**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. University Development and Fund Raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1 University Development and Fund Raising (0 - 3.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total HPW for Semester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total HPW ws for previous semester (for information only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Limit of 4 1/2 years w/o masters and 3 1/2 years with masters

3/13/95
MARCH 1995

CLARIFYING POINTS ON STEVE STEVENSON'S PIECE IN THE OPEN FORUM

Faculty Senators are kindly requested to disseminate this information in any way that they find appropriate. The Open Forum Committee not wanting this debate to take on a personal stance did not approve the printing of this response. I respect their decision, but I feel that clarification of the following points is important.

A. Points to consider:
Note 1: Through clash of ideas, the sparkle of truth comes out. The searcher must embody the virtues of purity of motive, a desire to find the truth, the ability to be unprejudiced, and an eagerness to adjust his/her position when the issues are fully debated.

Note 2: If you glance through the 350 books on freedom that the Cooper library possesses (none of which were checked out), you will see that opposition to Freedom of Speech which peaked during Inquisition and culminated by McCarthyism and then, in the Watergate scandal was initiated by people who took a high moral ground in terms of protecting the "religion" or the "state" or the "institution" or the "monarchy" or the "individuals in power".

B. Responses to Dr. Stevenson's Letter:
Item 1. "Any member of the University can say anything they like when speaking for themselves".
Response: Any member of the University should be able to say anything s/he believes is true and can be substantiated. It is responsible speech that we must protect and not supermarket journalism.

Item 2. "I would also support the notion that a Faculty Senator may say anything s/he wants when backed up by his/her constituents."
Response: The difference between direct representation and elected representation is that the elected people gather information but make a judgement on what is a right and responsible position to take. We can not go to our constituents and conduct a poll every time there is a vote on the Senate floor, and we can not burden constituents with all the detail on every single issue. In a dictatorship, the president communicates directly with everyone. As individuals can not delve into every issue, accountability is lost and the dictator solidifies his position and undermines such a "rubber-stamp" senate. As a senator, I can say what I think based on my understanding of the issues and with consideration of the constituents' needs. The polling mechanism is always there to see what the constituents think. The constituents have the options of impeachment for wrongdoing or defeating a person in reelection through their voting power. The right thing to do is not always a popular thing to do. Raising Fike fees and parking fees were not popular. Did you conduct a poll before voting on these issues? Democracy is, in fact, a misnomer. We have government with representation.

Item 3. "Who speaks for the Senate?... The Executive/Advisory Committee has taken on this role - and those faculty do not approve".
Response: Based on what I know the Executive/Advisory Committee has never taken on this role by any stretch of imagination. According to Roberts Rules of Order, the Executive Committee must take care of business between meetings of the assembly. On the question of finalizing the presidential selection, there was less than a week given to the Faculty to go through the final screening process for the four candidates. The task involved was as follows: a) review detailed resumes and background information on each candidate, b) attend, participate, and interact in detail with every candidate, c) collect information on each candidate from inside and outside sources, and d) provide the results to the Board.
of Trustees. The Senate had three options: a) require all faculty to be involved in detail in this process, b) ask the whole Senate to attend each meeting within this five-day period and participate in all discussions, c) with the approval of the Senate, have the 15-member Executive/Advisory Committee go through this process and ask all senators to solicit any information that their constituents could provide to the Committee for communication of the Senate sentiment to the Board. Under the circumstances, the only viable option seemed to be the last one for which approval was obtained from the Senate.

Item 4. "Now who speaks for the Senate?.... Here is where Roger and I part ways."
Response: I have never spoken on behalf of the Faculty Senate or even as a Senator. I have spoken as a responsible citizen, and I have no problem reaffirming a Senate position which is a matter of public record.

Item 5. "There was a time to go to the press and I have supported those moves when they were warranted".
Response: Who decides when it was warrented and when it was not warrented? In effect, you support free press when it suits your needs. You are against it when you disagree with an outcome. I am for responsible free speech, period. In 1992, we had the 42 cents-per-mile scandal; in 1993, we had the luxury car scandal; in 1994, we had the luxury pay-raise scandal particularly, for those whose milage and car perks were taken away. In 1995, we have the undebated and uncertain restructuring issues. Only through responsible vigilance and reporting, we can hope to create the necessary check and balance or at least, make people in position of power think twice before they spread the perks even further. In such a setting, the atmosphere will not be "poisoned" as you suggest. The President will thank you and the Senate (and the public) for being vigilant in protecting this University and the tax-payers' money. The important thing to remember is purity of motive and an eye on the long-term prize; i.e., a better university for our children and grand children.

Item 6. "Going to the press is like starting a nuclear war; you better be sure you are going to win. We are not currently in a winning position."
Response: You see the debate and exchange of ideas and the press's role of picking up on public information as a nuclear war. You want to be in a position of destroying and winning or retreating and hiding. We are not in a war zone, my friend. This is healthy, open, responsible, and respectable interaction between faculty, administration, and the general public in a public institution. The more you hide things; the more you play hide and seek or win and lose games and positioning strategies, the worse it will get.

Item 7. "How do we, the Faculty Senate, get the best deal for our constituents? This is a question of both strategy and tactics."
Response: Again, I have a peace-time and you have a wartime strategy. I see everyone as my friend, and the only enemy to be the absence of clear communication. (Communication in a university setting is not issuing commandments but holding a continuous, open, and honest dialogue with all the constituents). I don't see it in the sense of playing games to see what we can get away with. I see it as our duty to make this place the best it can be in terms of accountability for the long-term health of this institution that we all love.

Item 8. While you agree that "a university is a place for questioning, contemplation, reflection, teaching, research, service, and an unencumbered and uninhibited search after truth", you say, "I SUBMIT THAT MOST TAXPAYERS DO NOT".
Response: You disguise your sentiments for absence of Free Speech on the premise of ignorance of taxpayers. I realize that you and I may have Ph.D.'s, but I submit to you that the elementary school kids and their parents understand that truth, honesty, decency, fairness, equity, elimination or reduction
of university overhead, worker empowerment, elimination of administrators’ perks, classroom accountability, elimination of duplicate courses, etc. are all good things that will promote the interests of this state and this university.

Item 9. If “legislature does not hold Roger’s view....”
Response: Even if I accept your supposition, the solution is not misinformation or silence, but rather honest interaction with regards to where we are and what we think - clear, forthright, and without political hedging of any kind.

Item 10. "It is time to work together... We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately".
Response: What I propose is honest, unabashed, uninhibited, and responsible Free Speech on the part of Faculty and the Faculty Senate with all of our friends in Columbia, in general public, and in the Administration for the long-term health of this institution. What you propose is war-time tactics of positioning, game playing, withholding of facts and information to get something in return in the short-run. The rule that I have followed so far has been that personnel matters (primarily grievance) that are discussed under closed doors shall remain confidential. Any other issue is a matter of public record, and I will not play the games of positioning and posturing of any kind. Let the Faculty and the Senators decide what approach they want to take and I will follow the “informed” majority's wish. Will you?

Respectfully submitted,

Roger K. Doost
CODES OF ETHICS IN ACADEME

A PRESENTATION FOR CLEMSON FACULTY,
STAFF, AND ADMINISTRATORS

SPONSORED BY THE FACULTY SENATE

by

Dr. Daniel Wueste

Associate Professor of Philosophy,
Clemson University

Editor of
Professional Ethics and Social Responsibility

3:30 p.m.
Tuesday, March 28, 1995
Student Senate Chambers at the Student Union

ALL WELCOME!
## Faculty Performance Management System

**NAME:**

**DEPARTMENT:**

**TERM:**

**COLLEGE:**

### INSTRUCTION:

**Course Contact, Preparation, and Grading:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>Undergraduate and Graduate lecture contact hours (incl 600 level):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>Lab contact hours (graduate and undergraduate):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>Directed Studios, Special Projects, Select Topics (variable cred.) 0.33 HPW per U/G cr. hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>Adjustment for team teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5</td>
<td>Telecampus (A.1) x 2 (only for portions on telecampus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6</td>
<td>Off-Campus (not on overload) (A.1) x 1.5 (only for off-campus courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.7</td>
<td>Class preparation time add (1.5 HPW for each lecture contact hour, 1 HPW for each lab contact hour, and for 800 level and above add 2.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.8</td>
<td>Off-campus course (not on overload basis) add travel hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.9</td>
<td>Honors courses add 1.5 HPW per stand alone section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.10</td>
<td>Course evaluation and grading (1.75 HPW per contact for undergraduate (lecture or lab), 1.0 HPW/lecture contact for other honors and 400 level courses, and 1.5 HPW for Grad lecture or lab contact, 1.5 HPW per contact hr. for writing across the curriculum courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.11</td>
<td>Practicum / Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.12</td>
<td>Multimedia Preparation (A.1) x 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"A" SUBTOTAL**

### INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>Additional preparation time (add 1.0 HPW per lecture hour for each course taught first time or not in three years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>Course development: New course wide (multiple sections) textbook with revised syllabus (add 0 - 0.2 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>Required extra time for grading (projects, etc.) (add 1.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"B" SUBTOTAL**

### GRADUATE COMMITTEE/RESEARCH SUPERVISION (GS 2 must be completed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1.1</td>
<td>Master Committee Chair (2.0 HPW w/t: 2 w/t) per student (Limit 3 semesters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.2</td>
<td>Master Committee Member (0.2 HPW w/t: 1 w/t) per student (Limit 3 semesters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2.1</td>
<td>Ph.D. Committee Chair - 2.0 HPW per student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2.2</td>
<td>Ph.D. Committee Member - 0.2 HPW per student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>Preparation of depart wide oral or written graduate exams (0-2HPW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"C" SUBTOTAL**

### STUDENT ADVISING: (only students directly assigned may count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.1</td>
<td>Number undergraduate student advisees: x 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2</td>
<td>Number graduate student mentorship (without committee appointments) x 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3</td>
<td>Student Organizations (not CO), credit as assigned (max = 0 - 1.0 HPW for all groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4</td>
<td>Assigned recruiting activities (add 0 - 3.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.5</td>
<td>College Advising activities: coordinators (add 0 - 3.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.6</td>
<td>Academic unit advising activities coordinators (add 1.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"D" SUBTOTAL**

### ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES: (PAID FROM 1-49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>Director (add 0 - 40.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>Chair (add 0 - 20.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3</td>
<td>School Coord/Program Coord (add 1.0 - 10.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.4</td>
<td>Other Administrative duties (add 1.0 - 40.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.5</td>
<td>Performance coordinator (add 1.0 - 40.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"E" SUBTOTAL**

**INSTRUCTION TOTAL**
FROM: CLEMSON U  
TO: 8036560690000001  
MAR 14, 1995 11:26AM  

**A. Scholarly Endeavors (fact-llty publications / performances/ compositions):**

- **A.1 Books written (scholarship, creative, etc.)**
- **A.2 Books edited, annotatlve. bibliography, etc.**
- **A.3 Major text, chapter of book, or scholarly book, etc.**
- **A.4 Creative monograph**
- **A.5 Article/essay**
- **A.6 Poems, short stories, book reviews, etc.**
- **A.7 Proposal reviews/program reviews, etc.**
- **A.8 Exhibits/Performances (music/theater)**
- **A.9 Compositions/arrangements (music)**
- **A.10 Faculty research on 1-30 with publications** (not applicable to those with 1.0 FTE on 1-20)
- **A.11 Papers presented on state or regional level; refereed & non-refereed**
- **A.12 Papers presented or invited at national & Int'l meeting**
- **A.13 Journal reviews/proposal reviews/program reviews; refereed & non-refereed (depending on level of involvement)**

**A" SUBTOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Research (sponsored research)**</th>
<th>External funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1 External funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2 Major external funding (greater than 50K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3 Major external funding (10 - 50K, regardless of year in force or if no cost extension approved)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4 Minor external funding (less than 10K/year) (includes Provost Award, Sigma Xi) (add 3.0 HPW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5 Administration of grants (multiple PI grant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6 For each minor (less than 10,000) proposal submitted -1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7 New faculty member - first year set up (add 1.0 - 10.0 HPW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.8 Return to research from teaching or administration OR change in research direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.9 Professional Practice (Peer Review)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B" SUBTOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. University Development and fund raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1 University Development and fund raising (0 - 3.0 HPW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C" SUBTOTAL**

**SERVICE TOTAL**

**TOTAL HPW FOR SEMESTER**

**PREVIOUS SEMESTER WORKLOAD**

- **I.1 Total HPWs for previous semester (for information only)**

* Limit of 4 1/2 years w/o masters and 3 1/2 years with masters
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Salaries spark Winthrop unrest
Friday meeting to address inequities in staff's pay

By DAN HUNTLEY
Staff writer

ROCK HILL — The Winthrop University faculty will meet Friday to discuss increasing unrest about inequities in salaries between faculty and administrators.

Some faculty, however, say their concerns go beyond dollars and cents and center on the performance of school president Dr. Anthony DiGiorgio.

"Faculty morale is at the lowest point it's been in the decade I've been at Winthrop," said associate education professor Steve Million. "The faculty has serious concerns about the direction this university is taking under DiGiorgio’s leadership."

In recent weeks, a series of anonymous communications about salary discrepancies has circulated on campus — some from a group called "The Winthrop Committee of Correspondence." Others came from a student known only as "The Gingerbread Man," who claims responsibility for posting "Impeach DiGiorgio" fliers last week.

According to the committee, which gathered its data from the S.C. Higher Education Statistical Abstract, raises for Winthrop administrators ranged from a 20.5% increase to $66,086 for a Winthrop vice president of finance to a 30.77% increase to $85,000 for a vice president of academic affairs over the last 6 years.

DiGiorgio's salary rose 29.96% to $87,919. Meanwhile, an average associate professor's salary rose 6.69% to $37,326.

"We're looking forward to being able to discuss these concerns in a straightforward manner on Friday," said Winthrop spokesman Ray Jones.

"One of the problems about anonymous communications is trying to address information that may be taken out of context, or later turnout to be wrong."

Winthrop junior Janet Brindle, who plans to attend Friday's meeting, said most students side with the faculty.

"There's a general sympathy with the faculty because it’s a fact they are underpaid," said Brindle, editor of the student paper, The Johnsonian.

The faculty meeting is at 2 p.m. at Johnson Hall, with a student campus rally in support of the teachers scheduled at the same time.

Staff salaries spark unrest at Winthrop

Faculty
Continued from page 1Y

for a vice president of academic
affairs over the last 6 years.

DiGiorgio's salary rose $87,919. Meanwhile,
an average associate profes-
sor's salary rose 6.69% to
$37,326.

Some administrators have
tioned the accuracy of
some of the anonymously dis-
tributed data, but Winthrop offi-
cials have not specified which
data they believe to be wrong.

"We're looking forward to
being able to discuss these
concerns in a straightforward
manner on Friday," said Win-
throp spokesman Ray Jones.

"One of the problems
about anonymous communica-
tions is trying to address infor-
mation that may be taken out of
context, or later turnover to be
wrong."

Winthrop junior Janet Brin-
dle, who plans to attend Fri-
day's meeting, said most stu-
dents side with the faculty.

"There's a general sympathy
with the faculty because it's a
fact they are underpaid," said
Brindle, editor of the student
paper, The Johnsonian.

The faculty meeting is at 2
p.m. at Johnson Hall, with a
student campus rally in support
of the teachers scheduled at the
same time.
Pay scales at Winthrop

Winthrop University President Anthony DiGiorgio attempted to calm the tempest created by the disclosure of large raises for a number of administrators by explaining the various calculations that went into the decision to award the raises.

**In Summary**

- Are salaries at university in line with those at other schools in the region?
- Were given raises of less than seven percent — some as little as three percent, some nothing at all — a number of administrators were given raises totaling more than 10 percent — some more than 12 percent, one more than 17 percent.
- At a time when public universities are complaining about the lack of money available for salary increases, some administrators were rewarded with raises that strike many as exorbitant. At the least, there is a question of sensitivity regarding these raises.
- No one, especially faculty, should question the need to recruit and retain able administrators. They are an essential component to the smooth functioning of the university.
- But there also is a need to hire and keep the best professors available. If better-paying jobs are available elsewhere, the good educators not only will leave Winthrop but also the Southeast, and the region will suffer for it.

If DiGiorgio wants to silence the critics of these administrative raises, he should produce statistics comparing salary levels for comparable positions, including faculty, at other schools in the region. This should include figures showing the trend in salary increases.

We know that faculty salary levels have been depressed in many South Carolina institutions of higher learning in recent years. Have administrative salaries also remained level or have they steadily increased during the same time period?

The University of South Carolina recently has undergone a painful reassessment of its faculty salaries, in which it was determined that 62 professors — 52 of them women — had not received fair pay adjustments. The university will settle with 52 of those professors, paying them more than $400,000 in raises and back pay.

Winthrop, according to the chairman of the board of trustees, has formed a committee to make sure pay is adjusted fairly. We hope the committee will provide sound suggestions that will satisfy most, if not all, of the critics of the school's pay structure.

In the meantime, the administration — fairly or not — is stuck with the appearance of living high on the hog while being insensitive to the needs of faculty members.
Salaries raise concerns

Winthrop professors question pay hikes at time of budget cuts

By Reginald T. Dogan

Students taking final exams aren't the only people looking for answers at Winthrop University this week.

Some irate professors want to know how several administrators received raises as high as 17 percent while the average faculty salary raise was 4 percent.

"There is a lot of faculty concern about salaries and how they are being determined," sociology department chairman Jack Tucker said. "People are questioning whether or not raises are based on merit."

The questions started after Winthrop released the 1993-94 job titles and salaries for professors, coaches and administrators. On Friday, a graphic was sent anonymously to Winthrop professors. It named six administrators who received salary increases totaling nearly $42,000.

Kathryn Holten, executive assistant to the president, received at least a $8,000 raise, or 17.4 percent, boosting her salary to $54,000. Holten's 1993-94 salary was between $42,000 and $45,999.

Salaries under $50,000 are shown in $4,000 ranges.

Other administrators' salaries included in the graphic were:

PLEASE SEE SALARY, BACK PAGE
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Faculty to do its own study

Winthrop trustees vote to use outside consultants for probe.

By TONYA JAMESON

ROCK HILL — An ad hoc faculty board has decided to conduct its own study into Winthrop University's finances despite the decision by the school's board of trustees to hire outside consultants.

"This ad hoc committee was formed and its members elected to conduct a study of budget priorities at the university," said Glen Broach, a professor who wrote last week's resolution to form the faculty-proposed committee. "We shall proceed with the implementation of our charge."

The trustees' decision to use an outside consultant, announced in a letter from board chairman Robert L. Thompson Jr. on Saturday, comes after a rash of anonymous letters and computer messages circulated on campus.

The letters requested the impeachment of University President Anthony DiGiorgio and pointed out inequities between administrative and faculty salaries.

Friday, the board of trustees unanimously voted to decline a faculty resolution that would have had an ad hoc committee investigate faculty concerns.

The concerns include salaries, budget priorities, reduced enrollment and the effect of tightened budgets on academic programs.

Several board members doubted the objectivity of a committee with five faculty members and no administrators. The faculty-proposed committee would have included a board member and an S.C. higher education budget official.

Using an independent consultant is a dispassionate way to review the organization and administration, the academic programs and the faculty and student body, Thompson's letter said. A committee, made up of ten

Please see Winthrop/page 3 Y

Faculty to conduct own study of university

Winthrop

Continued from page 1 Y

ured faculty chosen by other faculty members, students and administrators, will work with the consultant.

The review should take three to four months to complete. The board will use the report to develop a university plan; however, the plan is not binding.

"We (the ad hoc committee) were not elected to serve in an advisory capacity and we regret that the board chose not to appoint a member to join us," Broach said. "If they should wish to do so at a later date we would welcome their participation."

The faculty already has elected four members to serve on the ad hoc committee: Broach from arts and sciences; Steve Million from education; Bob Gorman from the library; and Bob Kline from business administration, Broach said.

The faculty has scheduled a meeting for Friday to discuss the committee and other matters, Broach said. Lack of official status could hurt a committee's ability to gather information.

Staff Writer Dan Huntley contributed to this article.
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Using an independent consultant is a dispassionate way to review the organization and administration, the academic programs and the faculty and student body, Thompson's letter said. A committee, made up of ten

Please see Winthrop/page 3 Y

Faculty to conduct own study of university

Winthrop
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ured faculty chosen by other faculty members, students and administrators, will work with the consultant.

The review should take three to four months to complete. The board will use the report to develop a university plan; however, the plan is not binding.

"We (the ad hoc committee) were not elected to serve in an advisory capacity and we regret that the board chose not to appoint a member to join us," Broach said. "If they should wish to do so at a later date we would welcome their participation."

The faculty already has elected four members to serve on the ad hoc committee: Broach from arts and sciences; Steve Million from education; Bob Gorman from the library; and Bob Kline from business administration, Broach said.

The faculty has scheduled a meeting for Friday to discuss the committee and other matters, Broach said. Lack of official status could hurt a committee's ability to gather information.

Staff Writer Dan Huntley contributed to this article.
Behind closed doors

The Winthrop University Board of Trustees conducted public business behind closed doors last week. In so doing, we believe they violated the spirit, if not the letter, of the law.

The state Freedom of Information Act requires that governing bodies of public institutions such as Winthrop conduct their business in the open. Exemptions from the law, such as discussions about contracts or the hiring or firing of an employee, are few and specifically defined in the law.

The trustee board met in two executive sessions on Friday to discuss "personnel matters," according to board chairman Bob Thompson. On Saturday, Winthrop trustees again met behind closed doors on the first day of a two-day retreat. Following that meeting, Thompson announced the board had discussed initiating an "independent third-party review" of the school's finances. That proposal then was unanimously approved by the board in a perfunctory public meeting.

All the discussion leading up to that vote would appear to fall under the category of public business. Although Thompson said Saturday's executive session was called to discuss contractual matters, there was no contract on the table, only the proposal that a consultant be hired.

This meeting took place after the board voted Friday not to appoint a member to serve on a special faculty committee, whose purpose also is to review Winthrop's finances. Saturday's action by the board was, in effect, a response to the decision by faculty members to pursue their own review. Thompson said he hopes the review by an independent consultant will open channels of communication and ensure that the board hears from all parts of the university.

But the reluctance of the board to discuss its decision openly seems contradictory to its expressed goal of opening channels of communication. Given the nature of the issue and the importance it has to both the university and the community at large, we think a public meeting was called for.

The public is entitled not only to know the result of the board's discussions but also to observe the process by which the board makes decisions about public matters. Rather than alleviating concerns, going behind closed doors may have heightened them. We hope board members will take that into
THE DiGIORGIO YEARS

SALARY COMPARISONS

1988/89 and 1993/94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>1988-89</th>
<th>1993-94</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>1988-89</th>
<th>1993-94</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>67643</td>
<td>87919</td>
<td>29.98%</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>42266</td>
<td>46015</td>
<td>8.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>65000</td>
<td>85000</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>34985</td>
<td>37326</td>
<td>6.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Academic</td>
<td>57400</td>
<td>69284</td>
<td>20.70%</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>28871</td>
<td>32494</td>
<td>12.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Students</td>
<td>54800</td>
<td>66086</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>21271</td>
<td>24450</td>
<td>14.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Finance</td>
<td>46000</td>
<td>49999</td>
<td>26.97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winthrop Salary Information
1. **Call to Order.** President Owens called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated March 14, 1995, were approved as written.

3. **Committee Reports**
   
a. **Committee Reports**

   **Welfare Committee.** Senator Lois Lovelace Duke submitted this Committee's report (Attachment A), thanked her Committee for its work and gave special thanks to Allen Turner who analyzed this year's salary data. Senator Duke called attention to House Bill 3263 from the Ways and Means Committee which would amend the section of the Code of Laws relating to the reduction of retirement from 30 to 20 years. For more information one may call: 1-800-922-1539.

   **Finance Committee.** During a presentation of the this year's work by this Committee, Senator Roger Doost submitted a University Cost Summary, Other Expenditures, and draft resolutions (Attachment B). Senator Doost thanked members of his Committee for their work and especially thanked David Larson and Alan Godfrey for their assistance in providing data with which to work. Questions, answers and general discussion followed this presentation.

   **Policy Committee.** Senator Ron Thurston referred to and briefly discussed the Policy Committee Report (Attachment C). Senator Roger Rollin shared with members of the Faculty Senate information gleaned from the presentation, "Codes of Ethics in Academe" by Professor Dan Wueste.

   **Research Committee.** Senator David Leigh submitted a Critique of the Clemson University Long-Range Master Plan (Attachment D) noting that this Committee's full report will be housed in the Faculty Senate Office and available for perusal. Senator Leigh stated that there is a nomenclature problem with this Plan; that it is an architectural plan for growth and placement of facilities at Clemson University based on information received by the Master Planner. Senator Leigh believes that there are issues that need to be re-investigated, and that coordination does need to occur among people giving information and problems within the existing plans.

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Webb Smathers submitted the Summary Outline of Major Items of Business of the Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee (Attachment E). Items that are ongoing or considered carry over items include: committee appointed by Provost to evaluate the need for a University Honor Code; issue of improved classroom equipment; issue of grade inflation; and a review of the academic grievance procedure.

President Owens expressed his thanks to each committee chair and to all committee members for their diligent work this year.
b. University Commissions and Committees

1) Commission on Graduate Studies - Senator Tom Jenkins reported that the Commission met in March to revise the academic dishonesty policy - the first offense penalty now allows for the dismissal of the student instead of a maximum penalty of the Grade F; that the Graduate Catalog will not be published this year; and that the Graduate School is now cracking down on "incompletes".

2) Senator Kenneth Murr reminded the Senate to encourage their colleagues to complete the survey from the Dean of the Library regarding periodical subscriptions.

4. Remarks by President Constantine Curris - President Owens introduced President Curris. President Curris expressed thanks for this opportunity to visit with the Faculty Senate and stated that he is looking forward to working with the administration, faculty, and students at Clemson University.

President Curris noted that it is the responsibility of those in academia to correct the misconceptions of academia and define ourselves to the public. On the issue of tenure, President Curris stated that consideration of employment for faculty should not be from the Legislature, but from administration; that employment should be defined; the significance of tenure should be communicated by those involved in academia; and that the privilege of tenure can and should be revoked if it is abused.

President Curris stated that he looks forward to forging a good working relationship to bring all parts of the University together to sustain a high seminary of learning.

5. President's Report - President Owens presented his outgoing report (Attachment F) and briefly discussed each item. Senator Marvin Dixon was congratulated upon his receipt of the Murray Stokely Award for Excellence in Teaching by the College of Engineering.

6. Old Business

a. Robert A. Waller, Chair of the Faculty Manual Revision Committee, submitted and explained each item of the Final Report of this Committee in regards to the Faculty Constitution. Senator Rollin moved that the Faculty Senate accepts this Committee's Report and requests that the Provost forward the Report to the faculty for action at the May 11, 1995 General Faculty and Staff Meeting. Motion was seconded. Following friendly amendments which were accepted and general comments, vote to accept Report (of which two-thirds of those present was necessary because it requires a Faculty Manual change) was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment G). President Owens thanked Dr. Waller and his committee for their efforts.

b. Senator Thurston moved that the Faculty Senate accept the clarification of Item #1 as presented in the Policy Committee Report (Attachment C) which was seconded. Senator Murr noted that Item #6 is to be deleted prior to vote on clarification which was approved by Senator Thurston and the Senate. Vote was taken to accept clarification as stated and passed unanimously.
7. Remarks from Outgoing Senate President Walt Owens. Remarks by President Owens were received followed by an ovation from the Faculty Senate. President Owens then introduced the new Senate President, A. B. Bodine, II. New officers were installed at 5:00 p.m.

David Leigh, Secretary

8. New Business

a. President Budd Bodine introduced, as a group, new senators of the Faculty Senate.

b. President Bodine encouraged senators to respond to and return the Committee Preference Questionnaire to the Senate Office.

c. The announcement of Kenneth Murr as Parliamentarian from April, 1995 until April 1996 was made by President Bodine.

d. Senator Rollin explained the reasoning for establishing the proposed Open Forum Guidelines and moved for adoption, which was seconded. Vote was taken to accept adoption of Guidelines and passed unanimously.

e. Senator Steve Stevenson questioned the policy that departments not give booklists to downtown book stores is still enforced. Senator Stevenson suggested that the policy be changed since Clemson now has a private store so that everybody receives the booklists at the same time. President Bodine will refer this issue to the Policy Committee.

f. Senator John Bednar suggested that this body welcome members of the State Legislature by creating a visitation program to our campus.

g. Senator Murr referred to the memo from the Provost dated April 5, 1995 and proposed that President Bodine send a letter to the Provost asking for clarification on credit for service of tenure. Since the Provost does not approve of the Senate’s changes, Senator Murr recommended that he be informed that the current policy is still in effect and is outlined on Page 27 of the Faculty Manual.

9. Adjournment. President Bodine adjourned the meeting at 5:25 p.m.

Roger Doost, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Senators absent: H. Allen, J. Rathwell, S. Amirkhanian, G. Bautista, P. Smith, R. Williams (J. Waldvogel attended)
1994-95

WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT

TO THE FACULTY SENATE

April 11, 1995

During 1994-95, the Welfare Committee focused on two salary data analyses: (1) for those persons (faculty and administrators) earning $50,000 or more for the years 1987-1995 and (2) an analysis of summary of raises across campus based on status (academic, administrative, classified, unclassified) for 1995 for all employees at Clemson University. The Welfare Committee also made available (Cooper Library and Faculty Senate Office) salary data for those persons (faculty and staff) earning $30,000 - $49,999 for 1994-95. In order to protect privacy, the data for those under $50,000 were provided in salary ranges only.

The Welfare Committee also investigated and brought about resolution in several matters of concern to faculty welfare including the following:

(1) A payroll deduction auto and home owners insurance plan

(2) Increase in Fike Recreational Center fees

(3) Gathered data from other universities and explored the feasibility of a Faculty House or Faculty Club at Clemson university. Incidentally, this will be passed along to our incoming officers.
FINANCE COMMITTEE'S FINAL REPORT
1994-95 ACADEMIC YEAR

Thanks to committee members Dr. Steve Lewis, Dr. David Swanson, and Dr. Eleanor Hare as well as our part-time assistants Dr. Jeff McMillan from Accounting and Dr. Scott Barnharrdt from Finance. We had total agreement on every issue that we raised. No issue was acted on based on majority vote. Our final action was always based on total agreement. Thanks also to Mr. David Larson, Mr. Roger Patterson, Mr. Alan Godfry, and the rest of Finance Division who provided us with all the data that we asked for.

1) ATTENDED EVERY GENERAL OR TOWN MEETING ON RESTRUCTURING AND FOCUSED ON TWO MAJOR QUESTIONS. WHAT ARE WE GOING TO ACHIEVE THROUGH RESTRUCTURING? HOW MUCH ARE WE GOING TO SAVE IN RESTRUCTURING? THE RESPONSES WE HAVE RECEIVED SO FAR HAVE BEEN BOTH INCONSISTENT AND UNSATISFACTORY. BUT WE WILL CONTINUE ASKING THESE TWO BASIC QUESTIONS THROUGH THE COURSE OF THIS ORDEAL.

2) SPONSORED AN IMPORTANT SEMINAR ON FACULTY RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS (SPEAKER: THE ATTORNEY FROM GREENVILLE, MR. STEPHEN J. HENRY, ESQ.) This was as a follow-up on an earlier challenge to academics by Wall Street Journal and the later challenges from inside and outside ranks as well as the SC legislature on the question of tenure, academic freedom, and freedom of responsible speech. Of course, no one says outright that s/he is against freedom of speech. The justifications are protection of the institution and its officers via delays in releasing of even public information.

3) BASED ON WELFARE COMMITTEE'S REPORT, THE QUESTION OF CONSISTENT INEQUITY IN FACULTY RAISES AT LEAST IN THE PAST SIX YEARS WAS VIGOROUSLY PURSUED. THE HISTORY OF PAST SIX YEARS REVEALS THAT THE TOP ADMINISTRATORS HAVE RECEIVED RAISES RANGING FROM 60% TO 300% HIGHER THAN THOSE OF FACULTY FOR AMOUNTS OF UPTO 55,000 DOLLARS IN ONE YEAR. THE RESOLUTION ON SALARY INEQUITY IS CURRENTLY TABLED BASED ON THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO PERSONALLY LOOK INTO EVERY RAISE FOR HIGHER PAID PERSONNEL.

4) REVIEWED THE UNIVERSITY'S BONDED INDEBTEDNESS CURRENTLY EXCEEDING ONE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS AND SUGGESTING MORE FACULTY INPUT FOR ANY FUTURE UNDERTAKING. (EACH STUDENT PAYS 90 DOLLARS PER YEAR TO PAY THE BALANCE OF THE $11,000,000 COST OF BROOKS CENTER ALONE).

5) OTHER ACTIONS:
* REVIEW AND DISSEMINATION OF COMPARATIVE COST AND REVENUE DATA.
* REVIEW AND DISSEMINATION OF COMPARATIVE INSTITUTIONS' COST DATA.
* REVIEW AND GENERAL AGREEMENT ON THE QUESTION OF PRIVATIZATION OF BOOKSTORE.
* REVIEW AND REPORTING OF THE RISE IN RETIREMENT BUYOUT COSTS.
6) POSING THE QUESTION OF WHY THE UNIVERSITY ACCEPTS CREDIT CARDS FOR PAYMENT OF TUITIONS COSTING THE UNIVERSITY ABOUT $180,000 PER YEAR AT THIS TIME OF BUDGET CUTS AND SERIOUS LIMITS ON FINANCIAL RESOURCES. SUGGESTION IS MADE TO ADD THE CREDIT CARD FEES TO TUITIONS OR FIND ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF FINANCING TUITIONS.

7) INDEPTH ANALYSIS OF UNIVERSITY COSTS WITH A NEW BREAKDOWN IN TERMS OF SALARIES, BENEFITS, AND OTHER COSTS BY ACADEMIC, EXTENSION, AND ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS. HIGHLIGHTS:

* 1/4 OF UNIVERSITY COSTS ARE FACULTY SALARY AND BENEFITS WITH UNIVERSITY OVERHEAD FAR EXCEEDING TOTAL FACULTY COSTS.

* ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS ARE CREDITED FOR OVER 17 MILLION DOLLARS FOR SERVICES RENDERED BY OTHER UNITS - RESULTING IN A DISTORTED COST FIGURE BY SERVICE UNITS.

* OVERHEAD RECOVERIES ARE PRIMARILY CHARGED TO THE USER UNIT SUPPLY ACCOUNTS.

--- ON THE QUESTION OF CREATIVITY:
LUCA PACIOLI, FATHER OF ACCOUNTING, AND LEONARDO-DI-Vinci, THE REKOWNED 15TH CENTURY ARTIST AND ARCHITECT WERE CLOSE FRIENDS. SOMETHING HAPPENED IN THE PAST FIVE CENTURIES IN THAT THE FORMER SHY AWAY FROM CREATIVITY AND ARCHITECTS AND ARTISTS CHERISH IT.

8) DRAFTED RESOLUTIONS FOR THE NEW SENATE TO ACT ON THE IMPORTANT MATTERS OF BONDED INDEBTEDNESS, CREDIT CARD USAGE FOR TUITIONS, FACULTY SALARY INEQUITY AND AN OPERATIONAL AUDIT OF THE UNIVERSITY.
what are colleges and universities to do? They must completely restructure the organization and make radical changes. They need to ask themselves, if we were creating this university today, given what we know and given current administration, technology, what would it look like? Metaphorically, this means closing one organization and opening another.
## UNIVERSITY COSTS
### UPON ELIMINATION OF ALL COST ALLOCATIONS
#### 1993-94 FISCAL YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount (000)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY SALARIES</td>
<td>$65,973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY BENEFITS</td>
<td>10,762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FACULTY SALARY AND BENEFITS</td>
<td>76,735</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER DIRECT COSTS EXCLUDING EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>20,542</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COST OF EXTENSION</td>
<td>61,143</td>
<td>20.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC SUPPORT (BEFORE ALLOCATION)</td>
<td>24,928</td>
<td>8.3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT SERVICES</td>
<td>7,135</td>
<td>2.4 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT (BEFORE ALLOC.)</td>
<td>21,791</td>
<td>7.2 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE (BEFORE ALLOC.)</td>
<td>25,225</td>
<td>8.4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>19,168</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OVERHEAD EXCLUDING AUXILIARY ENT.</td>
<td>98,247</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES</td>
<td>54,964</td>
<td>18.2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERHEAD CREDITS NET OF EQUIPMENTS</td>
<td>(10,318)</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS</td>
<td>10,543**</td>
<td>3.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COSTS</td>
<td>301,313</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* **NOT INCLUDED IN TOTALS*

### Notes:

* A small amount of faculty salaries may have been charged to this account.
1) Academic support includes library, computers, and deans offices
2) Student services includes admissions, registrar, student-aid, counselling.
3) Institutional support includes president's office, finance, personnel, and security.
4) Operation and maintenance includes maintenance, general services, and utilities.
5) Auxiliary enterprises include bookstore, housing, canteens, etc.
University Cost Summary
1993-94 Fiscal Year (000's)

- Auxiliary Enterp - Netted (14.8%) ($44,646)
- Extension (20.4%) ($61,143)
- Faculty Salary/Benefits (25.5%) ($76,735)
- Other Costs (39.4%) ($118,789)
Other Costs
1993-94 Fiscal Year (000's)

- Dept. Admin (16.1%) ($19,168)
- Other Direct (17.3%) ($20,542)
- Operation & Maint (21.2%) ($25,225)
- Academic Supp (21%) ($24,928)
- Institution Supp (18.4%) ($21,791)
- Student Serv (6%) ($7,135)

1993-94 Fiscal Year (000's)
University Salaries
1993-94 Academic Year (000's)

Other ($62,833)
Faculty ($65,973)
Extension ($40,273)
### UNIVERSITY COST SUMMARY 1993-94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A/C #</th>
<th>A/C Description</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Benefits &amp; Other**</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$43,982</td>
<td>$8,047</td>
<td>$52,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>$21,991</td>
<td>$2,715</td>
<td>$24,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$13,378</td>
<td>$2,429</td>
<td>$15,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$118</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$4,593</td>
<td>$917</td>
<td>$5,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$18,367</td>
<td>$4,488</td>
<td>$22,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$4,593</td>
<td>$917</td>
<td>$5,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$18,367</td>
<td>$4,488</td>
<td>$22,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$4,593</td>
<td>$917</td>
<td>$5,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>$11,348</td>
<td>$2,498</td>
<td>$13,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$3,680</td>
<td>$822</td>
<td>$4,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Total Extension</td>
<td>$40,273</td>
<td>$8,750</td>
<td>$49,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Operation &amp; Maint</td>
<td>$9,126</td>
<td>$2,558</td>
<td>$11,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>$12,474</td>
<td>$2,740</td>
<td>$15,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>$65,973</td>
<td>$10,762</td>
<td>$76,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Departmental Admin</td>
<td>$21,991</td>
<td>$2,715</td>
<td>$24,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Total Extension</td>
<td>$60,264</td>
<td>$13,502</td>
<td>$73,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Operation &amp; Maint</td>
<td>$9,126</td>
<td>$2,558</td>
<td>$11,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Institution Supp.</td>
<td>$11,348</td>
<td>$2,498</td>
<td>$13,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$3,680</td>
<td>$822</td>
<td>$4,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>$79,516</td>
<td>$15,274</td>
<td>$94,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Operation &amp; Maint</td>
<td>$9,126</td>
<td>$2,558</td>
<td>$11,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>$12,474</td>
<td>$2,740</td>
<td>$15,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Total Extension</td>
<td>$60,264</td>
<td>$13,502</td>
<td>$73,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Operation &amp; Maint</td>
<td>$9,126</td>
<td>$2,558</td>
<td>$11,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Institution Supp.</td>
<td>$11,348</td>
<td>$2,498</td>
<td>$13,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$3,680</td>
<td>$822</td>
<td>$4,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>$79,516</td>
<td>$15,274</td>
<td>$94,789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students, $s omitted

UNIVERSITY COST SUMMARY 1993-94
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% to 100.0%</th>
<th>10.0% to 28.7%</th>
<th>28.7% to 56.7%</th>
<th>56.7% to 80.7%</th>
<th>80.7% to 100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,479,437</td>
<td>$2,276,860</td>
<td>$2,149,322</td>
<td>$1,152,772</td>
<td>$406,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,925,131</td>
<td>$3,004,458</td>
<td>$3,947,458</td>
<td>$3,663,816</td>
<td>$3,464,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$333,807</td>
<td>$3,433,957</td>
<td>$3,022,287</td>
<td>$2,122,407</td>
<td>$2,336,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$49,230</td>
<td>$2,492,789</td>
<td>$2,382,782</td>
<td>$2,092,900</td>
<td>$2,320,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,096,799</td>
<td>$1,120,217</td>
<td>$1,064,302</td>
<td>$856,248</td>
<td>$1,184,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachments**

- Scholarships
- Equipment
- Special Codes
- Travel

**Other Expenditures:**

- Salary
- Benefits
- Supplies
RESOLUTION DRAFTS FOR THE NEW SENATE
ON UNIVERSITY FINANCES

Whereas, only a quarter of university costs go to faculty salary and benefits for their teaching, research, and service activities;

Whereas, university overhead costs far exceed total faculty costs;

Whereas, the potential 3.3 million dollars of savings as a result of restructuring for which no hard documentation is at hand seems to account for less than one percent of total university budget;

Whereas, the university is facing severe budget cuts and limitations;

Whereas, significant questions have been raised concerning university accounting systems and charging practices;

Resolved, Faculty Senate hereby recommends an Operational Audit of the University's systems with appropriate faculty input and involvement with the goal of making the system more efficient and more effective.

***********************

RESOLUTION ON THE USE OF CREDIT CARDS

Whereas, the university accepts Visa and Mastercards for payment of student fees and tuitions;

Whereas, although such a practice is prevalent in retail businesses where such costs are passed on to consumers;

Whereas, the university absorbed a total of $179,565 in charge fees in the fiscal year 1993-94 for the Bursar's area alone;

Whereas, such a huge amount could be saved by the university to be used for classroom or scholarship purposes;

Whereas, we have to find ways saving limited financial resources that this university has;

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate urges the Administration to find alternative ways of financing tuitions and immediately put a stop to the costly practice of paying user fees on charge cards.

***********************

RESOLUTION ON SALARY INEQUITY OF THE PAST SIX YEARS

***********************

RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY'S BONDED INDEBTEDNESS
MEMORANDUM

TO: Roger Doost

FROM: David Larson

DATE: March 29, 1995

SUBJECT: Credit Card Discount

Clemson University’s credit card and banking relationships are established by the State Treasurer’s Office. The cost of the credit card discount charged to state agencies accepting credit cards in the past was paid by the State Treasurer. Beginning July, 1993, the credit card discount charge was passed on to all state agencies. Following the common practice of most retail operations that accept Visa and Mastercard, a decision was made to absorb the credit card discount charge as an operating expense.

Visa and Mastercard are accepted for payment by most areas of campus that conduct cash transactions. Each area absorbs the credit card discount charge as a cost of doing business.

In FY 94, the discount charge allocated for the Bursar’s area as an institutional expense was $179,565. At February 1995, a discount charge of $136,621 has been allocated for the Bursar’s area for FY 95. Your request for the total number of Visa and Mastercard transactions is not readily available since these payments are not isolated as a specific payment type.
April 11, 1995

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE POLICY COMMITTEE

The Faculty Senate Policy Committee met on April 4, 1995, to consider the following items of business pending before the Committee.

1. Clarification of Faculty Senate Resolution FS-94-8-1P, approved by the provost on 8/25/94, on the Length of service and evaluation of department heads.

2. Response to the request of the Computer Advisory Committee, presented by chairman Clint Isbell, to approve policy on computer misuse for incorporation into the Faculty Manual.

3. Response to President Owen’s request to develop ethics policies for faculty and administrators.

4. Development of guidelines for release of sensitive material generated by the senate to the news media.
ITEM #1 - LENGTH OF SERVICE AND EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

Clarification of Faculty Senate Resolution FS-94-8-1 P, Length of Service and Evaluation of Department Heads. (Approved by the Provost, 9-1-94)

NOTE: Clarifications are given in bold. The term "department head" has been clarified to read, department heads/chairs. The term senior faculty has been corrected to read "full and associate professors".

1. Department heads/chairs will serve at the discretion of the dean of the college with advice of the faculty.

2. Terms of appointment for department heads/chairs shall be four (4) years, and given normal circumstances, the appointment shall be renewable only once.

3. At the beginning of each academic year, the department head/chair shall submit a statement of administrative goals and objectives for the department. This statement shall be written, and shared with the departmental faculty and the dean. At the end of the academic year, the department head/chair shall submit a written report on his/her administrative accomplishments to the faculty and for the dean's evaluation.

4. At the beginning of the department head's/chair's fourth year in office, a committee shall be elected by the faculty of the department to conduct a formal evaluation of the department head/chair. The committee shall have a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) senior faculty, (full and associate professors) one of whom will be a representative appointed by the Provost from outside the college.

   The committee shall conduct individual interviews with all faculty members in the department, review the department head's/chair's previous statements of goals and objectives and conduct a secret ballot vote of the departmental faculty on reappointment. The report of the committee and a record of the faculty vote shall be sent to the dean, department head/chair, the department and the Provost.

5. Given special circumstances where a department head/chair is considered for renewal beyond two terms, the aforementioned evaluation process will be repeated.

6. A department head/chair in office at the time of approval of this policy shall be scheduled for evaluation as determined by the dean, at least once every five (5) years. The evaluation will be performed in accordance with the policy outlined above in provisos #3 and #4. This does not apply to acting department heads/chair.
Item 2. The Policy developed by the Computer Advisory Committee on computer misuse is as follows:

Use of University computing resources (including account numbers, interactive terminals, data storage media, other peripherals, networking facilities, microcomputer systems and software) for computing activities other than those authorized by the University is strictly prohibited.

If the need for other uses develops, you must obtain the appropriate authorization in advance. Unauthorized duplication or alteration of software licensed by the University is strictly prohibited. In addition, use of resources other than those authorized by the University is regarded as a criminal act, and may result in criminal prosecution. The university will require restitution for any theft of computing resources and for cost incurred due to such misuse.

In any investigation of misuse of computing resources, the University reserves the right to inspect, without notice, the contents of computer files, regardless of storage medium, and system output, such as computer printout.

End Policy

After much deliberation, the Policy Committee decided not to recommend the computer misuse policy, in its present form, be adopted by the Faculty Senate for incorporation into the Faculty Manual. There were many concerns, but the main objections were the following:

a. A computer misuse policy should not be in the Faculty Manual without a computer use policy also being stated.

b. What constitutes university computer facilities is undefined, vague and overly broad. A statement such as “the University reserves the right to inspect, without notice, the contents of computer files, regardless of the storage medium” may represent infringement of the rights of those with proprietary agreements or projects classified for security reasons.

For these and other reasons, the Policy Committee suggests that the misuse policy be referred to the 1995-1996 Computer Advisory Committee for reconsideration with regard to the suggested emendations. However, the Policy Committee wishes to thank the current Computer Advisory Committee for their efforts concerning this matter, which represents an important first step in the development of a computer use policy which will be fair to all.
Item 3. Response to Faculty Senate President Walt Owen's request that the Policy Committee develop ethics guidelines for the faculty and administration.

The Policy Committee sponsored a presentation given by Dr. Daniel Wueste on March 28, 1995. The following is a response to this presentation developed by Faculty Senate Policy Committee member, Roger Rollin, and adopted by the Policy Committee on April 4, 1995, for presentation to the Senate.

1. Professor Wueste indicated that the main justification for developing a code of ethics should be—not image—or reputation—enhancement or the "bandwagon effect"—but the clear and present existence of a problem or set of problems. Codes of ethics are intended to address extent or potential problems of a serious nature in a specific area. Neither I nor the persons in attendance at the session could point to particular problems at Clemson that could be solved by the existence of a faculty code of ethics. --Administrators might, but as far as I could tell none was present, nor am I aware of administrators calling attention to any specific problems other than that of "amorous relationships" between faculty and students.

2. Professor Wueste noted that workable codes of ethics tend to be those associated with very specific "cultures," e.g. architects, health science professionals, certain types of manufacturers. The Clemson Faculty, however, is not a homogeneous culture for most purposes because academic disciplines and their particular issues and problems can vary widely.

3. To be effective, a code of ethics must be consistent with other university relations (e.g., between faculty and heads), must be drafted (by whom?), widely distributed, interpreted (by whom?), and enforced (how? by whom?).

4. A code can be a shield against wrongdoing: "I didn’t violate the code!" "There’s nothing in the code that says I can’t do that!"

5. Alternatives to codes—such as "ethics awareness programs" are available.

I would add that Section B, "Academic Freedom and Responsibility" of the Faculty Manual (pp. 14-16) offers faculty thoughtful and comprehensive guidance concerning their conduct. Though not so formulated, this section is tantamount to a code of ethics. In the future, the Policy Committee might examine it to see if it may require additions or corrections before the inevitable Manual revision is initiated.

Note: The Policy Committee also recognizes and approves the ethics guidelines for faculty developed and supported by AAUP. A copy is attached for reference.
Item 4. Guidelines for release of sensitive material to the news media.

After researching faculty senate policies at other universities, no senate was found to have formal guidelines which dictate how sensitive materials are to be released to the news media. Therefore, the Policy Committee recommends that no structured guidelines relevant to this matter be adopted by the Clemson University Faculty Senate. However, it is strongly recommended that individuals who release sensitive material to the news media follow the ethics guidelines recommended by AAUP (attached). Communication has been initiated between the Policy Committee, and Catherine Sams, Associate Vice President for Public Affairs, which addresses the issue of developing better methods to release sensitive information to the general public.
FACULTY SENATORS:

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee, I would like to thank all faculty senators, administrators and others who helped with policy matters which the committee developed and brought before the Faculty Senate this past year. Special thanks to the members of the Policy Committee who worked very hard and thus made my job easier.

The committee had an interesting year given the magnitude and nature of the reorganization process. Although this somewhat limited the amount of policy matters brought before the committee, it did not reduce the importance of policies which were approved, such as guidelines for evaluating department heads/chairs.

Special gratitude is expressed to Cathy Sturkie, Administrative Assistant to the Faculty Senate, and to Cheryl Enfinger, Administrative Specialist in the Poultry Science Department. Without their support and help, the Policy Committee would not have been able to conduct its business. Much appreciation and respect is given to Walt Owens, President of the Faculty Senate, for having confidence in me, as a freshman senator, to lead the Policy Committee and for providing support and outstanding leadership under most difficult circumstances.

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Thurston, Chair
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

RJT: cce
Statement on Professional Ethics

The statement that follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by Committee B on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Council as Association policy, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting in June 1987.

INTRODUCTION

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research.1 The Statement on Professional Ethics that follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to assure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession the individual institution of higher learning provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and Committee B, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, or the applicable provisions of the Association’s Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

THE STATEMENT

I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

III. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

IV. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.
FACULTY SENATE
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CRITIQUE OF THE CLEMSON UNIVERSITY LONG RANGE MASTER PLAN
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L.C. CARLSON
H.D. LEIGH
D. E. LINVILLE
T. C. JENKINS
G. L. POWELL
J. P. SMITH
D. E. STEVENSON
Critique of the Clemson University Long Range Master Plan

The Research Committee of the Faculty Senate was asked to review the Master Plan and critique it. The plan contains several sections dealing with different elements pertinent to the long development of the Clemson University campus and these elements were assigned to members of the committee for review and critique. A meeting was scheduled for March 29th with the master planner Mr. Gerald Vander Mey, to discuss the findings of the committee reports. The reports of the committee follow this summary critique. Committee member comments and Mr. Vander Mey’s letter received after the March 29th meeting are appended.

It is important to point out from the outset that there appears to be a problem with nomenclature that has triggered passionate discussions about the "Master Plan". The "Master Plan" in fact is a document that outlines basically architectural planning for the Clemson Campus as a result of current issues and future needs as articulated by the planning team and other committees and entities. The "Master Plan," that shall be known as the Plan, does not set policy, does not assess the logic or strategic thinking upon which assertions about future development are made, but simply outline ways in which the architecture of the campus can be organized to satisfy the parameters set by the planning entities.

The Research Committee viewed the plan as an unabridged plan for the University’s Future Development. In the latter regard, the committee found many contentious issues. In light of discussions with Mr. Vander Mey some of the issues were resolved; however, many of the remaining issues appear to be unresolved because; either the issues were not considered by the planning teams or information supporting assertions was not available or undocumented or the assertions were poorly or inadequately considered. For what ever reason there appears to be a lack of coordination among those involved in the planning process and insufficient consideration of the implications and ramifications of thrusts developed in the plan. These issues arise from questions about the fundamental assertions upon which the plan was based. This means the strategy of the future growth and development of the University has not been well developed or properly thought out.

From discussions with the Mr. Vander Mey it appears that the major difficulty is not with the Master Architectural Plan developed by him, but with the Process that provided information upon which the Master Architectural Plan was based.

There are some serious needs that must be addressed by those who intend to implement the provisions of the Master Architectural Plan. These issues are discussed in more detail within each element report and are highlighted below. First, the academic program element asserts that there is an excess of classroom space of 53%. The basis for this assertion is challenged.
Difficulty with scheduling concurrent classes and finding class room space during the semester indicates that an excess of class rooms in fact does not exist and planning scenarios based on an excess are clearly inaccurate. The basis upon which this "excess" was found must be reviewed and documented. Recent changes to move administration from the Minimall to Martin Hall will adversely affect class room space and if there is not an excess of class room space this change will exacerbate the problem. The plan itself acknowledges that there is a deficit of laboratory space of -132,217 square feet currently and growth will only increase this deficit to -256,654 square feet. A policy decision to address these deficiencies is required.

Second, the plan for library expansion would only allow the library to properly store holdings it currently has; therefore there is in fact no real long range plan for the library. There are assertions that new technology may reduce the need for holding space, but funds to secure this technology have not been provided. A policy decision is required to address the long range issues regarding the library situation since this may have some serious implications for accreditation of the University.

Third, the plan describes the development of land use and housing for students. Nowhere in the plan are provisions for expected installation of donated facilities. Experience with facilities like the military heritage park, or the carriage way prove that more public consideration of these thrusts is required. It is not known whether consideration has been given to the ability of the city of Clemson to absorb the impact of additional students. It is not known how apartment development within the city will be affected by further growth of the University nor whether consideration of the issue has been made. Additionally, only 100 beds have been allocated for married student housing. Changing demographics and the stated desire to build the graduate programs at Clemson seem to point to the need for significant affordable married housing on campus. It does not appear that this issue has been considered.

Fourth, the issues of parking and transportation seem to be uncoordinated. The subject is complex and the reader is referred to the specific committee report. Some high light of issues are given below. Little consideration has been given to ingress to and egress from the campus by pedestrians. Encouragement of these transport modes require safe entry and exit from the campus. Parking is a problem and the 10 principles of parking are not adequately addressed in the plan. In fact the neighborhood parking concept (principle 2) almost seems to be ignored. Several suggestions and important issues are raised in the Research Committee report dealing with this issue. An additional issue that must be addressed but is not considered is safety for faculty and staff who must work late and specifically library personnel. If parking at or near the library is not available, personal safety of people going to their parked vehicle may be an important issue.
Fifth, the Master Plan for sports and recreation is characterized by very little "meat" when compared to other elements in the plan. Less than three full pages of the plan is devoted to examining the sports and recreation components of a university with 23,000 students. The major new construction suggested in the plan is a recreation building and playing fields located in the East Campus. Yet, an objective or even subjective assessment of whether this new construction in conjunction with existing facilities will be adequate for the projected 23,000 student body and faculty of the future is never addressed.

Sixth, the issue of utilities is important. As pointed out in the Master Architectural Plan, a new energy facility will be able to cope with the future needs of the University. The plan does not stress the urgency of the need for the new facility; it appears that the steam plant is in a precarious situation and there is a lack of water Chiller capacity. The electrical supply seems to be in fairly good shape with some minor additions to the east campus substation capacity. There is a serious problem related to the breaker cycling routine that occurs each month. This procedure has been responsible for considerable equipment malfunctions and damage across campus. This procedure is required because a backup system for the current breaker system is not available.

These are serious problems and while they are not necessarily required for the development of a good long range architectural master plan, these issues must be addressed or at least considered by those making decisions about the future of Clemson University. Criticism about decisions to initiate thrusts like the golf course and conference center when such fundamental systemic problems exist are fueled by poorly thought out and poorly coordinated planing that is apparent. All of Clemson's resources both public and private funds, faculty, staff and student input and suggestions should be brought to bear on the problems facing Clemson.

Summary:

The Clemson University Long Range Master Plan should be recognized as an Architectural Master Plan that is not intended to set policy or be used to evaluate strategy for development. It is simply a means for accomplishing goals set out by others responsible for the development of Clemson University. The Research Committee finds that the Master Plan, in the context above, is reasonably straightforward, with certain exceptions regarding the parking and transportation elements.

The committee recommends, however, that the planing process used to develop criteria for the plan be reviewed and inadequacies be addressed before further implementation of the Architectural Master Plan is carried out.
Summary Outline
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Scholastic Policies Committee:

Harold Allen
Shelley Barbary
Syd Cross
Bill Hare
Francis McGuire

Jerry Waldvogel
Nancy Ferguson
Brian Suber (Student Rep.)
Webb M. Smathers, Jr., Chair

1. Reviewed and made recommendations to Mr. Carmichael on the timing availability of student financial aid checks. (Cross, Waldvogel, Barbary, Hare)

2. Reviewed the Student Senate proposal on academic advising. Suggested changes consistent with revised on line registration procedures.

3. Provost Jennett appointed Ad Hoc University Committee to evaluate "Service Learning." (Waldvogel, Smathers)

4. Provost Jennett appointed Ad Hoc Committee to evaluate the need for a University Honor Code. (Smathers)

5. Issues related to improvement of classroom instruction facilities. Worked with "Teaching-Learning Resources Committee," Chair Dr. Stone. (Hare, Barbary, Smathers)

6. Represented Senate on "Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation Committee," Ad Hoc Committee appointed by V. P. Reel. (Smathers)

7. Model United Nations funding in Political Science. (Recommended review by Provost, Dean, Dept. Head)

8. Reviewed classes with special problem rubric. Recommended that the Provost remand the issue to Undergraduate Commission with stipulation any class can be taught no more than twice without going to the department's curriculum committee for approval as a formal class.


10. Reviewed drop-add procedure changes needed because of on-line registration changes.

11. Reviewed the issue of grade inflation. Currently two students in math are researching issues in greater depth as part of their Master's projects.

12. Reviewed academic grievance procedure. Ad Hoc University Committee appointed by V. P. Reel currently studying issue.
Thank you for your very kind welcome. I feel as if I have gotten a survey of life at Clemson University as I have listened to various reports of the committees. The brief visit this Spring coincides with the regularly-scheduled meet of the Faculty Senate. I had indicated that I hoped to be around for the reception, but that may not proof feasible today so I would like a raincheck.

I looked forward to this meeting. At two universities, I have had the privilege of working with faculty and formed partnerships with administration, faculty, and students to help build a university for students and faculty. I hope that opportunity is here. I am encouraged by the nice resolution passed by this Faculty Senate and I look forward to working with you in the days ahead.

I have talked with many honor students at Northern Iowa and I was happy to hear they are pursuing graduate degree and entering the role of academia. We sometimes get caught up in issues of the day and tend to forget the good life of academia. Earnest Boyer referred to the life of the professor as a life of solitude. I am not sure the best interest of a university is people leaving each other alone. Cooperation efforts and respect are very important. There is a tendency for people outside academia to view our work as a mystery and misinterpretation. What are faculty workloads? We describe load in terms of hours of teaching per week. We have to correct connotation. Research, public service, advising students do not lend themselves to measures of activity. Some of the problems we encounter as an academy in recent years is how we define ourselves to the public. We need to ask the media to chronicle what we do, rather than in terms of reports.

One issue that surprised me and concerns me is the discussion that dealt with the future of tenure. Possible venue for consideration of employment for faculty should not be from legislature, but from administration. At the same time, there is a mystery associated with tenure. We should define employment. Privileges accorded to faculty after evaluation that is a presumption of lifetime employment but not a guarantee. Earned privileges - communicate significance of tenure. Only hesitation we should have is that with all privileges, there are responsibilities. There should
be no abuse of tenure. This privilege can and should be revoked if abused. It's the nature of the academy to deal with things quietly. We have to be sensitive to the public who supports us. We have to assure public that when instances arise, we deal with them in the academy. I have defended those privileges that are important to the academic community.

It is an honor to be with you. I look forward to working with you. I do believe Clemson has a very bright future in these difficult days of change. I am trying to understand these changes. We can forge a good working relationship and bring all parts of the University together to work together to sustain a high seminary of learning. Thank you.
Legislation

Retirement Bill. A bill (H 3263) to gradually reduce the number of years required for retirement without a reduction in benefits has been introduced in the House and referred to the Ways and Means Committee. It would decrease the number of years required, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year of Retirement</th>
<th>Required years of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several other provisions of the bill would limit the amount of Credited Service one can buy up.

Tenure Bill. On March 30 I talked with Fred Sheheen, Commissioner of Higher Education about the tenure bill. It is now before the House Education Committee. Fred feels there is a chance that the bill may die in committee, although he did note that Ron Townsend, the Committee Chair, is supportive of the measure. Rep. Harry Stille, chair of the higher education subcommittee, has not yet scheduled a hearing for the measure. Rep. Stille promised to call Fred if a hearing is scheduled and Fred has promised to call me, thereafter. I have also talked with other representatives. Some feel that the House will call for a study of tenure with changes being proposed for the next session (1996). Commissioner Sheheen felt that it would be counterproductive for us to campaign against it now, for doing so could give it enough visibility to bring it to a vote. I concurred.

On March 30, I took the matter up with the FS Executive Advisory Committee. I shared with them a strategy, including the draft of a letter I would send (first to the Education and Public Works Committee and then -- if necessary -- to the full House) arguing against the bill. The Committee agreed with the strategy. (I asked for feedback concerning the letter.)

I have a mail list of the Committee and of the whole House, and am prepared to send out the letter. I am also prepared to appear at a hearing, if one is held. I have expressed my reservations privately to a number of representatives, and I will continue to do so.

At Academic Council on April 3, I asked President Prince about the position of
the Council of Presidents. He indicated that they had not formally taken a position and expressed the concern that creating a stir about the tenure issue would invite problems with the budget.

Restructuring Bills. Two bills to restructure the Commission of Higher Education have passed committees. One, a Senate bill, has passed the Senate Education Committee. A second one (H 3607), a House bill, has passed the House Committee on Education and Public Works. I am 85% sure that one of these two bills or a compromise will be adopted by the legislature and implemented quickly.

A number of factors have contributed to the legislative attitude toward colleges and universities. One factor, of course, is the lingering memory of [former USC President] Holderman and his shenanigans. Another factor is our lobbying techniques. Among other factors, I believe, was the attempt last year by 8 - 12 college and university presidents and members of their Boards of Trustees to take over the Commission of Higher Education; this maneuver has not been helpful.

Funds and Fund Raising

The library’s shortage of funds requires discontinuance of some more serials. (Memo from the library is in the packet.)

There are a number of fund raising projects.

Elton John/Billy Joel Concert. According to the administration, 51,000 attended. The proceeds, however, will go to student programs. It was reported that the concert attracted national publicity for the university. Plans to have at least one, and perhaps two, of these concerts each year were mentioned at Cabinet meeting yesterday.

IPTAY and the Alumni Association have developed several fund raising gambits. It is now possible to endow a position on the football team (or another team). I can imagine that this will give the sports announcers some extra work. The money, however, was not scheduled to go to the library.

There are plans to rename the street between the stadium and Jervey, the "Avenue of Champions." I understand that people may make a contribution for paving units that will memorialize great coaches and great players. I do not know if coaches who have been bought out will qualify. I am quite certain, however, that this money will not go to the library, either.

The students are also raising some money: $30,000 for their "Senior Sidewalk Project." The money is for work on the sidewalk in front of the new student center. Actually the funds are already in place for the sidewalk; the $30,000
would be for the name of each member of the Class of '95 to be memorialized in concrete.

Other Items

Provost Jennett rejected our resolution on Credit for Service in Tenure Track Positions. His reasons are given in a memo (enclosed in the packet).

An article in the Wall Street Journal last week reported the practice of deception by college and university officials in overreporting average SAT scores of entering freshmen. I was pleased to see that Tom Inman took note of it in a Greenville News editorial of 9 April. I was told by faculty at another university in SC (and I understand that the information also appeared in print) that the administration there dropped the lowest 26% of SAT scores for its entering freshmen. Comments that I have heard from other institutions would indicate that this practice is widespread. I am greatly concerned about this type of behavior. Integrity in education should be our hallmark. How can we expect our students to follow an honor code, if administrators at various schools lie to the public?

"Service Learning." At the Council of Deans meeting yesterday, a report was given concerning a program initiated by the administration to give college credit for various types of community service. It ranges widely from mutually beneficial projects done by a class of students who apply what they learn for a town (that benefits from the students' knowledge, skills, and abilities), to internships, and to picking up trash. I understand that a fundamental function is to teach certain values (citizenship and public service) to the students. For decades, of course, there have been internships and class projects that benefit the community, but these would expand the range of activities considerably. I wanted to alert you to the ideas that are now in the pipeline.

Concern. In this farewell report to the Senate, I will share with you one major concern I have. It is the power of the non-academic sector of the university -- the massive influence of people who do not see the major focus of the university as academic. These people are vice presidents, others are at the vice presidential level, and still others are at the next level down. We see their power in many ways. We see it in the size of their offices (compared to faculty), we see it in their salaries (compared to faculty). We see it in the size of their secretarial staff. We see it in their perks and expense accounts. We see it in the makeup of the President's Cabinet, of whom only about one-fourth have the terminal degree and only two have been in a full-time teaching or research position in the last ten years.

Recommendations. Finally, I wish to address some persistent problems that have been brought to my attention.

Over the past two years individuals from every group within the university -- faculty, administrators, alumni, students, and parents -- have come to me with
a variety of problems. In fact, much of my time as President of the Faculty Senate has been spent listening to people describe these problems. They've brought written documentation of official behavior that, without exception, is unethical and, in many cases, illegal. In addition, of course, the behavior is dysfunctional.

There is need for a mechanism by which this type of behavior can be dealt with. After going through the files of the 23 instances that have been reported to me since 1993, I, as outgoing president, suggest two solutions to the next Senate. First, modification of the faculty manual to include additional grievable issues. I propose that a number of abuses which I will describe for the incoming president be considered unprofessional conduct and grievable under either Grievance Procedure I (where applicable) or II. In addition to the grievance procedure, I suggest that another mechanism be considered: intervention by an ombudsperson.

Grievance Boards are already overworked and lack the apparatus to subpoena witnesses and acquire sensitive but essential data. The additional grievable offences could double their workload. Therefore, I recommend the creation of an Office of Ombudsperson to deal with such matters before grievance. I recommend that it be staffed by a faculty member to be elected by the Faculty Senate for a specified term and appointed by the University President. It should also have its own secretarial staff and office space commensurate with that of a university vice president.

This office should report directly to the President of the University and have the authority to subpoena witnesses and collect personnel records necessary to the case. The office should have a budget that allows for advice from legal counsel not affiliated in any way with the university.

Finally, I endorse the recommendation of the Faculty Senate Finance Committee that there be an operational audit of the University. This would ideally be performed by a firm with no ties to the University or to state government. Realizing, however, that that would be very expensive, I suggest that an operational audit could and should be done by non-administrative faculty with expertise in the relevant academic disciplines. These faculty should be allowed a significant amount of released time from teaching and other obligations. Such an audit could locate ways to allot to teaching and research a larger portion of our expenditures, certainly more than 25.5%, as indicated by the FS Finance Committee.

Walt Owens, Ph.D.
President, Faculty Senate

Addendum. As of May 1, neither the Tenure Bill nor the Retirement Bill were reported out of committee and are presumably dead for this session.
To: Provost J. Charles Jennett  
From: Robert A. Waller, Professor and Chair  
Re: Final Report on Revisions for Faculty Constitution

In accordance with your request of February 16, Professors Joe Mullins, Roger Rollin, and I have completed our analysis of the changes to be made in the Faculty Constitution as result of the new academic structure to be placed into operation on the campus effective July 1, 1995.

These recommendations have been approved unanimously by the Faculty Senate at yesterday afternoon's meeting. This report differs only slightly from the draft presented to you under the date of March 29. The only modifications were friendly amendments in the language concerning the Grievance Board (Article II, Section 8).

The reservation faxed to me yesterday noon was conveyed to the Senate but did not meet with a sympathetic response, the principal argument being that the Faculty controlled the curriculum and that no School Director should be placed in the position of "final decision" on such matters which were properly of University-wide concern.

In accordance with the amendment procedures for the Faculty Constitution, the time frame will be tight for your office to distribute the proposed amendments "at least three weeks prior to the [regular faculty] meeting [in May] at which action is to be taken." There will need to be a strong campaign to have the faculty present since a quorum for this purpose is defined as one-half of the Faculty excluding emeritus members.

With this report the Faculty Manual Revision Committee will have discharged one-half its responsibility.

c.c.: President Phil Prince  
Campus Legal Counsel Ben Anderson  
Faculty Senate President Bud Bodine  
Committee Members Joe Mullins and Roger Rollin  
ad hoc Chair Larry Bauer  
Resource Persons Janis Cheezem, JoAnne Deeken, Betty Moore, and Cathy Sturkie

Enclosure: 1
To: Provost Charles Jennett

From: Joe Mullins, Roger Rollin, and Bob Waller, Chair

Re: Faculty Senate Approved Modifications in Faculty Constitution

Based upon the unanimous recommendation approved at yesterday afternoon’s meeting of the Faculty Senate, here is our final report concerning recommendations for changes in the Faculty Constitution resulting from reorganization.

Preamble, insert a sentence in line 12 after "Departmental Faculties" as follows: "For the purposes of this Constitution, the term 'department' shall designate a discipline-specific, self-governing unit within a school or college." (page 55)

Article I, Section 3. "Officers" to be modified for clarity: "The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be the Chair of the Faculty. The Provost shall appoint a Secretary and, when necessary, shall appoint an acting chair to serve in his or her absence." (p. 56)

Article I. Section 4. "Meetings" change "Chairperson" to "Chair" in line 3 and modify the next paragraph to read as follows: "The quorum for any meeting of the Faculty shall be that number of members deemed necessary by the Chair to transact business other than the amendment of this Constitution." (page 56)

Article II, Section 2. "Membership" change the 2nd paragraph to read: "Any member of the Faculty may be eligible for membership on the Faculty Senate, except department chairs, school directors, deans, the provost, vice provosts, vice presidents, the president, and others with primarily administrative duties." (p.57)

Article II, Section 2. "Membership" 6th paragraph, lines 1-2 change to read: "Each college, except the Library, shall elect two alternates on a yearly basis; the Library shall elect one. Alternates may twice succeed themselves. An alternate shall have the status of a full member at any Senate meeting attended in the stead of a regular member." (page 57)

Article II, Section 2. "Membership" 8th paragraph beginning line 2 to read: "Senate seats shall be allocated according to the ratio of the number of members of the Faculty in a college to the total number of members of the Faculty in the University. Each college shall have as many seats as are in the nearest whole number when its ratio is multiplied by thirty-five, provided each college has at least one representative. For the purposes of this calculation, the Library is considered a college." (current paragraph 9 is retained) (page 58)
Article II, Section 5 on the Advisory Committee to be revised as follows: "The Advisory Committee shall be composed of the officers of the Faculty Senate, the Senator from the Library, and two senators from each college elected by the delegation of that college prior to the April meeting." (The remainder of the paragraph is unchanged.) (page 59)

Article II, Section 8 on the Grievance Board, to be modified as follows: "The Grievance Board shall consist of members elected by the members of the Faculty Senate from a pool of nominees named by the Executive and Advisory Committees in a joint meeting, and from nominations made from the floor at the Senate election meeting. Members of the Grievance Board must be tenured Full or Associate Professors, and shall be members, alternates, or former members of the Faculty Senate. These Grievance Board members shall consist of a representative from the Library and two representatives from each college." (The remainder of the paragraph is unchanged except the last sentence to be clarified, to wit:) "The Board, through three-member hearing panels, hears grievances brought to it in accordance with Faculty Grievance Procedure II." (p.60)

Article IV, Section 2, line 1 - insert "Senior" before "Vice Provost" so that the title reflects current use. (p.61)

Article IV, Section 2, lines 2 thru 5 - insert a change in order to expand the composition of each campus curriculum committee so the relevant segments would read: "...plus two representatives of the undergraduate curriculum committees of the several colleges, one of whom will be the chair of the college committee and the other elected by the college committee." Similarly (lines 4-8), the Graduate Curriculum Committee shall likewise be composed of a non-voting Chairperson from the Provost’s staff, "plus representatives of the graduate curriculum committees of the several colleges, one of whom will be the chair of the college committee and the other elected by the college committee. Should a college have a single curriculum committee, the chairperson and one other representative elected by the college committee shall serve on the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the college committee shall elect two representatives to the University Graduate Curriculum Committee." (page 61)

Article V. Amendment, lines 3-5 of paragraph 3 to be changed to read: "A two-thirds majority vote of the members present is required for passage with a quorum defined as at least one-half of the Faculty, exclusive of emeritus faculty." (page 61)

It is our collective belief that these changes will bring the Faculty Constitution into conformity with the reorganization activities taking place on the campus.
Symposium on Child Development Centers
at Institutions of Higher Learning

Self Auditorium
Strom Thurmond Institute

Tuesday, April 18, 1995
3 p.m.

Panelists
Mr. Frank Mauldin, CU Office of Human Resources
Dr. Sally McClellan, USC Children's Center
Dr. Alan Schaffer, CU Women's Commission
Dr. Dolores Stegelin, UGA Child Development Center
Dr. David Weatherford, CU Proposed Child Development Research Center

Reception immediately following
Call to Order. President Ashby B. Bodine, II, called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

Approval of Minutes. The Faculty Senate Minutes dated April 11, 1995, were approved as written.

Introduction of New Senators. President Bodine introduced newly-elected senators to the Faculty Senate.

Presentation on Division of Administration and Advancement. Vice President Gary A. Ransdell provided information on the structure of the new Division of Administration and Advancement which will become effective July 1, 1995, and shared the Draft Mission of this Division. An opportunity for senators to ask questions followed the presentation.

Election of Senate/Faculty Representatives to University Committees. Motion made by Vice President/President-Elect Ronald J. Thurston to suspend normal voting rules and elect by plurality was seconded by Senator Thomas C. Jenkins and passed. Senators then marked their ballots.

Committee Reports

a. Committee Reports

Research Committee. Senator Gary L. Powell, Chair, noted that the Committee had not met, but that Professor Janis Cheezem has informed him of minor changes to the Financial Disclosure Policy by the National Science Foundation. These changes will be circulated to faculty.

Finance Committee. Senator Roger K. Doost, Chair, stated that the Finance Committee had met, and provided the draft resolution for use of credit cards (see New Business).

Welfare Committee. Senator Kathy Neal Headley, Chair, stated that this Committee had not yet met.

Policy Committee. Senator Warren P. Adams stated for Bill Hare, Chair, that this Committee had not met.

Scholastic Policies Committee. No report.

b. University Commissions and Committees

1) Joint City/University Committee. Senator Thurston described the situation of a noisy party held at the National Guard Armory which resulted in many complaints to the Clemson University Police Department and ill feelings by the general public.
7. President’s Report. President Bodine submitted and briefly discussed the President’s Report dated May 9, 1995 (Attachment A). It was particularly noted that faculty must inform others who may not understand, what tenure actually is and that it is not a guarantee of job security.

8. Old Business (None)

9. New Business
   a. Resolution on the Use of Credit Cards was submitted by Senator Doost, Chair of the Finance Committee, who noted that this resolution was approved by the Executive/Advisory Committee. Discussion followed. Vote to accept resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS95-5-1 P) (Attachment B).

10. Adjournment. President Bodine adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Roger K. Doost, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

President’s Report

May 9, 1995

As we had hoped, the tenure bill died in House Committee. To be considered, all bills must be reported out of committee by May 1. The House did not meet on May 1, so for this year the bill to eliminate tenure at State supported institutions is dead.

The composition of the Committee on Academic Governance has been finalized. Membership of the committee and the committee’s specific charges are given on an attachment to this report.

The composition of the standing committees of the Faculty Senate has been established; specific charges for the committees are being prepared and will be finalized at the next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting on May 25.

Dr. Curris has made it clear that he will be significantly involved in the development of the budget and will have the budgetary matters and he should help greatly in maintaining an openness in the budgeting process, and in assuring fiscal responsibility.

I will be having monthly meetings with Provost Jennett to discuss diverse academic issues. I encourage you to seek input from your constituencies regarding academic matters and to transmit this information to the Executive/Advisory Committee. After this committee’s discussions and suggestions, I will discuss priority issues with the Provost.
MEMO TO: Committee on Academic Governance  
Ron Nowaczyk, Chair  
FROM: Philip H. Prince  
SUBJECT: Charge to the Committee examining academic governance at Clemson  

May 1, 1995  

Thank you for agreeing to serve as chair of the Committee to Examine Academic Governance at Clemson. This committee should examine the structure of academic governance at the University level within Clemson University. This includes all committees, commissions, boards, or other entities on which the faculty currently has elected or appointed representation. The committee should identify strengths within the current system and seek to maintain those strengths while eliminating weaknesses within the structure. Wherever possible, the committee should seek to:

- streamline the process for making decisions  
- improve communication across the various university constituencies  
- reduce the number of committees by eliminating redundant committee charges where they exist  
- recommend a consistent method for selection of membership of committees.

The committee's recommendations may take the form of modification of the present structure to a proposal of a new structure for governance. The committee should consult with the affected constituencies across the University as part of its deliberations and should strive to complete its report to the President, Provost, and Faculty Senate no later than August 1, 1995.

Committee membership includes:

- one full professor chosen by the University President, Provost, and the Faculty Senate President-elect. This individual will serve as committee chair:  
  Ron Nowaczyk

- five faculty members, one from each of the newly formed colleges, appointed by the Faculty Senate:  
  Architecture, Arts & Humanities - Roger Rollin  
  Agriculture, Forestry & Life Sciences - Larry Bauer  
  Engineering & Sciences - Leo Gaddis  
  Library - Ken Murr  
  Professional Studies - Jeri Milstead Pat Smart

- one Alumni professor selected by the Alumni professors: James Hite
one named professor selected by the named professors: Michael Drews

one Dean chosen by the Deans of the four newly formed colleges: James Barker

one undergraduate student selected by the Student Senate: Will Aiken

one graduate student selected by the Graduate Student Association: William D. Young

The committee shall elect its own vice chair.

xc: Dr. J. Charles Jennett
   Dr. Budd Bodine
   Committee Members
   Dr. Constantine Curris

Phil Prince
RESOLUTION ON THE USE OF CREDIT CARDS

FS95-5-1 P

Whereas, The University accepts Visa and Mastercards for payment of student fees and tuitions; and

Whereas, The University absorbed a total of $179,565 in charge fees in the fiscal year 1993-94 in the Bursar's area alone; and

Whereas, Such a practice is prevalent in retail businesses where such costs are passed on to consumers;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate urges the Administration to husband its limited resources by instituting an appropriate surcharge to recoup all costs associated with credit card financing of student fees and tuitions.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate on May 9, 1995.
THE MISSION OF ADMINISTRATION AND ADVANCEMENT

* To insure a quality learning environment for Clemson University. To acquire and manage information and resources to help the teaching, research, public service and student development functions of Clemson reach their potential.

* This will be accomplished through inspired people, efficient systems and optimum facilities.

* All A&A actions are intended to serve and support the students, faculty, staff or constituents of Clemson University. What is done for faculty and staff, is done to help them serve students or constituents.

* Every decision must be made in the best interest of this mission.

The A&A Organizational Chart

```
STUDENTS AND CONSTITUENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty and Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Advancement Employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Distributed to Senate at meeting, but not mailed in 5-9-95 Minutes
Packet per Randsell's instructions
1. Call to Order. Vice President/President-Elect Ronald J. Thurston called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The Faculty Senate Minutes dated May 9, 1995, were approved as written.

3. Committee Reports
   a. Committee Reports
      Finance Committee. Senator Roger K. Doost, Chair, noted that (1) the Provost responded to various issues relating to the use of credit cards which will be discussed by the Committee; (2) there has not been a reply to a letter from the Committee to Vice President for Business & Finance, David Larson, regarding the cost allocation system; (3) the Committee continues to endorse an operational audit for the University which President Curris supports; (4) the summer school dilemma should be reconsidered, and asked for any comments from senators; and (5) a response from Vice President for Institutional Advancement, Gary Ransdell, has been received and the Committee will address this response.
      Policy Committee. Senator Bill Hare, Chair, stated that this Committee had not met.
      Research Committee. Senator Gary L. Powell, Chair, announced that the senators from the College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Life Sciences have recommended that duties for the Vice President for Research be separated from the duties associated with the College.
      Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Shelley Barbary, Chair, stated that this Committee met on June 12th and discussed some of the tentative charges given by President Bodine and do expect more formal charges.
      Welfare Committee. Senator Kathy Neal Headley, Chair, stated that there was no report.
   b. University Commissions and Committees
      1) Parking Advisory Committee - Senator Kenneth Murr informed the Senate that he and former Senator Webb Smathers continue their efforts regarding the parking tax for employees (parking fees based on income), and hope to resolve this issue.
   4. President's Report. Vice President Thurston read the President's Report dated (Attachment A).
Vice President Thurston then asked for a Sense of the Senate for the Graduation Ceremony Committee on the issue of vendors serving food and beverages at the Graduation Ceremony. Discussion followed. It was determined by a vote that the Senate opposes the sale of food and beverages before the Ceremony; and a split decision was arrived at for the sale of food and beverages after the Ceremony. The Senate was reminded that individual colleges may host receptions prior to the Graduation Ceremony and provide refreshments.

The announcement was made by Vice President Thurston that the Faculty Senate will not meet during the month of July, 1995.

Remarks were then shared by Vice President Thurston with the Senate regarding whether or not the work of the Faculty Senate makes a difference. He stated that the Faculty had, in fact, made a difference; that the Faculty Senate stands for what is right, which makes a difference; and that we are now headed in the right direction. Vice President Thurston explained that he likes President Curris' values and could not agree more with them. Vice President Thurston stated that Dr. Curris is anxious to work with this Faculty Senate; urged the Senate to make Clemson University what we want it to be and can be; and closed by saying he is proud to be working with the faculty and Deno Curris.

5. **Old Business** (None)

6. **New Business**
   a. The Resolution Concerning Converse College and The Citadel was submitted for the Executive/Advisory Committee to the full Senate and read aloud by Senator Roger Rollin. Discussion followed during which two friendly amendments were offered, rejected, and failed. A final friendly amendment was offered and accepted. Vote to accept both the amendment and resolution was taken and passed, 22 to 3 with no abstentions (FS95-6-1 P) (Attachment B).

7. **Adjournment.** Vice President Thurston adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

[Signature]

Roger K. Doost, Secretary

[Signature]

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

President's Report

June 13, 1995

1) The Faculty Senate Select Committee on Tenure will be involved with tenure and related issues. The charge to this Committee will include public relations to increase awareness on the tenure issue, developing a position paper on tenure, etc.

Members are:

Ron Thurston, Chair
Darryl DesMarteau
Mike Kohl
Beth Kunkle
Elham Makrum
Madeline Oglesby
Jerry Reel
Lucy Rollin
Bill Surver
Gerald Walker
Mable Wynn

2) Investiture Committee - the Faculty Senate is involved in the organization and planning of President Curris' Investiture Ceremony. Members of the Faculty Senate may be seated on stage for this event, so please remember this celebration as you plan your Fall. At this time, dates being considered are during late August/early September. There will be a large academic processional to the Brooks Center where the Ceremony will be held. Details will be provided to you as definite plans are made.
RESOLUTION CONCERNING CONVERSE COLLEGE AND THE CITADEL

FS95-6-1 P

Whereas, The proposal by the South Carolina State Legislature to establish a “South Carolina Women’s Leadership Institute” at Converse College is an attempt to avoid admitting women to the Corps of Cadets of The Citadel, a taxpayer-supported institution; and

Whereas, Women deserve the opportunity to participate fully in any educational program supported by taxpayers; and

Whereas, Women have for years participated fully and with distinction in the educational programs offered by the taxpayer-supported (and formerly all-male) military academies operated by the government of the United States; and

Whereas, The establishment of such a “leadership institute” for women reflects of the long-discredited and illegal “separate but equal” principle of education; and

Whereas, The State Legislature is proposing to pay Converse College 3.4 million dollars to establish such an institute at a time when higher education in South Carolina is seriously underfunded and after excessive taxpayer dollars have already been expended to support The Citadel’s legal battles to preserve its segregated program;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate of Clemson University deplores the proposal to establish a “women’s leadership institute” at Converse College and urges the Administration, Faculty, and Board of Trustees of Converse College to reconsider their participation in this action; and

Further Resolved, That the Faculty Senate urges the state legislature to rescind its proposal to fund such a leadership program and utilize the budgeted 3.4 million dollars to support established programs in higher education within the state, and urges the leadership of the Citadel to open its Corps of Cadets to all qualified candidates, regardless of gender.

Resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on June 13, 1995
THERE WAS NO FACULTY SENATE MEETING IN

JULY, 1995
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
AUGUST 22, 1995

1. Call to Order. President Ashby B. Bodine, II, called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The General Faculty & Staff Minutes dated May 11, 1995, were approved as distributed, as were the Faculty Senate Minutes of June 13, 1995.

3. Committee Reports

a. Committee Reports

Finance Committee. Senator Roger K. Doost stated that the Committee is keeping track of capital projects and the University Cost picture. The subject of using credit cards for tuition payments will be discussed in the near future among Budd Bodine, Roger Doost, and Gary Ransdell, Vice President for Administration and Advancement. The summer school issue has been referred to the Scholastic Policies Committee.

Policy Committee. Senator Bill Hare, Chair, stated that this Committee's first meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 23, 1995.

Research Committee. Senator Gary L. Powell stated that this Committee will meet within the next couple of weeks, and asked senators to forward any matters to be studied by this committee to him.

Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Syd Cross stated that there was no report from this committee.

Welfare Committee. Senator Kathy Neal Headley noted that this Committee had met and mentioned possible items for consideration by the Welfare Committee. The next meeting will be at 11:00 a.m. on August 31st in 102 Tillman Hall.

b. University Commissions and Committees

4. President's Report. President Bodine discussed the President's Report dated August 22, 1995 (Attachment A). President Bodine informed the Senate that he and President Curris have discussed the possibility of an operational audit for parts of the University; and that the Committee on Tenure will meet to receive the charge to develop a position paper to inform and educate the Legislature and general public on the importance of tenure and how it relates to academic freedom.

5. Old Business (None)
6. **New Business**

   a. Grievance Board elections were held by secret ballot, ballots were counted, and Jim Davis, Skip Eisiminger, John Gowdy, and Terry Leap.

   b. Senator Kenneth Murr provided a Report on the Clemson University Libraries Materials Budget, noting that faculty will be asked which serials should not be cut from the Clemson University Libraries holdings. This cut is necessary due to the tremendous growth of serial inflation. The goal is to cut $150,000 of serial subscriptions. Discussion followed.

   c. President Bodine reminded the senators of: (1) the Investiture Ceremony for President Curris on Friday, September 8, 1995 and (2) the Board of Trustees Breakfast on Saturday, September 9, 1995 at 8:30 a.m. in the Virginia Shanklin Room of the Clemson House.

7. **Adjournment.** President Bodine adjourned the meeting at 4:12 p.m.

Roger K. Doost, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: S. Lewis (B. Kunkle for), S. Barbary, S. Amirkhanian, M. Dixon, F. Tainter (Nelson for), J. Bednar, M. Morris, R. Rollin, P. Smith, P. Smart, H. Wheeler
President's Report
Faculty Senate
August 22, 1995

President Curris and I have met several times since the last Faculty Senate meeting. The following are some of the topics we have discussed:

1. ways to promulgate in-depth and meaningful communication between the Faculty and the Administration;
2. methods and resources to strengthen Faculty Senate involvement in University governance;
3. maintaining the spirit and intent of the Faculty Manual and its importance as the cornerstone in the academic foundation of the University and in interactions between Faculty and Administration;
4. methods for initiating a priority-area driven, operational audit of the University.

In the coming months, a major area of concern for all Faculty must be to inform and educate the legislature and the general public on matters pertaining to academic freedom and tenure. Nationwide, tenure is under great scrutiny, and in some instances, tenure has been eliminated or drastically modified. It is imperative that those of us in academia develop strategies for articulating the benefits of tenure and its importance as a foundation for academic freedom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>400000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>350000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>200000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>150000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>100000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>50000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Book Expenditures

Adj. for inflation since 1986
Funding for Monographs 1995-6

- State funds: 24%
- Private funds: 44%
- Salary savings: 32%
Number of Books Using Average Book Price

- 1986/87
- 1995/96
- State Funds 1995
- Private Funds 1995
$ Needed to Maintain the Collection

Both curves assume historic averages since 1986-7 continue. Black is Library funding. Upper line is projected needs.
GRIEVANCE BOARD

BALLOT

College of Architecture, Arts, and Humanities
(Elect One)

_____ Skip Eisiminger

_____ ____________________________

College of Business & Public Affairs
(Elect Two)

_____ Terry Leap

_____ ____________________________

College of Engineering & Sciences
(Elect One)

_____ Marvin Dixon

_____ John Gowdy
1. Call to Order. President Ashby B. Bodine, II, called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The Faculty Senate Minutes of August 22, 1995 were approved as distributed.

3. Committee Reports
   a. Committee Reports
      
      Finance Committee. Senator Roger K. Doost submitted the Committee Report and explained particular items on which this Committee is working (Attachment A).
      
      Policy Committee. Senator Bill Hare submitted and briefly discussed this Committee's Report (Attachment B).
      
      Research Committee. Senator Gary L. Powell noted that this Committee had met and is constructing a questionnaire to poll emeritus professors who have done research in order to receive input into the research atmosphere at Clemson University. Senator Powell asked the Senate to forward any names of professors who fit this category to his E-mail address: glpwl.
      
      Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Shelley Barbary invited senators to attend Committee meetings on the last Thursday of each month at noon at L. J. Fields. This Committee is discussing questions regarding syllabi (are they binding contracts between faculty and students, what particulars should be included, are there too many restrictions). The procedures and administration for the cancellation of summer school classes across campus are also being addressed by this Committee.
      
      Welfare Committee. Senator Kathy Neal Headley submitted the Welfare Committee Report (Attachment C). Gary A. Ransdell, Vice President for Administration and Advancement, informed the Faculty Senate of his willingness to discuss and pursue an effort to have the Madren Conference Center meet as many needs as possible with regards to a faculty club.
      
   b. University Commissions and Committees

4. President's Report. President Bodine discussed the President's Report dated September 12, 1995 (Attachment D). Regarding the economic plight of the Library, Senator Kenneth Murr urged the faculty to truly state those journals which could be cut from serial subscriptions (the response has been that all journals are essential). One hundred fifty thousand ($150,000.00) dollars must be cut from the Library's serials budget.
5. **Old Business**
   a. Senator Ronald J. Thurston announced that the Faculty Senate Select Committee on Tenure will meet at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, September 18, 1995 in F149 P&A Building.

6. **New Business**
   a. Senator Hare submitted the Resolution Regarding Rights and Privileges of Emeritus (Retired) Faculty from the Policy Committee. Following discussion, vote was taken and resolution passed (FS95-9-1 P) (Attachment E).

   b. Senator Hare introduced the Resolution Establishing College, School, and Departmental Advisory Councils (Attachment F). Discussion was held during which suggestions were offered. Senator Stephen A. Lewis moved to postpone the resolution indefinitely, which was seconded. Vote was taken to postpone deliberations, and passed. Senator Murr noted that this resolution will appear under “Old Business” on the Agenda for the October 10th Faculty Senate meeting.

   c. Senator Fran McGuire shared concerns regarding policies and procedures for joint appointments/departmental transfers. During discussion, Provost J. Charles Jennett recommended that the deans and President Bodine meet to resolve these concerns, and report findings to the Senate. Senator John C. Bednar noted that the thrust of this meeting should be of a positive nature and encouraged more of this type of collaborative activity across campus.

7. **Adjournment.** President Bodine adjourned the meeting at 4:19 p.m.

---

Roger K. Doost, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Clemson University's Bonded Indebtedness
As of June 30, 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>INTEREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student/Faculty Housing Revenue Bond</td>
<td>$29,209,362</td>
<td>$17,624,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes 15 million for Johnstone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Plant Improvement Revenue Bond</td>
<td>8,775,000</td>
<td>5,935,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stadium improvements</td>
<td>4,670,000</td>
<td>785,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parking facilities</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>162,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Auxiliary Facilities Revenue Bond (Fernow St. Cafe &amp; Harcombe renovation)</td>
<td>3,540,000</td>
<td>2,414,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. State Institution Bonds (Strom Thurmond Inst. &amp; Brackett Hall)</td>
<td>7,290,000</td>
<td>2,998,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$54,044,362</td>
<td>$29,920,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes to the above items:

1. This debt is composed of three series of bonds with true interest costs ranging from 5.60% to 6.78%. The last installment is due in the year 2012. The net revenues of the student and faculty housing operation are pledged for repayment of this debt. Also included in the above figures is a 5.5% Department of Education note which will be retired in the year 2010.

2. These bonds bear a true interest cost of 6.80% and will be retired in the year 2011. The $40.50 per semester Plant Improvement Fee charged each full-time student is pledged for repayment of this debt. Additionally, part-time students are charged a per credit hour Plant Improvement Fee.

3. These bonds bear a net interest cost of 5.43% and will be retired in the year 2000. Pledged for repayment of this debt is the $1 admission fee included in the price of each ticket to an event in the stadium plus a special student fee of $6 per semester full-time student. Additionally, the net operating revenues of the Athletic Department are pledged.

4. These bonds bear interest at the rate of 5.44% and will be retired in the year 2004. The net revenues of the parking and vehicle registration operations is pledged for the retirement of debt.

5. These bonds bear interest at the rate of 6.95% and will be retired in the year 2011. The net revenues of campus vending, dining facilities, laundry, bookstore, canteen, and convenience store are pledged for the retirement of this debt.

6. This debt is composed of three series of bonds with interest rates ranging from 5.25% to 6.02% and the debt will be retired in the year 2010. State Institution Bonds are issued by the State on behalf of Clemson University and the tuition and matriculation portion of student fees is pledged for the retirement of this debt. For FY 1996, full-time SC resident tuition is $62.50 per semester, full-time non-resident tuition is $245.50 per semester and the matriculation fee is $5.00 per semester.

The schedule of student fees for debt retirement and plant maintenance, repairs, and renovations for FY 1994-95 and approved by the Board of Trustees on June 20, 1995, for FY 1995-96 is shown on the attached pages.
State Institution Bonds in the amount of $3,075,000 were issued in FY 1995 to finance the following projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H12-9639 Jordan Hall Renovations (new fume hoods and re-roof)</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12-9640 Barre Hall - Ductwork Replace</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12-9641 Lehotsky Hall - Ductwork Replace</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of bond issuance</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,075,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: June 28, 1995

To: Alan Godfry, Budget Director

From: Finance Committee, Faculty Senate

Subject: University Cost Summary

With your assistance last year, we were able to provide the faculty with a cost breakdown prior to interdepartmental cost allocations for the 1993-94 academic year.

On May 25, we wrote a letter to Mr. David Larson requesting provision of such information for the Faculty Senate on a periodic basis. As of this date, no response has been received.

A copy of this letter is enclosed. Would you please review this request and provide us with this information for the 1994-95 academic year at your earliest convenience? Alternatively, you may provide our committee with detail of costs (similar to what you provided us last year) so that we can prepare the final summary. This information is needed by August 20, 1995.

Thank you for your cooperation on this important matter.

---

Dear Alan,

Finance Committee met on 8/4. As we did not have the requested list information, I was asked to contact you again and request that you provide us with this information within the next 2 weeks, if at all possible.

Thank you.

Reg: 10/20/95
This letter is a follow-up on David Larson’s letter of March 29, 1995 to this committee confirming that credit card fees for the Bursar’s area alone amounted to $179,565 for one year, and a response to his subsequent letter of May 26 to you detailing the justifications for the use of credit cards.

Reason #1. Other state schools use credit cards for payment of fees.
Response #1. Change is brought about usually by one agency taking the lead. If we think there is merit in this regard, we must pursue it regardless of how many other schools accept credit cards.

Reason #2. Our agreement with Wachovia prohibits any such surcharge.
Response #2. We recommend elimination of card usage all together in case recoupment of fees is not possible. However, if regular gas companies can get bank’s approval for use of surcharge, we should not have much difficulty in negotiating a new agreement.

Reason #3. Acceptance of credit cards for tuition payments helps keep our costs down by reducing returned check costs.
Response #3. It is our understanding that if any student’s fees are not fully paid, then, the student may be dropped from the rolls and can not sit for the class. Any returned check should be settled usually during the first week of class. Returned check handling fees should recover the necessary handling costs.

Reason #4. Acceptance of credit cards for tuition payments helps reduce security risks by decreasing the amount of cash that must be handled.
Response #4. We suspect that most, if not all students, will pay their fees by check and will not carry thousands of dollars of cash in their pockets. Such risk should be minimal or may not apply at all.

Reason #5. In today’s tight economy, allowing student fees to be paid by credit card increases the number of students that are able to attend the University.
Response #5. The primary beneficiary of credit cards (particularly for large purchases) are the banks who collect millions of dollars of fees for a minimal service. The University and the Student must pay considerable additional charges for use of this service. For most students (with some of whom we have personally spoken), they take advantage of this service for a little convenience. Otherwise, they would easily be able to pay via check rather than charge card and then payment to the credit card company at the end of the month.

Reason #6. The charge fees that the University absorbs for charge cards brings offsetting benefits to the University.
Response #6. We are not aware of other offsetting benefits. Please advise what these other offsetting benefits are.

We believe that the subject resolution passed by the Faculty Senate in this regard must be upheld. Thank you for your attention and consideration.

cc: Provost C. Jannelle
And Biderman
Faculty Senate Policy Committee
Report for Senate Meeting of September 12, 1995

The Policy Committee met the first time this academic year on Tuesday, August 29. Items discussed and resolutions brought forward include the following.

1. A short discussion led to the conclusion that Advisory Councils for Departments, Schools, and Colleges should be mandated in the Faculty Manual. A resolution to this effect is included under New Business.

2. A resolution that continued access to University computing facilities be available for emeritus faculty resulted from a brief discussion of the privileges of retired faculty. This resolution will be introduced under New Business.

3. There was a discussion of the handling of textbook request lists to all bookstores, instead of just the campus bookstore. Hare will attempt to determine the present situation.

4. Discussion of the evaluation and term limitations of school directors and deans began. A first objective is to learn what has happened with resolutions passed last year regarding department heads. More generally, there is concern as to what is happening with the committee which is rewriting the Faculty Manual.

5. Obtaining information on tenure policies at other institutions was discussed, but no specific plans were made to do anything concrete at this time.

6. The committee will meet next on Tuesday, September 26, 1995 at 2 pm in Room O-106, Martin Hall.

Report submitted by Bill Hare for the Policy Committee
The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee met on August 31, 1995, to consider the following items of business.

1. Richard Poling will be the Welfare Committee representative working on the issue of daycare with the President's Commission on the Status of Women.

2. The Welfare Committee will monitor the salary/raise data of faculty, staff, and administration. This information should be received soon. The Welfare Committee has requested an electronic copy.

3. Frank Tainter will be the Welfare Committee representative working with the Senate committee to develop a position paper and support materials relevant to tenure.

4. The Welfare Committee will pursue the current status of sabbaticals and will request President Curris' interpretation of Clemson's policy.

5. Marvin Dixon will be the Welfare Committee representative to the Finance Committee regarding the issue of retirement.

6. Parking has many aspects for investigation: ticketing without any grace period, August 16; replacing employee parking along the drive to Tillman Hall with visitor spaces; budget information and how the budget is supported by fines; different parking fees for the same service; cost per rider on the shuttle system; plans for a pedestrian campus.
   Clint Isbell will seek additional information on the parking issues. The Welfare Committee notes that it is important for faculty and staff to be informed about proposed changes and that time should be allowed for input into those changes.

7. The training of campus security personnel will be studied.

The Welfare Committee will meet the third Tuesday of each month at 3:30 in the conference room of 102 Tillman.
President's Report
Faculty Senate Meeting
September 12, 1995

President Curris will meet with a group of former Faculty Senate Presidents and me on September 15. If Faculty have issues that they wish me to discuss with President Curris, they should send their requests to me at the Faculty Senate Office by 3PM September 14.

President Curris and 13 members of the Faculty Senate had a luncheon meeting on September 5. Many of the senators felt that it was a candid, and informative session. Further meetings of this kind will be held in the future with other members of the Faculty Senate.

On Thursday I will be meeting with Vice President Jacks to discuss the myriad of problems relevant to parking on campus, and to discuss police, fire and security issues and related topics.

Many of our colleagues have expressed concerns that during the reorganizational changes which are occurring, inequities can arise regarding use/control of facilities, reassignment of duties, reallocation of College funds, etc. These concerns will be addressed to the Provost and the Council of Deans for discussion and possible remediation.

The ad hoc Committee on University Governance, chaired by Dr. Ron Nowaczyk, has issued an interim report. Many of the proposed changes are very exciting and if adopted, would significantly enhance faculty participation in all aspects of governance. Senators are advised to read the document carefully and send comments, suggestions, or other forms of input as directed on the cover page of the document.

I have received many calls and E-mails concerning the economic plight of the Library and the probability that the Library holdings may be significantly reduced. If Clemson is to remain a vital academic institution and provide the very best undergraduate and graduate education, it is imperative that funds be found to support the needs of this very important aspect of the University. The University must give top priority to undergraduate and graduate education and all their attendant support functions/areas - i.e., Library, teaching and research equipment, facility maintenance, etc. The University must be very cautious and/or fiscally conservative in its new construction programs, and new organizational structures. Monies received from cost-savings in reorganization, or a percentage of monies received through certain University-Industry commercial enterprises should be used exclusively in support of our primary mission of education... We owe that to the students, and to our State.
RESOLUTION REGARDING RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES OF EMERITUS (RETIRED) FACULTY

FS95-9-1 P

Whereas, Emeritus faculty have an honored place in the University community; and

Whereas, Emeritus faculty as scholars have been models to students and peers in seeking quality education; and

Whereas, Emeritus faculty have unselfishly served their respective Departments, Colleges and the University in various capacities; and

Whereas, Emeritus faculty are entitled to the use of many University facilities and services which do not exert undue financial burdens;

Resolved, That, to accomplish these ends, the following changes be made in the last sentence on Page 21, Section III, Subsection G of the Faculty Manual:

“In addition, emeriti may request the continued use of available office and/or laboratory space as well as the continued access to the University computer system and may apply, upon approval, for University research grants under the same rules as other faculty.”

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on September 12, 1995.
A RESOLUTION OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE (8/29/95):
ESTABLISHING COLLEGE, SCHOOL, AND DEPARTMENTAL ADVISORY COUNCILS

WHEREAS, the faculties of the Library and the colleges are repositories of experience and expertise with regard to academic as well as many non-academic aspects of departmental, school, and college operations;

AND WHEREAS, in some colleges, schools, and departments of the university, formal provisions for drawing upon such faculty resources are not available to unit administrators;

AND WHEREAS a system of college, school, and departmental advisory councils can make faculty expertise and experience readily available to academic unit administrators, and can also: facilitate liaison between administrators and faculty, foster collegiality between administrators and faculty, empower faculty, and enhance the accountability of administrators to faculty;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that it shall be the policy of Clemson University that the several colleges and the Library shall establish advisory councils, as shall the schools, academic departments, and Library units;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, to accomplish these ends, the following paragraphs shall be inserted as #3 of Subsection H—"Other University Councils and Committee"—of Section VI (p.54 of the current Faculty Manual):

3. College Advisory Councils: Each college and the Library shall establish an Advisory Council of elected faculty whose purpose is to provide assistance and advice to college administrators, and to serve as liaison between said administrators and the college faculty. Each council shall elect its own chair. The college bylaws shall specify the procedures for establishing departmental representation on the Council as well as terms of service.

Each college advisory council shall meet at least once per long semester, on its own initiative or at the request of a college administrator, with or without the participation of college administrators as the council chooses, and shall report on its activities to the college faculty at least once per long semester in writing, or orally, at college meetings; copies of said reports shall be forwarded to the Provost.

College advisory councils shall receive and consider information, questions, recommendations, and complaints from college faculty and administrators, shall make determinations about such matters, and shall undertake any initiatives regarding their colleges as shall seem appropriate.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the following paragraphs be inserted as #4 under Subsection H—"Other University Councils and Commissions"—of Section VI (p.54 in the current Faculty Manual):
#4. **School and Departmental Advisory Councils**: Each school, department, and equivalent academic unit shall establish an Advisory Council of elected faculty, whose purpose is to provide assistance and advice to school or departmental administrators, and to serve as a liaison between said administrators and their respective faculties. Each council shall elect its own chair. The school or departmental bylaws shall specify the procedures for establishing representation on the council and terms of service.

Each school or departmental council shall meet at least once per long semester, on its own initiative or at the request of an academic administrator, with or without the participation of administrators as the council chooses, and shall report on its activities to its faculty at least once per long semester in writing, or orally, at a unit meeting; copies of said reports shall be furnished to the Dean.

School and departmental advisory councils shall receive and consider information, questions, recommendations, and complaints from their faculty and administrators, shall make determinations on such matters, and shall undertake any initiatives regarding their academic units as shall seem appropriate.

**RATIONALE.** A growing concern among faculty has been the perceived need for more accountability by deans, school directors, and department heads to their faculties. And academic administrators as well as faculty have expressed a desire for more collegial relationships between administration and faculty. Establishing departmental, school, and college advisory councils is a simple and effective way to foster faculty-administration collegiality and enhance administrative accountability. Such councils have been working well in the College of Liberal Arts, for example, for years. Indeed, a provision establishing college advisory bodies at least was present in the 1982 Faculty Manual, but inadvertently omitted from the current Manual. This oversight needs to be corrected, and the concept of school and departmental advisory councils established, for the potential benefits to administrators as well as faculty are considerable. Moreover, restructuring has made even more imperative the establishment of formal mechanisms for administrator-faculty liaison.
1. **Call to Order.** President Ashby B. Bodine, II, called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes of September 12, 1995 were approved as distributed.

3. **Committee Reports**

   a. **Committee Reports**

      **Finance Committee.** Senator Roger K. Doost submitted and briefly discussed the Committee Report (Attachment A).

      **Policy Committee.** Senator Bill Hare submitted this Committee's report and noted that the next meeting will be on October 17, 1995 (Attachment B).

      **Research Committee.** Senator Tom Jenkins stated that the Research Committee is working on a survey which will be mailed to faculty to obtain insight into the research climate at Clemson. Senator Pat Smith provided copies of a draft survey and asked for comments and suggestions. The Research Committee Report dated October 4, 1995 was submitted (Attachment C).

      **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Shelley Barbary stated that this Committee continues to gather information; and plans to discuss the issues of summer school and Syllabi requirements with Jerry Reel and George Carter of the Undergraduate Studies Office.

      **Welfare Committee.** Senator Kathy Neal Headley submitted the Welfare Committee Report (Attachment D) and noted that Roger Doost, Allen Turner, and David Fleming are invited guests for the next meeting on October 17th. Issues for discussion include the salary data information and a faculty workload database system.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**

      1) Senator Kenneth Murr announced that the Provost had granted $125,000 from summer school funds to be allotted to the Library's serial budget.

      2) Senator Tom Jenkins reported that the Library Advisory Committee discussed and approved the reduction of library loans from three days to one day. This Committee also addressed the change of to whom it reports contained in the Interim Academic Governance Report and agreed that it should continue to report to the Provost.

      3) Vice President/President-Elect Ron Thurston stated that the Select Committee to Study Tenure had met twice and had endorsed the position paper presented by the Commission on Higher Education on the issue of tenure. Post tenure review policies at other universities are now being studied by this Select Committee.
4) Senator Pat Smith noted that the Athletic Council had met, and the approval of a new NCAA regulation that accepts more marginal students, rather than these students beginning their college careers at technical colleges.

4. President's Report. President Bodine stated that at this time there was no report.

5. Old Business

   a. Senator Murr withdrew the resolution that had been postponed indefinitely, and noted that the resolution for discussion under Old Business was a substitute resolution. Senator Rollin, for the Policy Committee, then submitted and explained the Resolution Establishing College, School, and Departmental Advisory Councils. Discussion followed. Vote was taken to accept resolution (for which two-thirds vote was necessary because it is a Faculty Manual change), and passed (FS95-10-1-P) (Attachment E).

6. New Business

   a. Senator Rollin introduced Ron Nowaczyk, who introduced discussion on the Interim Report from the Committee on Academic Governance (Attachment F). Following discussion, Dr. Nowaczyk asked for and received a Sense of the Senate on five particular items contained in the Interim Report. Senator Murr submitted a memo signed by all Library faculty which stated that the Interim Report contained no voting participation by the Library faculty on any of the proposed governing bodies (Attachment G). A Sense of the Senate vote was taken on Library faculty representation on three policy-making committees and failed.

   b. President Bodine reminded senators to seek nominations for the Class of '39 Award for Excellence, and noted that nomination forms may be obtained from the Faculty Senate Office (Attachment H).

7. Adjournment. President Bodine adjourned the meeting at 5:20 p.m.

Roger K. Doost, Secretary

Absence: S. Lewis, G. Bautista, J. Bednar, M. Cooper, G. Powell, H. Wheeler
September 27, 1995

Mr. Joe Granger, Director
Parking & Traffic Control

Dear Mr. Granger:

Several faculty have raised some concerns about parking and parking fees.

As I am sure that these items were debated in the parking committee before a decision was reached, I request that you provide our committee with any such information that you may have before we bring up these concerns to the attention of the Faculty Senate.

Item 1. Until mid-1980's, we paid no parking fee. Parking expenses were supposedly picked up by IPTAY and justified by the use of parking lots during football games. What happened to that arrangement and why did we all of a sudden were asked to pay for our parking privilege?

Item 2. Sliding fees may be considered illegal. Some faculty object to the sliding fees on the grounds that we can not ask for different prices for the same service. Has this issue been looked into?

Item 3. The question of paying for parking with before tax dollars has been raised. Ron Herrin has apparently investigated this option and provided us with a response. But has the issue of financing parking expenses and providing a proportionately less raise for the following year been considered?

Item 4. The question of gross pay as the basis for parking fees seems to be unclear and subject to various interpretations. Is gross pay meant to be university gross pay or one's total income per tax return. Is it last year's gross pay or current year's gross pay? Is gross pay determined based on inclusion of summer pay and any potential overtime or is it based on base pay (nine months pay for faculty)?

Item 5. Is there a correlation between parking fees charged and the cost of parking? In other words, does the revenue from parking go to a general fund and expenses paid from a pool mixed with other expenses, or there is a specific pool of revenue and expenses for parking?

Your response to these questions will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Roger K. Doost, Chair
Finance Committee,
Faculty Senate
MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles Jennett

FROM: Gary Ransdell

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate/Credit Card Concerns

Charles, please note my recent exchange with Roger Doost, Chairman of the Faculty Senate Finance Committee. Please include the matter of credit card services on your next agenda when you have a staff meeting with Jerry, Mike and Marvin. I would encourage you to invite Bill Kilgore to your meeting when this matter is discussed.

The Faculty Senate is anxious to eliminate or alter the use of credit cards by incoming students for the payment of tuition and fees. It does cost us some money, but my hunch is it may be worth the expense when we consider the convenience and needs of our incoming students and their parents.

The point for your collective consideration is the degree to which this service factors into the prospective student decision-making process and the bottom line matriculation of our students. It would be less than prudent for us to consider changing the credit card program without knowing the degree to which you guys believe such action would impact our Admissions process. Your perspectives are necessary before we follow through on some of the actions which we have assured the Faculty Senate we will consider (including survey of incoming students and possible strategies which might minimize the financial impact of these credit card charges). Let me know your perspectives. Thanks Charles.

xc: Budd Bodine
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Roger K. Doost, Chair, Finance Committee, Faculty Senate
FROM: Gary Ransdell
SUBJECT: Followup Information

Thank you for your communique of September 11. I, too, found our meeting on September 6 helpful and encouraging. It is appropriate, however, that I clarify some of the understandings which you gleaned from our discussion.

On your September 11 list you indicate that we will follow up with "the charge card company to see if we can convince them to give the University a 1% rebate for all tuition payments paid by a particular charge card." To clarify, please understand that there is no single charge card company which students use to charge their tuition. There are hundreds of different charge card companies and banks which sponsor MasterCard, Visa Cards, American Express Cards, Discover Cards, etc. It is impossible to contact all of those various banks and credit card companies to seek a 1% rebate—nor would they be interested in giving up 1% of their profit. What we agreed to do was check with MBNA, which sponsors the Clemson University Alumni Association credit card, to explore the feasibility of an advance mailing to prospective students through which we would offer the MBNA card and encourage these students to use the MBNA card for their tuition payments. This would allow 1% of those specific charges to accrue back to the Alumni Association endowment. The Alumni Association does get a 1% rebate on all charges made by cardholder participants in the Alumni Association MBNA credit card program. We will explore whether or not it is prudent to limit tuition credit card charges to this particular card.

Such determinations can only be made after we have surveyed incoming students (as per your September 11 statement #3) to determine the degree to which credit card privileges are a convenience for incoming students or whether they are a necessity for some. Wording on such a survey will need to be delicate so that we do not plant the seed for discontent based on the availability or lack of availability of such transaction opportunities.

In your statement #2, you suggest we add a statement to the tuition payment process which suggests the "inconvenience and costs of credit card charges to the University and the appreciation of payments by check." As we said in our meeting on September 6, it may be possible to add such a statement, but we must first complete the aforementioned survey process so as to insure our confidence that such a statement will not have a negative impact in the matriculation of incoming students.
The whole matter of credit cards comes down to making a smart business decision as we weigh cost to the University against good customer service and student/parent satisfaction. We simply have to know that altering one service for financial gain does not cost us in the long run either financially or strategically.

I am asking the Provost and his staff for their perspectives in this regard.

Your requests for periodic financial reporting are as we discussed. We will factor the points you outlined on September 11 into the next set of financial data which we provide to the Faculty Senate.

Finally, we certainly look forward to providing assistance to a joint task force which will be established to study areas of the University in search of improvement and efficiency. I will await instruction from either President Curris or Dr. Bodine with regard to suggested appointments for such a committee.

xc: Budd Bodine
✓Charles Jennett
John Newton
Alan Godfrey
Bill Kilgore
September 11, 1995

Dr. Gary A. Ransdell,
Vice President

Dear Gary:

The meeting I and Bud Bodine had with you and other representatives from Division of Finance on Wednesday, September 6 was quite useful. This is my understanding of what we decided to do and I will communicate the same to the Faculty Senate:

1. You will follow-up with the charge-card company to see if you can convince them to give the university a one percent rebate for all the tuition payments paid by a particular charge card.

2. A statement indicating that 'as use of charge cards involves considerable additional expense for the university, payment by check for tuitions will be appreciated' will be included in the request for tuition payment packets in the future.

3. A simple survey will be conducted by the Bursar Office for one or two semester asking a few simple questions from those who choose to pay their tuitions through a charge cards. Questions such as whether the card is used for convenience or for financial needs or installment payments and whether absence of credit cards will force the student to withdraw from the school will be asked.

4. We also discussed the question of periodic financial reporting for our internal use. What the Senate is looking for is some basic numbers without a lot of allocations and reallocations to various accounts. We got all the supporting figures and prepared such a report last year. We think that having such comparative data from here on is very educational and useful for university management and the faculty at large.

The breakdown we are looking for is as follows:

- Teaching faculty's salary and benefits
- Other direct costs associated with teaching such as supplies and travel
- Total cost of extension services
- The real cost of university overhead before any cost allocation broken down into: academic support, student services, institutional support, operation and maintenance, and departmental administration.
- The cost of auxiliary enterprises with a separate number indicating the amounts allocated to auxiliaries for the use of other departments' services.
5. We also briefly discussed the possibility of establishing a small joint task force between faculty and administration to continuously study one area at a time and suggest ways of improving and making this place a still better and more efficient university.

Dr. Bud Bodine is pursuing this matter with President Curris. We are excited about this possibility and think that such an attempt will build a bridge of cooperation and comradry among all of us.

Sincerely,

Roger K. Doost, Chair
Finance Committee, F. Senate

cc: Dr. Bud Bodine, President, F. Senate
Report of the Policy Committee  
October 10, 1995

1. The committee met September 26 at 2 pm in O-106, Martin Hall, with all members present.

2. The resolution on advisory councils was discussed; it will be brought up under Old Business at today's meeting. It will be brought up as a substitute motion.

3. There was discussion of the activity of the "Waller" Committee charged with rewriting the Faculty Manual: Hare reported that the provost has approved the Senate suggestion that more faculty be added to the committee, and that Holley Ulbrich and Dori Helms have been added. The Policy Committee will locate the final approved resolution from the 1994-95 Faculty Senate dealing with evaluation and term limits for department heads and draft similar resolutions for school directors and college deans.

4. Considerable discussion was held on the Interim Report of the Committee on University Governance, chaired by Ron Nowaczyk. A statement in support of the document was sought and there was considerable discussion of the phrase, overall responsibility for academic policies of Clemson University, found in the second line of V. There was a feeling among some of the committee members that the statement is too strong and perhaps inflammatory toward the provost. Rather than get into the details of a line by line criticism and rewrite, the committee finally came up with the following consensus statement:

"The Policy Committee endorses in principle the recommendations of the ad hoc Committee on Academic Governance as set forth under III (p. 1) of the committee's interim report."

Individual members will relay their concerns to chairman Nowaczyk for consideration in the final report.

5. Ken Murr told of procedural difficulties experienced by the Grievance Board recently. He and other members of that body feel that some sort of detailed procedures should be in writing. The committee suggested that the Grievance Board draft such procedures and bring it to the Senate for consideration.

7. Remaining committee meeting dates for 1995 are October 17, November 28, and December 12 -- 2 pm each time in O-10, Martin Hall.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 4, 1995

Present: Tom Jenkins, Dale Linvill, Gary Powell (Chair), Pat Smith, Steve Stevenson

Janis Cheezem, from Sponsored Programs, also attended.

Meeting began at 1430.

The Committee continued its review of the survey questionnaire. Pat Smith has reworked the questionnaire into a survey format. The Committee discussed various aspects of the questionnaire, as well as agreeing on wording of the questions. Pat Smith intends to take the Committee’s recommendations into account when he edits the survey. Pat is to be thanked for his efforts.

The Committee also discussed the groups to be asked to be surveyed.

1) A list of faculty who have submitted proposals through the Sponsored Programs Office in the last three years.

2) A list of faculty who are researchers at the Experiment Stations.

3) Individual researchers who have left Clemson University.

4) Department Chairs of departments not represented in Lists 1 and 2 above.

The survey will be pretested using former members of the Faculty Senate Research Committee.

Meeting adjourned at 1600.

Please note: A copy of the survey is available from Gary Powell, but its size precludes attaching it to the Agenda Packet until the final version. Everyone is encouraged to study this draft document.
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee  
September 19, 1995

Attending: Gloria Bautista; Marvin Dixon; Kathy Neal Headley, Chair; Clint Isbell; Richard Poling; Frank Tainter

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee met on Sept. 19, 1995, to consider the following items of business:

1. Richard Poling has been in contact with members of the President's Commission on the Status of Women. Richard is facilitating the Welfare Committee's support on the issue of daycare. Another member of the Welfare Committee, Gloria Bautista, is also a member of the Commission. Richard and Gloria will help communicate any needs/concerns related to daycare back to our Welfare Committee.

2. The Welfare Committee has requested an electronic copy of the salary/raise data of faculty, staff, and administration. Allen Turner and Roger Doost will be invited to our October meeting to discuss salary concerns.

3. Frank Tainter reports that Ron Thurston's Committee on tenure has already begun its work. Tenure is important in the university setting as protection for academic freedom. The Tenure Committee is attempting to sort through confusions about tenure and sabbaticals.

4. The Welfare Committee will pursue the current status of sabbaticals and will request President Curris' interpretation of Clemson's policy. No action by the committee at this time.

5. Marvin Dixon has contacted Roger Doost with the Welfare Committee's interest in the issue of retirement for university faculty and staff.

6. Clint Isbell has provided Budd Bodine with questions concerning parking. After a meeting with Almeda Jacks, Budd will update our committee.

7. A draft of the Faculty Workload Database System has been received by the Welfare Committee. Kathy Headley has been collecting background information from committee members involved in drafting the document last spring. The Welfare Committee has proposed that a pilot study be conducted for additional information and feedback before such an instrument is implemented.

8. The Welfare Committee would like to meet with Gary Ransdell to discuss a faculty club at the new conference facilities.

The Welfare Committee will meet 3:30 Tuesday, October 17, in the conference room of 102 Tillman. The November meeting, the 21st at 3:30, will be held in Tillman 420.
RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING COLLEGE, SCHOOL, AND DEPARTMENTAL ADVISORY COUNCILS

FS95-10-1 P

Whereas, The faculties of the Library and the colleges are repositories of experience and expertise with regard to academic as well as many non-academic aspects of departmental, school and college operations; and

Whereas, In some colleges, schools, and departments of the University, formal provisions for drawing upon such faculty resources are not available to unit administrators; and

Whereas, A system of college, school, and departmental advisory councils can make faculty expertise and experience readily available to academic unit administrators, and can also: facilitate liaison between administrators and faculty, foster collegiality between administrators and faculty, empower faculty, and enhance the accountability of administrators to faculty;

Resolved, That it shall be the policy of Clemson University that the several colleges and the Library shall establish advisory councils, as shall the schools, academic departments, and Library units; and

Further Resolved, That, to accomplish these ends, the following paragraphs shall be inserted at an appropriate location in the revised Faculty Manual:

College Advisory Councils: Each college and the Library shall establish an Advisory Council of elected faculty whose purpose is to provide assistance and advice to college administrators, and to serve as liaison between said administrators and the college faculty. Each council shall elect its own chair. The college bylaws shall specify the procedures for establishing departmental representation on the Council as well as terms of service.

Each college advisory council shall meet at least once per long semester, on its own initiative or at the request of a college administrator, and shall report on its activities to the college faculty at least once per long semester in writing, or orally, at college meetings; copies of said reports shall be forwarded to the Provost.

College advisory councils shall receive and consider information, questions, recommendations, and complaints from college faculty and administrators, shall make determinations about such matters, and shall undertake any initiatives regarding their colleges as shall seem appropriate.
School and Departmental Advisory Councils: Each school, department and equivalent academic unit shall establish an Advisory Council of elected faculty, whose purpose is to provide assistance and advice to school or departmental administrators, and to serve as liaison between said administrators and their respective faculties. Each council shall elect its own chair. The school or departmental bylaws shall specify the procedures for establishing representation on the council and terms of service.

Each school or departmental council shall meet at least once per long semester, on its own initiative or at the request of an academic administrator, and shall report on its activities to its faculty at least once per long semester in writing, or orally, at a unit meeting; copies of said reports shall be furnished to the Dean.

School and departmental advisory councils shall receive and consider information, questions, recommendations, and complaints from their faculty and administrators, shall make determinations on such matters, and shall undertake any initiatives regarding their academic units as shall seem appropriate.

Resolution passed by the Faculty Senate on October 10, 1995.
College of Professional Studies

School of Health & Social Science
Department of Psychology

TO: Faculty Senators
FROM: Ron Nowaczyk, Chair, ad hoc Committee on Academic Governance
DATE: Oct. 2, 1995
SUBJECT: Clarification of major recommendations in the interim report

At the request of faculty senators who serve on the ad hoc Committee, this memo is a clarification of some information in the interim report of the ad hoc Committee on Academic Governance:

1) The committee is concerned that the current system for approving academic policies is not well defined and, at times, is circuitous.
2) The committee feels that one body should be charged with the responsibility of making reviewing and recommending academic policies that affect the University community at large. This body should have substantial faculty representation.
3) Any reorganization should reduce committees and commissions wherever possible by reassigning and combining committee charges.

Clarifications on Recommendations:

1) The proposed academic council will be responsible for reviewing and recommending academic policies. The term "approved" within the interim report was inappropriate in that the Committee did not intend to usurp the prerogatives of the President and Board of Trustees who hold ultimate responsibility for decisions. It is our intent that when the Academic Council "approves" a policy, it is approving that the policy be recommended to the Provost and President.
2) The council's recommendations are recommendations that can be accepted or rejected by the Provost, President, and/or the Board of Trustees. It is the committee's intent, however, that decisions of the Council are communicated to the President.
3) The actions of the Council do NOT preclude the Provost from offering his or her own recommendations. In most cases, the committee anticipates that the Provost can and should use the recommendations of the Academic Council to strengthen the position of the Provost in discussions with the President, other Vice-Presidents and the Board of Trustees. The committee, however, believes the Council should be more than an advisory committee to the Provost. We would hope that the Council and Provost would work in concert for academic policies, but in those rare instances in which a disagreement exists, both the Council's and Provost's recommendations would be communicated to the President.
4) Alternatives to a restructuring of the Academic Council have been proposed including an "Academic Senate" as well as restructuring the Dean's Council. The committee felt a restructuring of the current Academic Council and its related committees and commissions accomplished the goals of the committee with the least disruption.

The committee welcomes the Senate's input on these issues as well as those involving the method of selecting faculty to represent colleges, the combining of committees and commissions, the identification of committee membership including voting/non-voting status, and the need for a university review board.
MEMORANDUM

October 9, 1995

TO: Clemson University Faculty Senate
FROM: Library Faculty
SUBJECT: University Governance

The Interim Report of the Committee on University Governance provides no voting participation by the Library faculty on any of the proposed governing bodies. Since participation in university governance is the duty and responsibility of all faculty, the Library faculty request that the Faculty Senate reaffirm that no segment of the faculty should be excluded from participating in university governance by the lack of representation in the process.
MEMORANDUM

TO: ALL FACULTY SENATORS

FROM: ASHBY B. BODINE, II, PRESIDENT
       FACULTY SENATE

SUBJECT: CLASS OF '39 AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE

All faculty should have received by now information and nomination forms from respective deans and department chairs in order to nominate a colleague for the Class of '39 Award for Excellence. This is a reminder to you to encourage faculty to consider placing a name in nomination for one who meets certain eligibility requirements and has made the "highest achievement of service" to the Student Body, the University, and the Clemson Community, State of South Carolina, or the Nation.

The deadline to receive nominations is Tuesday, October 31, 1995. Nominations should be sent to:

Cathy Toth Sturkie
Faculty Senate Office
Cooper Library

The vote will take place at the November 14th Faculty Senate Meeting, so please plan to attend this very important meeting. The winner of this award will be formally announced at the December Graduation Exercises.

Please let me know if you have not received information or nomination forms regarding the Class of '39 Award for Excellence, and we will be happy to provide both for you.

ABB/cts
The following information is being distributed today by Inside FAX. Please share with your colleagues.

University Seeks Proposals on Child Care Center

Clemson will issue a request-for-proposals later this month to see if a private child care provider will establish and operate a center on university property.

The RFP is the most recent development in a longstanding effort to establish on-campus day care facilities for faculty and staff. Earlier efforts have focused on creating a child research center that would provide care for a limited number of children, but privatization is being pursued as a means of providing service to a larger number of faculty and staff.

"Child care is in short supply in this immediate area, and the number of two-career families continues to grow which simply adds to the demand," said Gary Ransdell, vice president for administration and advancement. "There have been numerous discussions about having a university-operated center, but it makes sense to partner with someone who is already in that business and knows how to operate a child care center."

The RFP stipulates that avenues will be created for academic internships, research opportunities and student projects, so that the center could enhance Clemson's academic, research and outreach programs in early childhood education, family and youth development, recreation management, nursing and other relevant disciplines.

Ransdell credited the President's Commission on the Status of Women, and the support of President Deno Curris, with keeping the project on track.

"The Women's Commission has made on-campus child care a priority, and their input into the RFP has been extremely valuable," he said. "And in his first meeting with the Commission, President Curris said that he hoped we could have a center in operation within a year. The privatization route will help us move quickly."

No university funds will be used to build or run the center, and parents who use the facility will pay fees in line with the market.
Child care is one of a number of privatization options currently being considered as university service operations are reviewed as part of the implementation of administrative restructuring. Other requests-for-proposals in various stages include:

* A contractual arrangement for oversight of facilities operations, with proposals currently under review for a mid-November decision;

* Privatization of the ag sales center, which will be released later this month with calls for proposals by the end of November.

* A single-vendor contract for providing office supplies to departments, which has just been released.
STUDY DESIGN AND TIMETABLE

Basically we wish to send copies of this questionnaire to four groups of faculty.

1. Department Chairperson nominees - names will be solicited from chairs of those faculty members with active research agendas, lists of publications, exemplary research skills. Up to three research scholars per department will be solicited.

2. List of active researchers - the Office of Sponsored Programs has a list of all CU staff who have applied for research grants with federal or state agencies or with foundations or corporations. These researchers are generally going through an application process for competitive grants that generate a return of funds to the university through indirect costs.

3. List of active researchers tied to Experiment Station Projects The Experiment Station has traditionally split appointments with the College of Agriculture faculty to enhance applied research in the Land Grant System. Some faculty from Life Sciences are attached to these projects as well.

4. List of "Expatriates" - names of former faculty who were involved in research and had an active research agenda when they were at Clemson. We are looking for the names of faculty who went on to other institutions so they can give a grounded comparison.

TIMETABLE

October 27 - Send comments for final draft of questionnaire to: Pat Smith, 139 Brackett or john4

Send names of former faculty to Gary Powers (glpw1)

November 3 - First batch of Questionnaires out to faculty on List 2 and 3. Two week turnaround; back by 11/17

November 10 - Second batch of Questionnaires out to nominees from List 1 and List 4; Two week turnaround; back by 11/30

Preliminary results by 1/15/96
A. BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. How long have you been here at Clemson? _______ years

2. Did you have prior post-doctoral experience prior to CU?
   _____yes   _____no (if yes, where:______________________)

3. Did you have prior university experience at the faculty level elsewhere? _____yes _____no

4. In which department is your tenure slot located?
   ___________________________________________________________

B. Assessment of Organizational Relationships at Clemson

Below are five categories of global response that we would like you to use in regard to your assessment of these components at Clemson. Please write your response in the space to the left. If an item is not applicable, use "0".


PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

____ 1. Interpersonal collegiality
____ 2. Resolution of Conflicts between teaching and research
____ 3. Resolution of Conflicts between teaching and service
____ 4. Interactions with colleagues within department
____ 5. Interactions with colleagues within college
____ 6. Interactions with colleagues between departments
____ 7. Interactions with colleagues between colleges
____ 8. Interactions with Institutes
9. Interactions with Clemson Foundation

10. Interactions with Sponsored Research (3rd floor - Brackett Hall)

GRADUATE STUDENTS AND GRAD STUDENT SUPPORT

11. General quality of graduate students

12. Administrative support for graduate students

13. Departmental support for graduate teaching

14. Departmental concern for quality of graduate teaching

15. Relevant departmental degree objectives

16. Relevant cross-disciplinary degrees

17. Relevant cross-disciplinary courses

18. Major curriculum requirements for degree

19. Relevant methods/statistics courses available

20. Adequate qualifying and preliminary examinations

21. Relevancy of oral examinations

22. Adequacy of graduate school support

23. Adequacy of graduate school student recruitment

24. Speed and accuracy of handling graduate student admissions

25. Fairness of enforcement of graduate school regulations

26. Fairness of admissions standards

27. Appropriateness of Standardized thesis format requirements

28. Support for international graduate students
DIRECT INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH

29. Availability of intramural funds for "gateway" or innovative research projects
30. Availability of intramural funds for new faculty
31. Fairness in determining competition for internal grants
32. Timeliness in announcement of recipients for internal grants
33. College administrative efficiency in processing intramural grants
34. Departmental administrative efficiency in processing intramural grants
35. Adequacy of return of overhead from external grants
36. Adequacy of notification about the availability of Federal grants
37. Adequacy of notification about the availability of corporate and foundation grants
38. Availability of equipment for research
39. Adequacy of general equipment (<$20,000) for research
40. Adequacy of specialized equipment (>=$100,000) for research
41. Availability of primary research space
42. Adequacy of size and location of primary research space
43. Maintenance of primary research space
44. Quality of primary research space for collegial interaction
45. Adequacy of departmental clerical support for preparation of research proposals
RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE

46. Satisfaction with grants office administration in processing proposals

47. Clarity of institutional requirements for processing grant proposals (sponsor and CU)

48. Adequacy of assurance certification (drug-free workplace, animal rights)

49. Adequacy of the speed of decision in grants process by grants administration

50. Clarity of grantee requirements

51. Clarity of protection of intellectual property (patents and copyrights)

52. Adequacy of central support facilities

53. Adequacy of radiological control

54. Adequacy of biohazard control

55. Adequacy of animal housing

56. Adequacy of veterinary care

57. Adequacy of growth chambers

58. Adequacy of greenhouses

59. Adequacy of fields and farms

60. Adequacy of Library Serials

61. Adequacy of Library Monographs

62. Adequacy of Library holdings

63. Adequacy of special services (interlibrary loans, searches, etc.)

64. Adequacy of support for personal computers from Computing Center
65. Adequacy of support for work stations and servers from Computing Center

66. Availability of software from Computing Center

67. Adequacy of visualization from Computing Center

68. Availability of programmers for special applications

69. Competitiveness of MICRO CENTER for purchases

70. Adequacy of collegiality with peer institutions within South Carolina

71. Adequacy of collegiality with regionality Southeastern universities (UGA, DUKE, UNC, NCSU, etc.)

C. TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE EXCELLENCE

Many of the awards on campus go to faculty that exhibit meritorious and even heroic service. But their roles in a department and a college are sometimes submerged in the process of selection. Below we would like you to name colleagues whom you judge the best in certain areas. One reason we are soliciting this list is to establish who excels in a variety of roles necessary for the re-establishment of inter-disciplinary teams. Another reason is that we would like to establish a peer-referent nomination method that might guide administrators in their decisions. Again, your answers are confidential.

1. Colleague who can best explain your field to the public.

2. Colleague who is best at searching electronic data bases.

3. Colleague who has best integrative skills for developing grant proposals.

4. Colleague who has best interpersonal skills to work on an interdisciplinary teams.
5. Colleague who is the most productive performer in research grant production.

6. Colleague who is seen as best undergraduate teacher.

7. Colleague who is best graduate teacher.

8. Colleague who is best advisor for undergraduates.

9. Colleague who is best advisor for graduate students.

D. CONCLUDING QUESTIONS

Please choose one aspect that you thought was outstanding at Clemson University and briefly tell why it was considered outstanding.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please choose one aspect that is particularly disappointing at Clemson University and Briefly tell why it is such a disappointment.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much for your help.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
November 14, 1995

1. Call to Order. President Ashby B. Bodine, II, called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The Faculty Senate Minutes of October 10, 1995 were approved as distributed.

3. Class of '39 Award for Excellence. President Bodine appointed Kathy Neal Headley to count ballots for this Award with the Provost. The election of the 1995 Class of '39 Award for Excellence was held by secret ballot, and ballots were collected.

4. Committee Reports
   a. Committee Reports

   Finance Committee. Senator Roger K. Doost submitted and discussed the Committee Report (Attachment A). The University Cost Summary 1994-95 was then explained in greater detail by Senator Doost. During discussion, Senator Roger Rollin suggested that a formal recommendation regarding the University budget and these figures be forwarded to President Curris. Senator Doost will take this suggestion to the Finance Committee for consideration.

   Policy Committee. Senator Bill Hare noted that this Committee met on October 17 and submitted the Committee report (Attachment B).

   Research Committee. Senator Gary Powell informed the Senate that the research survey form and distribution list are finalized and will be mailed out to be returned by Christmas. Senator Powell announced that the Research Committee will gather at 3:00 p.m. in Room 300 Brackett Hall to prepare the survey for mailing, and invited senators to assist. Senator Powell stated that the Animal Care Policy had been forwarded to the Research Committee for review.

   Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Shelley Barbary stated that this Committee had met with Jerome V. Reel, Jr. and George E. Carter, Jr. of Undergraduate Studies, and further stated that now that the benchmark universities had been identified, this Committee will contact them regarding issues such as syllabus requirements. The issue of summer school cancellations continues to be discussed and a final report will be submitted in the near future. Senator Barbary noted that the issue of the continuation of Reading Day is one of ambivalence to committee members at this time. Any comments or concerns regarding any of these issues will be appreciated by this Committee.
Welfare Committee. Senator Clint Isbell submitted and briefly discussed the Welfare Committee Report (Attachment C), and encouraged members of the Senate to contact the Madren Center for a tour in order to provide feedback as to its feasibility as a faculty club. The next meeting of the Welfare Committee will be Tuesday, November 21st at 3:30 p.m.

b. University Commissions and Committees

1) **President’s Commission on the Status of Women at Clemson University** - Senator Gloria Bautista submitted figures and expressed concern on behalf of the Commission on “Women’s Progress at Clemson after Restructuring (Attachment D).

2) **Classified Staff Commission** - Stephanie Pawlowski expressed concern about the lack of classified staff in various selection committee processes, and urged that changes be made in the Faculty Manual to ensure the participation of staff in the selection of academic administrators.

3) **Graduate Commission** - Senator Marvin Dixon noted changes by the Educational Testing Service in their Graduate Record Exam which is currently used as an admission criterion to the Graduate School at Clemson. The new GRE will be composed of five, instead of the current three, parts and departments need to decide which of the parts they will use. Also being discussed is a possible limit on the number of television courses (those offered by Clemson but presented by others) which could be used on a student’s plan of study (GS-2).

4) **Parking Advisory Committee** - Senator Kenneth Murr stated that this Committee had not met and that when he contacted the office, was told that due to reorganization the status of this committee was “up in the air”, and that there were no plans to hold meetings.

4. **President’s Report**. President Bodine elaborated on the items presented in the President’s Report (Attachment E).

5. **Old Business** (None)

6. **New Business**

   a. Senator Doost inquired about the status of the workload database system. President Bodine responded that he had spoken with President Curris and that he is aware of the problems and will address this issue shortly. Any problems should be forwarded to President Curris or to the Faculty Senate Office. Discussion followed, during which the desire was expressed that administrators be faculty advocates with those in the Legislature, and that accountability should be at the end of this process rather than during the process. Suggestions made during discussion included the establishment of an ad hoc committee to work directly with Governmental Affairs as a vehicle through which faculty concerns and strategies could be conveyed; that regular lobbying efforts in Columbia by faculty be undertaken; that efforts be made to bring Legislators to campus to shadow a faculty member for a day; and/or that a plotting/tracking system be designed so that faculty may record exactly what is done by them.
7. **Adjournment.** President Bodine adjourned the meeting at 4:34 p.m.

Roger K. Doost, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Professor Roger K. Doost
Accountancy
329 Sirrine Hall

Dear Roger:

Thank you very much for sending me a brief summary of the work of the Faculty Senate Committee. I apologize for the delay in responding to you but I wanted to have a little more information to pass on in return.

I anticipate developing within the month a list of benchmark institutions that have geographic as well as programmatic significance for the University. Once we can firm those institutions to be part of our benchmark group, I am hopeful that we will be in a position to collect meaningful and parallel data with which we can assess how funds are expended at this institution.

I share with you some of the concerns over indebtedness and its impact on tuition. The Trustees are aware of this concern and have taken a reasoned and conservative position in which we are going to assess carefully any potential bond issues and their impact on student payments. At the last committee meeting, for example, we received an affirmation that the construction of the new Student Center will not entail additional tuition or fee costs for students.

I trust that we can make progress in a way that truly opens the budget process and provides rational bases for decision making.

With kindest regards,

Constantine W. Curris
President

CWC/ew
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>65,973</td>
<td>69,449</td>
<td>(3,476)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Benefits</td>
<td>10,762</td>
<td>12,137</td>
<td>(1,375)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty Salary and Benefits</td>
<td>76,735</td>
<td>81,586</td>
<td>(4,851)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs Excluding Equipment</td>
<td>20,542</td>
<td>22,989</td>
<td>(2,447)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support (Before Allocation)</td>
<td>24,928</td>
<td>25,609</td>
<td>(681)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>7,135</td>
<td>6,657</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support (Before Allocation)</td>
<td>21,791</td>
<td>22,480</td>
<td>(689)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance (Before Alloc.)</td>
<td>25,225</td>
<td>23,745</td>
<td>1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Administration</td>
<td>19,168</td>
<td>18,063</td>
<td>1,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Overhead Excluding Auxiliary Ent.</td>
<td>98,247</td>
<td>96,554</td>
<td>1,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>54,964</td>
<td>54,909</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Credits Net of Equipment</td>
<td>54,283</td>
<td>54,645</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>10,543</td>
<td>10,289</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>301,313</td>
<td>312,984</td>
<td>(11,671)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- A small amount of faculty salaries may have been charged to this account.
- Not included in Totals.

1. Academic support includes library, computer center, and dean's office.
2. Student services includes admissions, registrar, student aid, and counseling.
3. Institutional support includes president's office, finance, personnel, and security.
4. Operation and maintenance includes facilities, general services, and utilities.
5. Auxiliary enterprises include bookstore, housing, canteens, etc.
## Clemson University
### Comparative Actual Expenditure Summary
(000) Omitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>% of Salaries and Benefits</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>% of Salaries and Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACULTY SALARY AND BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td>76,735</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERHEAD - LEVEL (1)</strong></td>
<td>20,542</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>22,989</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERHEAD - LEVEL (2)</strong></td>
<td>19,168</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>18,063</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERHEAD - LEVEL (3)</strong></td>
<td>24,928</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>25,609</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERHEAD - LEVEL (4)</strong></td>
<td>25,225</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>23,745</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERHEAD - LEVEL (5)</strong></td>
<td>26,926</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>29,137</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OVERHEAD</strong></td>
<td>118,789</td>
<td>154.8%</td>
<td>119,543</td>
<td>146.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes travel, supplies, and miscellaneous charges.

(2) Includes departmental administration.

(3) Includes library, computers, and deans' offices.

(4) Includes operation and maintenance (general services and utilities).

(5) Includes president's office, finance, personnel, security, and student services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>A/C Description</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>46,930,203</td>
<td>8,733,447</td>
<td>14,993,332</td>
<td>70,656,982</td>
<td>35.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>22,519,152</td>
<td>3,403,147</td>
<td>14,197,660</td>
<td>40,119,959</td>
<td>21.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>3,466,143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>760,029</td>
<td>4,226,172</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Scholarships &amp; Fellow.</td>
<td>213,542</td>
<td>7,657,201</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Departmental Admin.</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Institution Supp.</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Operation &amp; Maint.</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Scholarships &amp; Fellow.</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Institution Supp.</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>70,656,982</td>
<td>29,190,992</td>
<td>110,747,974</td>
<td>312,983,925</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

- 150,983,092
  - 35,234,764
    - 54.22%
  - 100,748,328
    - 65.78%
## Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>52,029</td>
<td>55,664</td>
<td>(3,635)</td>
<td>6,088</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>(977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>24,706</td>
<td>25,922</td>
<td>(1,216)</td>
<td>36,951</td>
<td>40,120</td>
<td>(3,169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>103,039</td>
<td>110,777</td>
<td>(7,738)</td>
<td>52,029</td>
<td>55,664</td>
<td>(3,635)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>15,807</td>
<td>15,891</td>
<td>(84)</td>
<td>20,253</td>
<td>22,248</td>
<td>(1,995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>22,855</td>
<td>22,665</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>26,855</td>
<td>26,665</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>4,638</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6,335</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>15,519</td>
<td>14,101</td>
<td>(1,418)</td>
<td>20,253</td>
<td>17,745</td>
<td>(2,508)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>4,246</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>(464)</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>4,638</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>(108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>15,019</td>
<td>14,936</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>21,355</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Institution Supp.</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>4,246</td>
<td>(256)</td>
<td>6,335</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>(1,116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>11,076</td>
<td>10,976</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>17,022</td>
<td>17,022</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Operation &amp; Maint.</td>
<td>5,919</td>
<td>5,558</td>
<td>(361)</td>
<td>8,657</td>
<td>7,745</td>
<td>(912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Departmental Admin.</td>
<td>6,088</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>(977)</td>
<td>9,657</td>
<td>7,745</td>
<td>(1,912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Auxiliary Enterp.</td>
<td>6,088</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>(977)</td>
<td>9,657</td>
<td>7,745</td>
<td>(1,912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>76,735</td>
<td>81,586</td>
<td>(4,851)</td>
<td>103,039</td>
<td>110,777</td>
<td>(7,738)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Total Extension</td>
<td>49,023</td>
<td>48,701</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>61,143</td>
<td>67,161</td>
<td>6,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Total Support</td>
<td>13,846</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>(203)</td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>21,355</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Total Student</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>48,701</td>
<td>(594)</td>
<td>91,566</td>
<td>81,586</td>
<td>(9,980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Total Academic</td>
<td>13,846</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>(203)</td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>21,355</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Total Institution</td>
<td>15,519</td>
<td>14,936</td>
<td>(583)</td>
<td>20,253</td>
<td>17,745</td>
<td>(2,508)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Total Operation</td>
<td>4,246</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>(464)</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>4,638</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Total Maint.</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>(108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Total Admin.</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Total Support</td>
<td>13,846</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>(203)</td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>21,355</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Total Student</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>48,701</td>
<td>(594)</td>
<td>91,566</td>
<td>81,586</td>
<td>(9,980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Total Academic</td>
<td>15,519</td>
<td>14,936</td>
<td>(583)</td>
<td>20,253</td>
<td>17,745</td>
<td>(2,508)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Total Institution</td>
<td>20,253</td>
<td>22,248</td>
<td>(1,995)</td>
<td>26,855</td>
<td>22,248</td>
<td>(4,607)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Total Support</td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>21,355</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>21,355</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Total Student</td>
<td>91,566</td>
<td>81,586</td>
<td>(9,980)</td>
<td>91,566</td>
<td>81,586</td>
<td>(9,980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Total Academic</td>
<td>20,253</td>
<td>22,248</td>
<td>(1,995)</td>
<td>26,855</td>
<td>22,248</td>
<td>(4,607)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Total Institution</td>
<td>26,855</td>
<td>22,248</td>
<td>(4,607)</td>
<td>26,855</td>
<td>22,248</td>
<td>(4,607)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Total Support</td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>21,355</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>21,355</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203,309</td>
<td>204,923</td>
<td>(1,614)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301,313</td>
<td>312,984</td>
<td>(11,671)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Salary and Benefits:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52,029</td>
<td>55,664</td>
<td>(3,635)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,253</td>
<td>22,248</td>
<td>(1,995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,375</td>
<td>21,355</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91,566</td>
<td>81,586</td>
<td>(9,980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.187%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.04%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Account Expenditures:

- Travel
- Supplies
- Scholarship Equipment
- Support
- Special Codes

TOTAL
POINTS FOR REFLECTION
1994-95 CLEMSON UNIVERSITY'S FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

1. There was no attempt at this time to compare these numbers to comparative other institutions. We will attempt to do so in the future. At this time, such comparative data is not available.

2. For the first time in quite a number of years, there appears to be a reasonable improvement in terms of the share of faculty cost to other university costs. At the same time, total overhead costs have remained substantially at the 93-94 level with some improvements in some areas. Total overhead as a percentage of faculty salary and benefits is now at 146.5% as compared to 154.8% for the prior year. Congratulations to all those who are attempting to put a higher emphasis on teaching and research as compared to heavy administration. The question to be asked though is this: assuming that some generous benefactor (state and federal governments) give you buildings free of charge, and you hire teachers to teach the students, would you consider paying $1.50 for administration for every one dollar that you pay to the teacher for conducting your classes?

3. The breakdown between instruction and research appears to be arbitrary and is not based on hard facts and evidence. The data in this regard are available and should be used accordingly to give us better information on how faculty resources are being used between the three components of teaching, research, and service.

4. Please note that the financial reports are just a starting point. They are input oriented and show how input (financial resources) are distributed among different constituents; they do not show the output and the outcome which should result from putting more resources into teaching and research.

5. There is a lot of manipulation among overhead accounts in university reporting system (cost allocation). For the purpose of this report, these allocations have been reversed, to the extent possible, to provide us with a better picture of the facts.

6. Overhead categories (level 1 through level 5) are categorized in accordance to the proximity of the service to the faculty. For example, level one overhead includes travel and supplies and other costs necessary to conduct research whereas, level 5 overhead includes personnel, finance, security, student services, and the president's office.

7. University spent a total exceeding eight million dollars on travel. This amount is approximately equal to 80% of total fund spent on scholarship and fellowships. Should we look at travel cost more carefully?

8. Supplies account with the exclusion of Auxiliary enterprises and Operations amount to 48 million dollars about 18 million dollars of which is charged to academics. This account has been apparently used as a dumping ground and includes a lot of miscellaneous charges. Finance department is encouraged to provide a better detail and accounting for this account. We don't think our use of chalk, pens, pencils, and paper for the last 50 years could amount to 18 million dollars let alone the expenses for one year.

9. We have to look at how the account "special codes" has been used rather carefully. This account has been used to recharge, reallocate, and redistribute charges from one division to another. As a result, without detail scrutiny, it is virtually impossible to look at the reported financial statements and figure out what the real university overhead costs are. This deficiency must be addressed and corrected.

Roger K. Doost, Chair
POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

(Senate meeting of November 14, 1995)

The Policy Committee met on October 17, 1995 with all members present. Most of the meeting was devoted to discussion and revisions of a document on Faculty Manual Revisions received from the Provost through President Bodine. The committee voiced serious concerns and reservations regarding the document and will continue deliberations at its November 28, 1995 meeting.

(Respectfully submitted by Bill Hare, Chairman)
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee  
October 17, 1995

Attending: Marvin Dixon; Kathy Neal Headley, Chair; Clint Isbell; Richard Poling; Frank Tainter

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee met on Oct. 17, 1995, to consider the following items of business:

1. Richard Poling reported to the Welfare Committee that progress has been made on the daycare center. News items have been published across campus and locally.

2. Marvin Dixon will analyze the faculty, staff, and administration salary data for additional information. David Fleming, Allen Turner, and Roger Doost provided the Welfare Committee with perspectives to consider while studying the data. Copies of the salary data will be distributed when the additional analyses have been completed. At the present time, a copy is on file in the library.

3. David Fleming met with the Welfare Committee to discuss the Faculty Workload Database System. The committee will draft a position statement at the November meeting.

4. The Welfare Committee will meet with Gary Ransdell at the Madren Center on Thursday, Nov. 2 at 4:00pm to discuss a faculty club at the new facilities.

The Welfare Committee will meet 3:30 Tuesday, November 21, in 420 Tillman.
WOMEN'S PROGRESS AT CLEMSON AFTER RE-STRUCTURING

After 40 years of Coeducation, 1955-1995:

Senior Academic Appointments by gender at Clemson University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairpersons</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endow Chairs &amp; Titled Professors</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Professors</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C.U. Students 54% 46%

*C.U. Employees 53% 47%

It has been 40 years since Clemson become a coeducational institution, in 1955. Before Re-structuring, women had shown remarkably slow progress in achieving equitable status on this campus. There were, however, several women department heads and one Dean. After Re-structuring, there is only one woman Chair (Public Health), despite the unprecedented opening of 61 positions of which only ONE woman was chosen.

SOURCES: Institutional Research

President’s Commission on the Status of Women

Provost’s Office
President's Report
Faculty Senate
14 November 1995

1. I met with the Graduate Student Association last week and have had discussions with representatives of the Undergraduate Student Government. We are working to forge a closer relationship between the Faculty Senate and these very important student governance organizations. It is hoped that these closer ties will permit active communication and planning, as well as joint projects, and resolutions.

2. At the next Executive/Advisory committee meeting, a select committee will be named to assist President Curris and the Administration in establishing priority areas for operational audits. Many organizational units already have supplied to the Faculty Senate office descriptions of operational procedures and in some cases budgetary figures. These data will permit careful and thoughtful evaluation of these units and will aid in modifying operational procedures to improve efficiency.

3. I am concerned that in many instances, upper tier administrative personnel are given substantial raises because of increased duties, more responsibilities, etc., while faculty and lower tier staff are very often called upon to assume more duties and responsibilities with no remuneration. This activity continues to widen the gap between faculty and administrative salary base, thus even with "equal" cost-of-living adjustments for both groups, real dollar differences in salaries continue to increase. It is difficult to embrace the "family" concept of the University with a caste-like approach to position and salary.

4. It is important to restate that in all matters dealing with the hiring of academic/administrative personnel, screening and selection procedures must be in accordance with the Faculty Manual. Search committees must be established fairly and with appropriate representation. The selection process must take into account faculty and staff comments and concerns, and there should be available detailed documentation of the search and selection process.
Instructions: From the following list of nominees, make your selection for first choice, and place the figure 1 by that nominee’s name. Then make your second choice selection, and place the figure 2 by that nominee’s name. If you feel that only one of the nominees merits consideration for the award, place the figure 2 on a line headed “No one”. If you feel that none of the nominees deserves consideration, place both 1 and 2 on the lines headed “no one”.

Michael J. Drews
John W. Kelly
Francis A. McGuire
John T. Warner
No One
No One

Your Choice

Do Not Sign Your Ballot
MEMORANDUM

TO: Budd Bodine, President, Faculty Senate

FROM: Gary Ransdell

SUBJECT: Miscellaneous Initiatives

Budd, in continuing our pattern of timely communication, I wanted to call to your attention four initiatives which may be of interest to you and the Faculty Senate.

1. We are in the process of identifying the classrooms across campus which are in the greatest need of renovation and improvement. The Provost's Office is currently identifying the campus's highest priorities for painting, electrical systems, ceiling tiles, chalk boards, floor tiles, window blinds, etc. I am committed to finding a way to cover these types of costs. The Provost is seeking funds to cover furniture and equipment enhancements. We hope to make some progress this year and continue to devote funds for this purpose in an ongoing manner.

2. I am sure the Faculty Senate has read about the University's priority for a new Central Energy Facility. We have, indeed, achieved endorsement from the Commission on Higher Education to approach the General Assembly for a new Power Plant. We are pursuing funding this session. In summary, we are seeking $23.5 million for three new boilers and six new chillers to replace our current facilities which range in age from 34 to 47 years. We have been able to reduce the cost of the project from $33 million to $23 million by converting the energy source from coal to natural gas. This facility may not directly enhance the quality of teaching and research across our campus, but it is important that we provide proper heating and cooling for all of our academic and administrative space. We just happen to be the lucky generation which inherited an outdated power plant.

3. Hardin Hall has emerged as the leading priority for renovation among academic buildings. It is among our oldest buildings and is certainly in deplorable shape. I am not encouraged that we will find legislative funds for this purpose in this Legislative Session, but it is important for you to know that Hardin Hall is a priority should we get funds for academic capital projects.

We are pursuing funds for PSA's highest priorities as well.
4. The Senate may have read about a law suit involving a former employee in the Facilities area. This is an unfortunate circumstance which we have inherited. We are in the process of negotiating a conclusion to the situation. I would be happy to discuss this with you or the Faculty Senate Executive Committee at your discretion.

There may be other matters which you would like to address with me. As always, I am at your service and available to discuss whatever the Faculty Senate deems to be important. Thanks Budd.

xc: Deno Curris
Charles Jennett
The meeting was called to order by the president Will Aiken at 7:05 PM. The following were absent: Beudreau, Bland, Cleveland, Delucia, Garner, Rogers, and Yates.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs, Ted Swann: No report.

Business Services, Spencer Mazyck: Meeting with Jeff Hall to discuss dining services problems.

Environment, Safety, and Accessibility, Kelly Grefenstette: No Report.

General Affairs, Sarah Hall: There will be a meeting about library concerns on 9-21-95 all are welcome to come.

Housing, Melanie DuBois: Melanie will be meeting with Verna Howell if you have any concerns see Melanie.

Judiciary, Jeff Melton: No report

Traffic and Parking, Jim Hendrix: Jim will be meeting with Chief Granger to discuss problems on 9-21-95, if you have any concerns please let Jim know.

University Relations, Chal Brasington: There will be a committee meeting on 9-19-95 at 7:00 PM.

Pro Tem, Chal Brasington: If you lost anything at retreat please see Chal.

Vice President, Chad Young: Excellence in teaching nomination forms will be in the Tiger on Friday. New Faculty orientation went well. Jim Hendrix, Reid Rucker and Chad Young met with Chief Granger about parking during the games cars in the grass after games will be towed or ticketed. Safety in the pits was also discussed Reid and Chad will be speaking to Parent’s Council about the issue.

President, Will Aiken: Please pick up a constituency report and complete it for the next meeting. Please sign-up to work at the Research and Development table in the Loggia, it will count for you constituency report. If you are interested in serving on the Academic Grievance Committee see Will.

Old Business: Resolution #2 Forgiveness: discussion and vote held, resolution failed

New Business: Bill #5 ’95 - ’96 Organization Funding - Bill read and sent to University Relations Committee

A Motion was made to adjourn after announcements. Senate stood adjourned at 7:45 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kimberly Johnson
Senate Secretary

cc: Constantine Curris, WSBF, Student body Pres.
    Joy Smith, Student Gov. Secretary
    Almeda Jacks, Faculty Senate Pres.
    the Tiger, George Smith, GSA President
Student Senate Minutes

9-25-95

The meeting was called to order by the president Will Aiken at 7:10 PM. The following were absent: Ayers, Cleveland, Crandall, Delucia, Eustace, Hall, Kernighan, Nilsen, Prickett, Pulaski, Rice, Spaulding, Tolson, and Yates.

Committee Reports:
Academic Affairs, Ted Swann: Resolution next week.
Business Services, Spencer Mazyck: Canteen service problems should be solved. Shiletter probably will never open on weekend because the demand is not there. The cafeterias are open from 7 AM to 7 PM. There is a Student Health Advisory committee being formed if you are interested on being a member of the committee please see Spencer.
Environment, Safety and Accessibility, Kelly Grefenstette: No Report.
General Affairs, Sarah Hall: The library concerns meeting went well. The library is considering canceling the subscriptions to some scientific and academic journals, these cuts would impact 75% of the students and almost all the faculty. There will be a suggestion box in the library and you can use EDDIE or the library web to give suggestions as well. Kimberly Bryson is working on the organization visits that the senators will be doing.
Housing, Melanie DuBois: Will be meeting with Verna Howell and Greg Padgent if you have any problems please see Melanie. There will be a committee meeting on 9-28-95 at 7 PM.
Judiciary, Jeff Melton: The committee is currently working on the elections process.
Traffic and Parking, Jim Hendrix: Met with Chief Granger and are continuing to work on the parking problems.
University Relations, Chal Brasington: Will be presenting the funding bill tonight.
Pro-Tem, Chal Brasington: Consuancy reports will be taken until 9-27-95.
Vice President, Chad Young: Career Expo was a real success, over 100 companies were there. Thank you to the senators that helped. The Georgia game will start the centennial celebration for Clemson Football. On 10-5-95 free T-shirts will be given to students. The Athletic Department is working on having a Jimmy Buffet concert in Death Valley in the spring, it would be free to students. Excellence in teaching award nomination forms are out, please pass on the word to participate.
President, Will Aiken: October 9, 1995 will be a formal meeting Reid Rucker will give the State of the University Speech.

Old Business: Bill #5 Organizational Funding; passes
New Business: None

Respectfully Submitted,
Kimberly Johnson
Senate Secretary

cc: Constantine Curris
Joy Smith
WSBF
Student Gov. Secretary
Student Body Pres.

Al Jacks
George Smith
Faculty Senate Pres.
GSA President
the Tiger
1. **Call to Order.** President Ashby B. Bodine, II, called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes of November 14, 1995 were approved as distributed.

3. **Committee Reports**

   a. **Committee Reports**

   **Welfare Committee.** Senator Kathy Neal Headley submitted this Committee's report (Attachment A) and provided information on the meeting among President Constantine W. Curris, President Bodine, and herself regarding the workload database system. President Curris will respond to Senator Headley as soon as data gathering is complete.

   Senator Marvin W. Dixon then explained the comparisons in dollars and percentages contained in the Salary Comparison for Faculty Senate prepared by the Office of Institutional Research (Attachment B). During discussion, Vice President/President-Elect Ronald J. Thurston requested that President Bodine inquire as to whether or not President Philip H. Prince saw the raises above ten (10%) percent as was promised.

   **Finance Committee.** Senator Roger K. Doost submitted and discussed the Committee Report, and overhead figures contained in the “Comparative Actual Expenditure Summary” were explained (Attachment C).

   **Policy Committee.** Senator William R. Hare submitted the Policy Committee Report (Attachment D).

   **Research Committee.** Senator Gary L. Powell stated that this Committee had mailed out one-third (1/3) of the research questionnaires, and that twenty-four (24%) percent had already been returned. The remainder of the questionnaires will be mailed out this week.

   Senator Powell also stated that he has a copy of the Clemson University Research Foundation (CURF) Annual Report for perusal.

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Francis A. McGuire referred to the Committee Report (Attachment E) noting that Reading Day was considered by the Committee and will not be pursued further, that changes to course Syllabi could be made in writing, that it is not contractual, but does provide some protection for students; that how summer school monies are spent deserves further attention; and that the cancellation of summer school classes is a college-by-college decision.
b. University Commissions and Committees

1) Vice President/President-Elect Thurston informed the Senate that the South Carolina Conference of Faculty Senate Presidents shares the general concern of a special legislative committee appointed to report on higher education in early 1996. Another shared concern is that members of this committee are not experienced in higher education issues. This Committee will consider the issues of sabbaticals, teaching loads, and research vs. teaching.

2) Vice President/President-Elect Thurston reported that the Faculty Senate Select Committee on Tenure will bring to the full Senate its recommendations on tenure and post tenure review. The issue of sabbatical review will be studied by this Committee and input from the Senate was requested.

4. President's Report. President Bodine made the following announcements: (1) that Fran McGuire is the 1995 recipient of the Class of '39 Award for Excellence; (2) that elections to the Grievance Board will be held in January, 1996, and that nominations from each college should be forward to the Faculty Senate Office; and (3) that a Select Committee to describe the roles and responsibilities of faculty has been established. (Membership includes Steve Stevenson, Chair; Shelley Barbary; Syd Cross; Tom Hughes; Beth Kunkel; David Leigh; Fran McGuire; Sixto Torres; and Peg Tyler.

5. Old Business (None)

6. New Business

a. Senator Hare submitted for approval a report dated November 28, 1995, "The Duties, Terms, and Evaluation of Academic Administrators: Policy Committee Recommendations for Changes in the Faculty Manual", (Attachment F). Senator Thomas C. Jenkins introduced suggestions from Dean T. E. Skelton to the Recommendations by the Policy Committee as friendly amendments (Attachment G). Each amendment was brought forward, seconded, and voted upon as individual items. Two of the six friendly amendments were accepted by the Faculty Senate. Two additional friendly amendments were offered to the Policy Committee Recommendations which were considered, voted upon, and passed. The vote on the acceptance of the entire Report from the Policy Committee was taken and passed unanimously. President Bodine will forward these Recommendations to the Provost (Attachment H).

    Senator Kenneth R. Murr reiterated to those in attendance that changes to the Faculty Manual must go through proper channels so that the Faculty Senate will have the opportunity to debate policy changes.

    b. President Bodine was asked his perception of the state of Clemson University at this time. President Bodine responded that: morale is still down; faculty and staff are looking for positive changes and for President Curris' leadership to ensure positive changes; President Curris is cognizant of the problems and is trusted to make the changes he feels appropriate; he is optimistic; and has emphasized to President Curris that faculty and staff are looking for changes.

    c. Senator Doost requested that members of the Faculty Senate forward suggestions to handouts regarding summer school teaching and an alternate method to determine faculty workload to the Faculty Senate Office.
7. **Adjournment.** President Bodine adjourned the meeting at 5:16 p.m.

Roger K. Doost, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: S. Lewis (B. Kunkel for), R. Sutton, D. Swanson, S. Barbary, S. Amirkhanian, E. Makram, G. Bautista (D. White for), M. Morris, P. Smith, B. Stephens, J. Peck (W. Adams for), H. Wheeler
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
November 21, 1995

Attending: Kathy Neal Headley, Chair; Richard Poling; Frank Tainter

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee met on Nov. 21, 1995, to consider the following items of business:

1. Kathy Headley and Budd Bodine met with President Curris on November 9th concerning the Faculty Workload Database System. Several questions were posed to President Curris. First, what is the purpose for using the FWDS? Second, who is the audience or consumer for the information gleaned from the reports? Although the need for communicating with others about the work we perform is vital to growth and support, the Welfare Committee's concerns revolve around the use of the FWDS as an evaluation instrument. The FWDS is too cumbersome to complete each semester and looks too intricately at quantity instead of quality. President Curris has taken our questions into consideration. When information has been investigated for these concerns, President Curris will communicate further on the issue.

2. Additional topics posed to President Curris during the November 9th meeting centered on continued support for tenure and sabbaticals. The discussion was positive and focused on the need to communicate with the public the academic purposes of tenure and sabbaticals.

3. The Welfare Committee requests that the Faculty Senate President, Budd Bodine, invite an administrative representative to discuss the Faculty Workload Database System and the current evaluation system with the Faculty Senators.

4. A position statement on the Faculty Workload Database System from the Welfare Committee has been tabled until information is more complete.

5. The Welfare Committee met with Gary Ransdell at the Madren Center on Thursday, Nov. 2 at 4:00pm to discuss a faculty club at the new facilities. The Madren Center offers many possibilities to our faculty for interaction and exchange, both formally and informally.

6. Continuing under study: parking & analysis of the salary data.

The Welfare Committee will meet 3:30 Tuesday, December 19, in 102 Tillman.
SALARY COMPARISON FOR FACULTY SENATE

INTRODUCTION
The Faculty Senate requested that the Office of Institutional Research conduct a salary comparison. Salary changes in dollars and percentages were requested.

DISCUSSION
The preliminary data considered for the salary comparison consisted of the 4,424 non-student employees as of November 5, 1995. From this preliminary set, the following groups of employees were eliminated: new employees, temporary employees, part-time employees, and employees that have appointments for less than nine months. The final data set contained 3,542 employees.

For employees that switched from nine to twelve months or from twelve to nine months, adjusted salaries were calculated. The adjusted salary percentage formulae were:

Switch for nine to twelve months

\[
\text{New Base Salary} - \frac{(\text{Old Base Salary}/.818)}{\text{Old Base Salary}/.818}
\]

Switch from twelve to nine months

\[
\text{New Base Salary} - .818(\text{Old Base Salary})
\]

\[
.818(\text{Old Base Salary})
\]
COMPARISON GROUPS

Below is a list of the comparison groups along with the title descriptions of several of the groups.

Classifications Used in Comparisons

Academic administration includes: the provost, deans, associate deans, assistant deans, assistants to deans, school directors, department heads, assistants to department heads, and department chairs.

Vice presidents include: the provost, executive secretary to the board of trustees, vice president for administration and advancement, and vice president for student affairs.

Academic deans include: the senior vice provost and dean of the graduate school, interim vice president for agriculture, natural resources and research, interim dean for the college of agriculture, forestry, and life sciences, dean of the college of business and public affairs, dean of libraries, dean of the college of engineering and science, dean of the college of architecture, arts and humanities, senior vice provost and dean of undergraduate studies, and dean of agricultural research and director of the experiment station.

Faculty includes: research associates, lecturers, instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, professors, endowed chairs, librarians, and visiting faculty. It does not include anyone in academic administration.

Agricultural extension includes: senior area cooperative extension agents, senior cooperative extension directors, senior associate cooperative extension director, extension associates, district extension director, assistant directors of extension, resident directors, senior cooperative extension agents, associate senior cooperative extension agents, associate cooperative extension agents, assistant cooperative extension agents, senior associate area cooperative extension agents, associate area extension agents, assistant area cooperative extension agents, and the state extension leader.

Other unclassified employees are any unclassified employees not found in the above categories.

Staff includes all classified employees.

COMPARISON

Tables 1 through 3 provide information about salary changes in dollars. The tables list by category: the number of employees, the mean salary change, the minimum salary change (0% quartile), the 25th, 50th, and 75th quartiles, and the maximum salary change (100% quartile). Table 1 is an overall comparison, while Tables 2 and 3 make comparisons based on whether or not an employee changed job titles. Tables 4 through 6 provide information about salary changes in percentages. The tables list by category: the number of employees, the mean percentage salary change, the minimum percentage salary change (0% quartile), the 25th, 50th, and 75th quartiles, and the maximum salary percentage change (100% quartile). Table 4 is an overall comparison, while Tables 5 and 6 make comparisons based on whether or not an employee changes job titles.
Table 1. Overall Group Comparison for Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. that covertcd from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5,088</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>3,718</td>
<td>7,110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. with no change in number of months</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td>3,921</td>
<td>5,088</td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All academic admin. (Both of the above categories)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5,759</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>3,921</td>
<td>5,759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic deans</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6,175</td>
<td>-6,161</td>
<td>-10,417</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>4,599</td>
<td>8,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty with no change in number of months</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>-5,785</td>
<td>-6,161</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>4,599</td>
<td>8,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All faculty (Both of the above categories)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>-6,161</td>
<td>-10,417</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>4,599</td>
<td>8,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>-2,296</td>
<td>-1,239</td>
<td>6,175</td>
<td>10,461</td>
<td>21,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural extension</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td>-6,161</td>
<td>-10,417</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>4,599</td>
<td>8,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All unclassified employees</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>7,453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice presidents</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>12,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty that covertcd from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>12,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic deans</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>12,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. that covertcd from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,924</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>6,160</td>
<td>12,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>1.925</td>
<td>2.779</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>7.453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Group Comparison for Employees with a Title Code Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean (1.974-2.166)</th>
<th>0% (2.166-2.383)</th>
<th>25% (2.111-2.338)</th>
<th>50% (3.2-3.498)</th>
<th>75% (4.9'-5.174)</th>
<th>100% (6.1'-6.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin, that covered from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10,345</td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>9,063</td>
<td>10,417</td>
<td>2092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin, with no change in number of months</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5,860</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>4,360</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All academic admin. (Both of the above categories)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6,701</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>3,157</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>9,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice presidents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic deans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,983</td>
<td>-6,161</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty that covered from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5,007</td>
<td>-6,161</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty with no change in number of months</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>-5,254</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>9,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All faculty (both of the above categories)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3,689</td>
<td>-6,161</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>9,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural extension</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4,360</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>2,841</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>4,659</td>
<td>9,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starr</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>-10,417</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>10,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unclassified employees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2166</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,703</td>
<td>10,417</td>
<td>2092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,514</td>
<td>8,722</td>
<td>11,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,983</td>
<td>9,983</td>
<td>9,983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dollar Change in Salary

Table 3. Group Comparison for Employees with a Title Code Change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Percent Change in Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. with no change in number of months</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. that converted from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All academic admin. (both of the above categories)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. with no change in number of months</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. that converted from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All academic admin. (both of the above categories)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. with no change in number of months</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. that converted from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All academic admin. (both of the above categories)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. with no change in number of months</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. that converted from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All academic admin. (both of the above categories)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. with no change in number of months</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin. that converted from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All academic admin. (both of the above categories)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5. Group Comparison for Employees with no Title Code Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin, that converted from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin, with no change in number of months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All academic admin. (Both of the above categories)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic deans</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice presidents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All academic admin. (Both of the above categories)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic dean, that covered from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unclassified employees</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural extension</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>-8.31</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>33.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic deans</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>-8.31</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin, that converted from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin, that covered from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent Change in Salary**

100% 75% 50% 25% 0% **Mean** **Number** **Category**

Table 5. Group Comparison for Employees with no Title Code Change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin, that covertcd from 12 to 9 months</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic admin, with no change in number of months</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All academic admin. (Both of the above categories)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice presidents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic deans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty with no change in number of months</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>-5.91</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All faculty (Both of the above categories)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>-14.11</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural extension</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unclassified employees</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>-22.98</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other unclassified employees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Group Comparison for Employees with a Title Code Change
POINTS FOR REFLECTION
1994-95 CLEMSON UNIVERSITY'S FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

1. There was no attempt at this time to compare these numbers to comparative other institutions. We will attempt to do so in the future. At this time, such comparative data is not available.

2. For the first time in quite a number of years, there appears to be a reasonable improvement in terms of the share of faculty cost to other university costs. At the same time, total overhead costs have remained substantially at the 93-94 level with some improvements in some areas. Total overhead as a percentage of faculty salary and benefits is now at 146.5% as compared to 154.8% for the prior year. Congradulations to all those who are attempting to put a higher emphasis on teaching and research as compared to heavy administration. The question to be asked though is this: assuming that some generous benefactor (state and federal governments) give you buildings free of charge, and you hire teachers to teach the students, would you consider paying $1.50 for administration for every one dollar that you pay to the teacher for conducting your classes?

3. The breakdown between instruction and research appears to be arbitrary and is not based on hard facts and evidence. The data in this regard are available and should be used accordingly to give us better information on how faculty resources are being used between the three components of teaching, research, and service.

4. Please note that the financial reports are just a starting point. They are input oriented and show how input (financial resources) are distributed among different constituents; they do not show the output and the outcome which should result from putting more resources into teaching and research.

5. There is a lot of manipulation among overhead accounts in university reporting system (cost allocation). For the purpose of this report, these allocations have been reversed, to the extent possible, to provide us with a better picture of the facts.

6. Overhead categories (level 1 through level 5) are categorized in accordance to the proximity of the service to the faculty. For example, level one overhead includes travel and supplies and other costs necessary to conduct research whereas, level 5 overhead includes personnel, finance, security, student services, and the president's office.

7. University spent a total exceeding eight million dollars on travel. This amount is approximately equal to 80% of total fund spent on scholarship and fellowships. Should we look at travel cost more carefully?

8. Supplies account with the exclusion of Auxiliary enterprizes and Operations amount to 48 million dollars about 18 million dollars of which is charged to academics. This account has been apparently used as a dumping ground and includes a lot of miscellaneous charges. Finance department is encouraged to provide a better detail and accounting for this account. We don't think our use of chalk, pens, pencils, and paper for the last 50 years could amount to 18 million dollars let alone the expenses for one year.

9. We have to look at how the account "special codes" has been used rather carefully. This account has been used to recharge, reallocate, and redistribute charges from one division to another. As a result, without detail scrutiny, it is virtually impossible to look at the reported financial statements and figure out what the real university overhead costs are. This deficiency must be addressed and corrected.

Roger K. Doost, Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>93 - 94</th>
<th>% Of Salaries and Benefits</th>
<th>94 - 95</th>
<th>% Of Salaries and Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary and Benefits</td>
<td>76,735</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead - Level (1)</td>
<td>20,542</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>22,989</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead - Level (2)</td>
<td>19,168</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>18,063</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead - Level (3)</td>
<td>24,928</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>25,609</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead - Level (4)</td>
<td>25,225</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>23,745</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead - Level (5)</td>
<td>28,926</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>29,137</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Overhead</td>
<td>118,789</td>
<td>154.8%</td>
<td>119,543</td>
<td>146.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes travel, supplies, and miscellaneous charges.

(2) Includes departmental administration.

(3) Includes library, computeres, and deans offices.

(4) Includes operation and maintenance (general services and utilities).

(5) Includes president's office, finance, personnel, security, and student services.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Roger Doost, Chair, Faculty Senate Finance Committee

FROM: Alan M. Godfrey, University Budget Director

DATE: November 9, 1995

SUBJECT: Financial Reporting for the Faculty Senate

I have studied the financial reports attached to your 9/28/95 memo to Dr. Ransdell. I remain convinced that the exclusion of cost allocations distort and overstate the various "overhead" categories discussed below for the many reasons given. However, I do not think it significantly distorts the trends shown on your summary. In these trends, all categories of overhead except Level 1 decreased as a percentage of Faculty Salaries and Benefits. Overhead Level 2 through 5 costs decreased by $1.7 million (1.7%), which indicates the administrative and support cost containment efforts pursued the last three or four years are having a true positive effect on the University. Faculty Salaries and Benefits and direct instruction/research non-personnel costs (Overhead Level 1) increased by $4.85 million (6.3%) and $2.5 million (11.9%) respectively. One hopes this increase reflects the proof of the budgetary commitment of the University to support the faculty and their direct needs.

However, as we have discussed before, ignoring internal allocations of cost to the proper functional category causes inaccuracy. In your memo to Dr. Ransdell, you stated "All we want is a set of financial reports before accountants took over and massaged them..." I still contend that without including the cost allocations, these are rather arbitrary financial reports. Further, no attempt is made to identify who may be paying the University directly for these costs, i.e. revenue supported units.

The Faculty Salary and Benefits figures shown are largely E&G costs except for about $10 million in sponsored programs with PSA excluded completely. The five levels of "overhead" listed below are shown as a percentage of these salaries, but include substantial costs that were allocated to and paid for by Auxiliaries, PSA funds, or even other state agencies. Examples of how this may distort the figures on the first page of your report (Comparative Actual Expenditure Summary) are described below.
For example, Academic Support gross costs before allocations (listed as Overhead - Level 3) include computer center costs that are charged to and paid for by sponsored research projects, self supporting units, etc by allocation. This category also includes several million in costs that are directly paid for in revenue by the state's Health and Human Services department for contract MIS services. Also, a large portion of the computer center costs are allocated as a direct cost of instruction based on actual usage whereas these costs are shown on the analysis exactly as a Dean's office would be. To take all these gross costs, which would not exist if there were no outside funding or direct usage, and simply state it as a percentage of largely E&G Faculty Salaries understates the overhead in this category by millions and understates Overhead Level 1, 2, and 5.

Operations and Maintenance of Plant (listed as Overhead - Level 4) is most distorted by excluding cost allocations. The O&M Plant net expenditures for FY 95 were $17 million. The additional $6.7 in costs included in your analysis include such things as utilities for all auxiliary operations (dorms, athletics, etc), utilities paid for by PSA activities, costs for work orders outside FMO's scope of maintenance (office renovations, cosmetic work, direct sponsored research work, etc). These costs would not exist if they were not paid for or caused by other departments, auxiliary units, or fund sources, but are stated as an inflated percentage of largely E&G Faculty Salary costs.

Institutional Support costs (listed as Overhead - Level 5) is also distorted by the exclusion of internal cost allocations. The University charges about $4.5 million in overhead costs to Auxiliary units and PSA units because of all the administrative costs incurred on behalf of these units. These units have no payroll/personnel dept, no accounts payable or accounting departments, no police dept, etc. They use the E&G departments and are directly charged for administrative overhead.

I did not address Instruction/Research Non-Salary costs (your Overhead - Level 1) as it is largely driven by faculty needs and requirements. This level of "overhead" includes faculty travel, copiers, telephones, clerical support, publications, subscriptions, etc. It is, however, the only category which increased as a percentage of Faculty Salaries over the prior year. Also not addressed is Department Administration (Overhead - Level 2), as there are no major internal cost allocation issues contained in this category, however at the University financial statement level this category is rolled up into Instruction.

As always, we are happy to help and I hope some of this information will be used to assist in understanding the reports and what they include or exclude.

c: Dr. Bud Bodine, President Faculty Senate
   Dr. Gary Ransdell
   Mr. John Newton
College of Business and Public Affairs

School of Accountancy and Legal Studies

To : Mr. Alan M. Godfrey, University Budget Director

From : Roger K. Doost

Date : November 16, 1995

Subject: Financial Reporting for the Faculty Senate

Thank you for your well-thought letter of November 9. I am preparing this response before our next Senate Finance meeting. I will take these notes to the Committee, and if there is any change of position, we will advise you in due course.

We have noted the improvement of costs in terms of overhead cost containment and increase in the share of faculty costs and related expenses (overhead level 1). Same was reported to the Senate yesterday. It is our hope that this trend shall continue and priorities will continue to be placed on the primary mission of the University.

We do not wish to argue the validity, necessity, and accuracy of all the cost allocations which are used for the University’s financial reporting. The University may wish to continue such reports for external audiences. However, the Senate’s interest in this regard is to see in a brief summary format similar to the report provided (a copy is attached) what the Faculty salary and benefits are as compared to all other costs.

We are also interested to see what these major pools of costs are. We have grouped overhead costs into Level 1 through Level 5 as a crude measure of proximity of these costs to the direct cost of faculty. If costs are transferred from one line to another, we wouldn’t know what the real costs of these overhead pools are. By not allocating these costs, we eliminate all levels of arbitrariness, and we could measure improvements in each of these areas without being concerned on what portion of these costs have been removed for whatever good reason.

It is true, however, that the overhead of $119.5 million dollars for this fiscal year has been used for more than managing the teaching, research, and service missions of this University. They have been also used to manage different auxiliary enterprises including Athletics and Housing. But service to these units by Finance, Payroll, Personnel, and other areas is incidental rather than being part of the main mission. The question is, how much would overhead be reduced if all those auxiliary enterprises are closed or outsourced? For example, can you give an estimate of the impact of Bookstore’s outsourcing on the President’s office and other components of Level 5 overhead?
My guess is that the impact on these overhead pools of such outsourcing is minimal at best and does not change the overall overhead picture.

On the other hand, the directly identifiable utility costs for Auxiliary Enterprises or services provided by the Computer Center for Human Services for which we are reimbursed are concrete and tangible items which should reduce the overhead chargeable to the main mission of the University. If you can help identify such costs for better reporting, we will appreciate it.

In either case, as long as we both understand the shortcomings in both approaches, we can move on and cooperate to better service the University community. These are some of our thoughts, and we hope to be able to work with your office in the following areas:

1. Attempt to reasonably divide the faculty salary and benefits to the three components of teaching, research, and service based on departmental activity reports and not arbitrary allocations. Such a breakdown will give us an understanding of how the direct university faculty resources are expended.

2. A better breakdown for the supply account. We have been provided with the detail of this account which amounts to 83 million dollars or more than a quarter of the budget. We feel that a better breakdown in terms of all major cost components under the supply account such as phone costs, office supplies, etc. will be helpful in better understanding how resources are consumed.

3. We like to have a breakdown for Level 3 overhead in terms of Computers, Library, and Deans’ offices. Again to better understand how resources are allocated at this level.

4. We were also concerned about the 8 million dollars travel cost. An analysis of this account should also be helpful.

5. We may also need to review the 17 million dollars equipment account at a point in the future.

We do not lose sight of the fact that all these measurements are input oriented and just a starting point. University management will measure the output and the outcome with the knowledge of how resources are consumed.

After our next committee meeting, we will schedule a meeting so that we can pursue these thoughts on an on-going basis. We appreciate your cooperation and your insight.

cc: Dr. Bud Bodine
    Dr. Gary Ransdell
    Mr. John Newton
MEMORANDUM

TO: Budd Bodine
    Roger Doost

FROM: Gary Ransdell

SUBJECT: Resolution of Credit Card Matter

November 14, 1995

The Clemson Student Senate asked me to come to their meeting on Monday, November 13, to discuss the use of credit cards for tuition payments. I asked them to consider this matter and offer their perspective in this regard.

Some students introduced the attached resolution. It was approved after I left the Student Senate meeting.

Given the Student Senate perspective and the perspective of the Provost's Office, including staff in Admissions and Financial Aid...I have decided on the following action:

1. Continue to offer MasterCard and Visa options in the payment of tuition and fees.

2. Communicate directly with prospective students and parents who participate in Orientation. Encourage them to use the Clemson Visa and MasterCard on the theory that at least with these cards the University receives a modest financial return from the credit card company which issues the Clemson cards.

I apologize for taking so long to bring this to resolution, but I felt it was important to gather the perspectives of those directly involved, i.e., current students and staff in the offices of Admissions and Financial Aid. Given the competition we face from peer institutions and the services which students and parents expect, I am comfortable with the decision to continue the program.

I want to thank the Faculty Senate for bringing this to our attention. Your question has caused the University to thoroughly analyze the pros and cons of this procedure, and has also caused us to implement a step which adds an additional benefit to the University. I enjoy working with the Faculty Senate and promise continuing responsiveness to your inquiries. Let me know if we need to discuss this further.

xc: Charles Jennett, Provost
    Will Aiken, President, Student Senate
A Resolution
The Right to Swipe Your Tuition

Resolution No. 7
1995/1996 Clemson University Student Senate

Date Submitted: 11/6/95

1. Whereas Clemson University students presently have the right to charge their tuition on a number of different credit cards, and

2. Whereas this option to charge tuition is not a luxury, but a necessity for many students, and

3. Whereas the University Faculty Senate's proposal to cut university expenditures would discontinue this policy, and

4. Whereas this action would negatively affect the students in a manner, of greater proportion, than this action would benefit Clemson University,

5. Be it resolved by the Clemson University Student Senate in regular session assembled the following:

6. That this policy be maintained as an alternative for student's tuition payment.
The Policy Committee met Tuesday, November 28, 1995 with all members present. Most of the meeting was spent in discussing and revising a draft statement prepared by Roger Rollin. This draft was a revision of a document, entitled *Faculty Manual Revisions*, received from the Provost several weeks ago and at the time of unknown authorship. It was later found attributable to Dean Keinath. The modified revision will be presented as a resolution under new business at this meeting. It deals with the duties of school directors and department chairs, and the evaluation of all in the administrative hierarchy from department chairs through Provost. The rest of the document, dealing with personnel practices such as tenure, promotion, salary determination, will be studied, revised, and a resolution should be presented at the January Senate meeting.

Discussion was initiated on ownership of the forms for student evaluation of faculty teaching.

Respectfully submitted,
Bill Hare, Ch., for the Policy Committee
The Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate met on November 30, 1995. Members present: Fran McGuire, Ben Stephens and Shelley Barbary, Chair.

The following items were reviewed following discussions at previous meetings.

I. Reading Day: The idea that Reading Day is not useful to the student body as a whole or to the academic process was suggested to the Scholastic Policies Committee. Committee members did not have strong feelings regarding an effort to eliminate Reading Day. After the November Faculty Senate meeting, only one comment was forwarded to the Committee. At the point, it appears that there is not much impetus to change the present situation. [It should be noted that the recommendation to continue the Reading Day policy was reviewed by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies (CUGS) several years after the initial proposal and it was voted to make no changes. Many proponents were faculty members.]

II. Syllabus Requirements: Current syllabus requirements were proposed by CUGS, approved by the Provost and Deans and reviewed by the Academic Council. The Faculty Senate concurred.

Drs. Jerry Reel and George Carter indicated that the syllabus requirements are subject to amendment when the Faculty Senate makes an amendment proposal to CUGS. They also pointed out that the syllabus requirements are reasonably flexible. For example, the schedule for the semester may be written in whatever format desired by the professor. A daily, or even a weekly schedule is not required.

The purpose of many of the requirements, such as attendance and grading policies, are included to provided protections and guarantees that students will not be hurt should the professor find it necessary to make changes in the course plan. The syllabus is NOT a binding contract, but a proposal of course content and requirements. However, Drs. Reel and Carter suggested that if a professor decides that a change is necessary, the change should be made in writing and signed by the students.

If any specific changes are desired by the Faculty Senate, the Scholastic Policies Committee can suggest an amendment to CUGS.

III. Summer School Class Cancellations: Much concern has been voiced over the cancellation of summer school classes that have an enrollment less than the “break even” point.
Prior to the summer of 1995, money was allocated to the Deans based on
enrollment in previous years. Deans then allocated this money to departments.
In 1995, the Provost appointed a committee which included Deans, the Budget
Officer, the Business Manager and others to look at summer school funding.
Currently, each College is allotted summer school funds by the Vice Provost's
Office. It is up to each College to determine how many (if any) courses will be
guaranteed or offered on a contingency basis. However, each unit must earn the
basic amount needed to pay summer school expenses. Maymester courses are run
on a totally contingent basis. These courses may be offered at a loss if funds
from the first summer session are available to cover Maymester expenses. Many
Deans consider this too risky.

Seventy-four percent of summer school revenues pay faculty salaries and
benefits. Of the remaining 26%, approximately 4% goes to the library, 2% is
used for catalogs and other printing costs and 20% goes into the general fund of
the University. If there are any excess funds, they are given to the department.
Faculty salaries and benefits make up a bigger percentage of summer school
revenues than revenues during regular semesters.

While the last minute cancellation of classes generates negative publicity
with students and their parents, the students themselves may be partially to blame.
Apparently, some students do not preregister or pay fees for summer school
prior to the first day of class. Had these students been included in the enrollment
count, it is possible that the classes might not have been canceled. With summer
school registration now being initiated before Christmas, it is hoped that a more
accurate count can be made much in advance of the first summer session and
cancellations can be made long before the first day of class.

The idea of a professor accepting a reduced salary (74% of tuition
revenues for his/her class) may be considered. On the one hand, it provides some
income to faculty members, rather than none at all. On the other hand, if faculty
members work for reduced salaries, it may hamper their ability to get just pay
for their work in the future.

There is NO uniform university policy about cancellation of summer
school classes. Decisions to cancel classes are made by the Deans of each College,
in consultation with department chairs. Whether or not a class is canceled may be
influenced by the enrollment of students who need the course to graduate.
Department heads also have the option of “averaging” enrollments, allowing
tuition revenues from a class with a large number of students to offset the
expenses of a class with low enrollment.

It has been suggested that ways to reduce overhead expenses during
summer school be explored and/or more realistic incremental overhead costs be
calculated. Both these suggestions bear further investigation.
THE DUTIES, TERMS, AND EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS:

POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN THE FACULTY MANUAL

NOVEMBER 28, 1995

Background. On August 25, 1994, the Provost approved a Senate recommendation that established term limitations for department heads as well as formal procedures for greater faculty involvement in their evaluation. This policy now applies to department chairs. In September the Policy Committee received from the Provost a document apparently drafted by Dean Keinath which, among other matters, set forth recommendations for changes in the Faculty Manual governing the duties of department chairs and school directors, in addition to recommendations for revised procedures for reviewing the performances of academic administrators. After extensive discussions, the Policy Committee concluded that substantive improvements could be made in the descriptions of the duties of department chairs and school directors contained in the document it had received. The Committee also came to the conclusion that the logic of the present university policy regarding department chairs—that incumbents, their faculties, and the University generally benefit from the establishment of limitations on terms of service and from formalized involvement by those most affected in the performance evaluations—applied as well to other academic administrators such as school directors, deans, vice provosts, and the Provost. Such are the bases for the following recommendations, offered in the spirit of improving academic governance at Clemson University.*

K. The School Directors (see p.9, current Faculty Manual)

School directors are generally responsible for the administration and management of their schools and for the academic departments which may constitute those schools. School directors are accountable to the dean of the college. School directors represent their schools in relations with other schools and with the deans and other administrative officers of the University. In exercising leadership, a school director is expected to take initiatives to report the school's needs and advocate its goals and plans. The primary responsibility of school directors whose schools contain academic departments is to provide support for those departments, thereby freeing department chairs to concentrate on academic concerns, especially departmental programs and faculty.

School directors serve at the pleasure of their deans, who evaluate their performances annually. All school directors hold faculty rank and engage in teaching, research, and service to the extent feasible.

*There was consensus in the Policy Committee on two principles that help to shape this report. 1) Given the diverse forms of academic organization presently at Clemson—departments within schools or not within schools, schools with directors or no director, etc.—it is important for the sake of efficiency, faculty morale, and even matters of law that the University's academic organization be as consistent and uniform as is feasible. 2) That school directors should not constitute an additional layer of administrative supervision with regard to personnel, curricular, and other academic matters.
L. The Department Chairs (p. 9)

Chairs of academic departments are generally responsible for the activities of their departments. They are accountable to their faculty, to the director of their school (when applicable), and to the dean of their college. In exercising leadership in the improvement of departmental programs and of the departmental faculty, a chair is expected to take initiatives to report the department's needs and to advocate its goals and plans. Department chairs serve at the pleasure of their deans, who evaluate their performances annually. Chairs hold faculty rank and engage in teaching, research, and service to the extent feasible.

M. Duties of a School Director

--Staff. Responsible for: school-level hiring processes, supervision, EPMS assessment, staff salary and raise recommendations, and staff development.

--Business and Finance. Responsible for: school budget development and monitoring; administrative approval of the expenditure of state funds, endowments, and gift funds, incentive funds, patent royalty funds, and research funds; and department-level assignments of allocated space.

--Research. Responsible for coordinating and supporting: the identification and cultivation of potential research sponsors; development of multi-disciplinary research teams; review of research proposals; general administrative oversight of research grants and contracts; engagement in research of his/her own.

--Outreach. Responsible for coordinating and supporting public service activities consistent with the school's mission or the general good of the University.

--University Relations. Responsible for: communication with school constituencies; responding to requests for information from within and without the University; fostering academic collaboration; philanthropic development.

--Teaching. Teach at least one course per long semester or its equivalent in directing undergraduate and/or graduate research.

N. Duties of a Department Chair

--Department Management. Responsible for: faculty teaching assignments; course scheduling; degree certification by faculty; support of student recruitment, admissions, and transfer processes; student and prospective student advising; graduate student recruitment, assignment, and supervision.

--Faculty. Responsible for: faculty recruiting processes and hiring recommendations; faculty development; faculty teaching assignments; faculty goal setting and assessment (Forms 1 and 3); faculty salary and raise recommendations; initiating department-level review of
faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure recommendations; making independent recommendations regarding reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

---Staff. Responsible for department-level staff hiring processes, supervision, EPMS assessment, salary and raise recommendations, and development.

---Business and Finance. Responsible for departmental budget development and monitoring; initial administrative approval of the expenditure of state funds, endowment, and gift funds, incentive funds, patent royalty funds, and research funds; assignment of allocated space.

---Research. Responsible for: the identification and cultivation of potential research sponsors; administrative oversight of research grants and contracts; development of intra-departmental and multidisciplinary research teams; encouragement and support of faculty research; engaging in research of his/her own.

---Outreach. Responsible for monitoring public service activities consistent with the department's mission or for the general good of the University.

---University Relations. Responsible for: department-level communications with prospective students, enrolled students, parents, and other constituencies; responding to requests for information from within and without the University; fostering academic collaboration; philanthropic development; alumni relations; establishing and maintaining external advisory boards.

---Teaching. Responsible for teaching at least one course per long semester or its equivalent in directing graduate and/or undergraduate research.

O. Evaluation of Academic Administrators (p.12)

Administrative officers of the University serve at the pleasure of their respective superiors. Thus, appointment to an administrative position, whether it be as a dean, a school director, a department chair, etc., cannot assure continuance in office for any specific period of time. The status of academic administrators as tenured or untenured faculty, however, is not affected by appointment to or termination of administrative positions.

All academic administrators, however, normally serve five-year terms of office which, normally, are once renewable. Service beyond ten years in a particular office shall occur only under extraordinary circumstances, as justified by the academic officer and his/her superiors and subordinates, and validated by the President of the University.

Academic administrators are subject to annual performance evaluations by their superiors. However, in the fourth year of continuous service, academic administrators shall also be formally evaluated by those most affected by their administration.
Department chairs. In their fourth year of continuous service, department chairs shall be evaluated by the faculty of the department. Departmental bylaws shall establish procedures for electing an evaluation committee composed of tenured faculty and one tenured faculty member from outside the department. The department bylaws shall also establish how confidential faculty opinion shall be elicited by the evaluation committee. The committee shall write a formal report of its findings which shall be presented to the school director, if any, the dean of the college, as well as the department chair. This report shall be made available to the faculty of the department. The dean shall take this report into account in determining whether the chair shall be offered a second five-year term of office. Input into the evaluation process from staff, students, and others shall be solicited by the evaluation committee and/or by the dean as they shall deem appropriate.

School directors. A director of a school in which there are no departments shall be evaluated like a department chair. A director of a school in which there are departments shall be evaluated annually by the dean and quadrennially by the department chairs according to written procedures agreed upon by the officers concerned. The department heads shall submit a written evaluation to the dean which, along with the dean's written evaluation, shall be forwarded to the Provost and shall be made available to the school director.

Academic Deans. Academic deans shall be evaluated annually by the Provost and quadrennially by their school directors and/or department chairs according to written procedures agreed upon by the officers concerned. The deans shall submit a written evaluation to the Provost which, along with the Provost's written evaluation, shall be forwarded to the President and shall be made available to the dean.

Vice Provosts. The vice provosts shall be evaluated annually by the Provost and quadrennially by the deans, according to written procedures agreed upon by the officers concerned. The deans shall submit a written evaluation to the Provost which, along with the Provost's written evaluation, shall be forwarded to the President and which shall be made available to the vice provosts.

Provost. The Provost shall be evaluated annually by the President of the University and quadrennially by the vice provosts and academic deans according to written procedures agreed upon by the officers concerned. The deans and the vice provosts shall submit a written evaluation to the President which shall be made available to the Provost.

Participation by Faculty and Others in the Evaluation of School Directors, Deans, Vice Provosts, and the Provost. In the case of school directors, deans, vice provosts, and the Provost, quadrennial reviews shall involve obtaining formal input from tenured and tenure-track faculty in accordance with provisions that shall be written into the evaluation procedures. Such procedures may also contain provisions for input from staff, students, and others as shall be deemed appropriate.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Thomas C. Jenkins

FROM: T. E. Skelton

SUBJECT: Reply to e-mail regarding Duties of Director and Chair

Tom, my suggestions for changes and additions to the proposed revisions are below. Thank you for this opportunity to comment prior to consideration by the Faculty Senate.

page 1 section K The School Directors

line 3 School Directors are accountable to the dean of the college and in the College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences are also accountable to the Director, SCAES and Director, CUCES.

page 2 section M Duties of the School Director

Business and Finance. Responsible for: school budget development and monitoring; administrative approval (or delegation of signature authority) of the expenditure of state funds, endowments and gift funds, incentive funds, patent royalty funds and research funds; and assignment of space to departments. (as stated could be interpreted to mean Director will assign space within departments)

Teaching. Normally teach at least...

Add: Other: Other unspecified responsibilities necessary for the normal and efficient operation of the school and departments within the school.

page 3 section N Duties of a Department Chair

After Teaching, add another section

Other: Special programs or other unspecified responsibilities necessary for the normal and efficient operation of the department.
The Duties, Terms, and Evaluation of Academic Administrators:

Policy Committee Recommendations For Changes in the Faculty Manual

November 28, 1995

Background

On August 25, 1994, the Provost approved a Senate recommendation that established term limitations for department heads as well as formal procedures for greater faculty involvement in their evaluation. This policy now applies to department chairs. In September the Policy Committee received from the Provost a document apparently drafted by Dean Keinath which, among other matters, set forth recommendations for changes in the Faculty Manual governing the duties of department chairs and school directors, in addition to recommendations for revised procedures for reviewing the performances of academic administrators. After extensive discussions, the Policy Committee concluded that substantive improvements could be made in the descriptions of the duties of department chairs and school directors contained in the document it had received. The Committee also came to the conclusion that the logic of the present university policy regarding department chairs -- that incumbents, their faculties, and the University generally benefit from the establishment of limitations on terms of service and from formalized involvement by those most affected in the performance evaluations--applied as well to other academic administrators such as school directors, deans, vice provosts, and the Provost. Such are the bases for the following recommendations, offered in the spirit of improving academic governance at Clemson University.*

*There was consensus in the Policy Committee on two principles that help to shape this report. 1) Given the diverse forms of academic organization presently at Clemson--departments within schools or not within schools, schools with directors or no director, etc.--it is important for the sake of efficiency, faculty morale, and even matters of law that the University's academic organization be as consistent and uniform as is feasible. 2) That school directors should not constitute an additional layer of administrative supervision with regard to personnel, curricular, and other academic matters.
K. The School Directors (see p.9, current Faculty Manual)

School directors are generally responsible for the administration and management of their schools and for the academic departments which may constitute those schools. School directors are accountable to the dean of the college and in the College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences are also accountable to the Director, SCAES and Director, CU CES. School directors represent their schools in relations with other schools and with the deans and other administrative officers of the University. In exercising leadership, a school director is expected to take initiatives to report the school's needs and advocate its goals and plans. The primary responsibility of school directors whose schools contain academic departments is to provide support for those departments, thereby freeing department chairs to concentrate on academic concerns, especially departmental programs and faculty.

School directors serve at the pleasure of their deans, who evaluate their performances annually. All school directors hold faculty rank and engage in teaching, research, and service to the extent feasible.

L. The Department Chairs (p.9)

Chairs of academic departments are generally responsible for the activities of their departments. They are accountable to their faculty, to the director of their school (when applicable), and to the dean of their college. In exercising leadership in the improvement of departmental programs and of the departmental faculty, a chair is expected to take initiatives to report the department's needs and to advocate its goals and plans. Department chairs serve at the pleasure of their deans, who evaluate their performances annually. Chairs hold faculty rank and engage in teaching, research, and service to the extent feasible.

M. Duties of a School Director

---Staff. Responsible for: school-level hiring processes, supervision, EPMS assessment, staff salary and raise recommendations, and staff development.
--Business and Finance. Responsible for: school budget development and monitoring; administrative approval of the expenditure of state funds, endowments, and gift funds, incentive funds, patent royalty funds, and research funds; and assignment of space to departments.

--Research. Responsible for coordinating and supporting: the identification and cultivation of potential research sponsors; development of multidisciplinary research teams; review of research proposals; general administrative oversight of research grants and contracts; engagement in research of his/her own.

--Outreach. Responsible for coordinating and supporting public service activities consistent with the school's mission or the general good of the University.

--University Relations. Responsible for: communication with school constituencies; responding to requests for information from within and without the University; fostering academic collaboration; philanthropic development.

--Teaching. Teach at least one course per long semester; or its equivalent in directing undergraduate and/or graduate research; and/or cooperative extension activities.

N. Duties of a Department Chair

--Department Management. Responsible for: faculty teaching assignments; course scheduling; degree certification by faculty; support of student recruitment, admissions, and transfer processes; student and prospective student advising; graduate student recruitment, assignment, and supervision.

--Faculty. Responsible for: Faculty recruiting processes and hiring recommendations; faculty development; faculty teaching assignment; faculty goal setting and assessment (Forms 1 and 3); faculty salary and raise recommendations; initiating department-level review of faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure recommendations; making independent recommendations regarding reappointment, promotion, and tenure.
--Staff. Responsible for department-level staff hiring processes, supervision, EPMS assessment, salary and raise recommendations, and development.

--Business and Finance. Responsible for departmental budget development and monitoring; initial administrative approval of the expenditure of state funds, endowment, and gift funds, incentive funds, patent royalty funds, and research funds; assignment of allocated space.

--Research. Responsible for; the identification and cultivation of potential research sponsors; administrative oversight of research grants and contracts; development of intra-departmental and multidisciplinary research terms; encouragement and support of faculty research; engaging in research of his/her own.

--Outreach. Responsible for monitoring public service activities consistent with the department's mission or for the general good of the University.

--University Relations. Responsible for: department-level communications with prospective students, enrolled students, parents, and other constituencies; responding to requests for information from within and without the University; fostering academic collaboration; philanthropic development; alumni relations; establishing and maintaining external advisory boards.

--Teaching. Responsible for teaching at least one course per long semester; or its equivalent in directing undergraduate and/or graduate research; and/or cooperative extension activities.

O. Evaluation of Academic Administrators (p.12)

Administrative officers of the University serve at the pleasure of their respective superiors. Thus, appointment to an administrative position, whether it be as a dean, a school director, a department chair, etc., cannot assure continuance in office for any specific period of time. The status of academic administrators as tenured or untenured faculty, however, is not affected by appointment to or termination of administrative positions.
All academic administrators, however, normally serve five-year terms of office which, normally, are once renewable. Service beyond ten years in a particular office shall occur only under extraordinary circumstances, as justified by the academic office and his/her superiors and subordinates, and validated by the President of the University.

Academic administrators are subject to annual performance evaluations by their superiors. However, in the fourth year of continuous service, academic administrators shall also be formally evaluated by those most affected by their administration.

Department Chairs. In their fourth year of continuous service, department chairs shall be evaluated by the faculty of the department. Departmental bylaws shall establish procedures for electing an evaluation committee composed of tenured faculty and one tenured faculty member from outside the department. The department bylaws shall also establish how confidential faculty opinion shall be elicited by the evaluation committee. The committee shall write a formal report of its findings which shall be presented to the school director, if any, the dean of the college, as well as the department chair. This report shall be made available to the faculty of the department. The dean shall take this report into account in determining whether the chair shall be offered a second five-year term of office. Input into the evaluation process from staff, students, and other shall be solicited by the evaluation committee and/or by the dean as they shall deem appropriate.

School Directors. A director of a school in which there are no departments shall be evaluated like a department chair. A director of a school in which there are departments shall be evaluated annually by the dean and quadrennially by the department chairs according to written procedures agreed upon by the officers concerned. The department heads shall submit a written evaluation to the dean which, along with the dean's written evaluation, shall be forwarded to the Provost and shall be made available to the school director.

Academic Deans. Academic deans shall be evaluated annually by the Provost and quadrennially by their school directors and/or department chairs according to written procedures agreed upon by the officers concerned. The department chairs and/or school directors shall submit a
written evaluation to the Provost which, along with the Provost's written evaluation, shall be forwarded to the President and shall be made available to the dean.

**Vice Provosts.** The vice provosts shall be evaluated annually by the Provost and quadrennially by the deans, according to written procedures agreed upon by the officers concerned. The deans shall submit a written evaluation to the Provost which, along with the Provost's written evaluation, shall be forwarded to the President and which shall be made available to the vice provosts.

**Provost.** The Provost shall be evaluated annually by the President of the University and quadrennially by the vice provosts and academic deans according to written procedures agreed upon by the officers concerned. The deans and the vice provosts shall submit a written evaluation to the President which shall be made available to the Provost.

**Participation by Faculty and Others in the Evaluation of School Directors, Deans, Vice Provosts, and the Provost.** In the case of school directors, deans, vice provosts, and the Provost, quadrennial reviews shall involve obtaining formal input from tenured and tenure-track faculty in accordance with provisions that shall be written into the evaluation procedures. Such procedures may also contain provisions for input from staff, students, and others as shall be deemed appropriate.
December 1, 1995

FACULTY SENATE

Dr. Gary Ransdell,
Vice President
Administration & Advancement

Dear Gary:

The Finance Committee of the Faculty Senate would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the good will, cooperation, and responsiveness that you have shown in dealing with our committee. There have been several instances that we needed help from you and your staff. They involved questions such as the University expenditures, bonded indebtedness, and most recently our concerns about tuition payments by credit card. On the latter subject, for example, you examined the subject in a professional manner, reflected positively on the information you discovered, and made an executive decision which was, in our opinion, both wise and advisable.

In the various dealings that we have had with the Administration, an appearance or assumption of 'confrontation' has occasionally emerged as an unwanted outcome in the process of communication. This is indeed unfortunate because both the Faculty and the Administration at Clemson University have a clear and unequivocal mandate to serve and contribute to the best of their abilities to one common cause - teaching our students and serving the people of our state. That service is obviously enhanced when everyone tries to cooperate and work together.

With the hope that we will continue along the same path and a belief that your example is very much worth commending, we reiterate our thanks and appreciation.

Sincerely,

On behalf of members of Finance Committee

cc: President Deno Curris
    Dr. Bud Bodine
    Inside Clemson
A Suggested Alternative to the Proposed
Faculty Workload Database System

1. INSTRUCTION
List the courses that you teach with credit hours for each course.
(Note: each 3-hour course should take between 8% to 12% of your time per year. Allow 8% if you have
taught the same course for at least 2 years, you have less than 25 students in the class, and it is a freshman
or a sophomore-level class. Allow one percent more for each variable if you have taught the course for
less than 2 years, you have more than 25 students, and it is a junior or senior-level course. Allow an
additional one or two percent if it is a graduate-level course).

2. SERVICE
List your committee assignments as well as any other professional activities
that you have including attending conferences and seminars, coordination of
professional societies and fraternities, and student advising).
(Note: each committee assignment should not take more than one percent of your total time. If you think
more than one percent is in order, please explain. Coordination of professional activities may take 2% to
8% of your time. Normally, service should not be for more than 20% of your total time).

3. ADMINISTRATION
If you are a department chair, department head, or a director, you spend a
portion of your time in administrative duties. Estimate the percent of your
time that you spend in administration and list your major administrative
duties.
(It is expected that department chairs will not spend more than 25% of their total time in administration.
If you have to spend more time, please explain).

4. RESEARCH
The unaccounted percentage of your time should go toward research.
Please indicate how much of your research is funded and accounts for what
percentage of your salary (net of overhead), and how much of it is unfunded
research.
Provide a list of your accomplishments for the year for the funded and unfunded research portion
separately (manuscripts, seminars, inventions, product improvements, etc.), and indicate how your research
helps you and the university and the state in accomplishing our common objective.
December 1, 1995

Mr. Michael Burns,
Editor-in-chief
The Tiger
P. O. Box 2097
Clemson, S. C. 29632

Dear Michael:

Two articles appeared in today’s issue of Tiger where I was quoted. Kindly have these corrections included in your next issue of the paper:

Re: Article by David Melnyk, "Students pay for debts"

According to the University’s published reports for Fiscal year 1994 and 1995 budget, the revenue from student tuition and fees is around 60 million dollars and not 50 million. This is close to 1/5 of total budget.

It is correct that $200 million from a total of $323 million for fiscal 1995 covers the cost of Faculty (81.5 million) and overhead (119.5 million), but the remaining $123 million dollars covers the cost of Extension and agricultural services ($67 million), scholarships and fellowships ($10 million) and the direct cost of Auxiliary Enterprises (Athletics, Canteen, Bookstore, Housing, etc.)

The 119.5 million dollars of overhead includes all supplies, travel, departmental administration, library, computers, deans offices, operation, maintenance, utilities, president’s office, student services, finance, personnel, security, and legal services.

In general, most of the funding for educational buildings comes from contributions and state funds and very little from student fees.

Re: article by Shakina Middleton, “Faculty questions salaries”
1. The article states that raises have been four percent across the board. This is not true. Raises have been from zero to 26 percent with an average being between 3 to 4 percent.
2. The salary list for those earning between 30 to 50 thousand dollars is provided in ranges and not in absolute amounts.
TO: FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE  
FROM: ROGER ROLLIN, SENATOR, CAAH  
SUBJECT: ANOTHER POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE TO THE PROPOSED "FACULTY WORKLOAD DATABASE SYSTEM"

DECEMBER 12, 1995

The following, respectfully submitted for the Committee's consideration, is my attempt at a what I believe to be simpler, more rational, method for generating data about faculty workloads than the one recently circulated by the University Administration. It combines both quantitative and qualitative elements. Please note that my outline has been freely adapted from a proposed system devised by Roger Doost. I am grateful to him for his initiative and his idea.

1. Teaching

--List each course (with course number and title) taught during the long semesters of the past calendar year, along with number of lecture (and, if any) lab hours per week and number of students.
--For each course, estimate the average number of hours spent in class preparation, student advising, etc.
--If your estimated average is over twelve* hours per week for a given course, briefly explain.

2. Research and Scholarship

--List each research/scholarly project begun, continued, and/or completed during the last calendar year.
--Estimate the average number of hours per week spent on each project during the long semesters, as well as the number of hours spent during the summer hiatus, if different.
--Briefly explain the potential value of each project to your students, Clemson University, your discipline, your professional development, and/or the public good.
--If your estimate for all projects is over twenty-five hours* per week during the long semesters, briefly explain.

3. Service

--List all your specific service activities undertaken during the calendar year and estimate the average number of hours per week taken up by each.
--If your total is over fifteen* hours per week, briefly explain.

4. Administration (for school directors, department chairs, associate/assistant directors and chairs, and program directors)

--Estimate the average number of hours spent in administration during the long semesters of the last calendar year.
--Estimate the average number of hours spent in administration during the summer hiatus, if any.
--If your estimate is over thirty-five* hours per week and you are a school director or a department chair, briefly explain.
--If your estimate is over twenty-five* hours* per week and you are an assistant or associate director or chair or the director of a program, briefly explain.

*These numbers are for discussion purposes only.