MINUTES of the
FACULTY SENATE of
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

JANUARY, 1993 to DECEMBER, 1993
1. **Call to Order.** President William Baron called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

2. **Class of '39 Award for Excellence.** Raymond C. Turner, Professor of Physics and this year's recipient, was honored at a ceremony during which congratulatory remarks were given by President A. Max Lennon, Provost J. Charles Jennett, and Dr. T. L. Senn, Class of '39.

3. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated December 8, 1992 were approved as written.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Committee Reports.**

      **Scholastic Policies Committee.** No report.

      **Welfare Committee.** Senator Brenda Vander Mey submitted a Welfare Committee Update (Attachment A).

      **Finance Committee.** Senator James Davis reported that this Committee is looking into the possibility of doing audits around campus. Centers on campus which are non-academically governed are also being studied.

      **Policy Committee.** Senator Eleanor Hare withdrew the item listed under New Business as the Faculty Manual Amendment - Inclusion of Form, Appointment of Academic Administrator; and submitted this Committee's Report (Attachment B).

      Because the policy is unclear regarding the position of the University when there is a difference of opinion, and since the issue of a two-year review of department heads is a policy that is in the Faculty Manual, President Baron requested that the Policy Committee consider an alternate avenue to pursue a result of this issue. President Baron stated that a possible solution to consider might be the present Grievance process.

      **Research Committee.** Senator Leslie Carlson stated that there was no report.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**

      1) **ad hoc Committee to Review Vice Presidents' Administrative Growth Reports.** Senator John Huffman reported that this Committee has provided the President of the Faculty Senate a copy of its Report, which will be presented to the Executive/Advisory Committee before being submitted to the Senate.

      2) **Council of Deans.** President Baron reported that this Council met recently to discuss a variety of issues which included: the Honors Program, re-evaluation of the appointment of department heads, and Grievance procedures.
c. Special Committee Report. Professor Leo Gaddis presented a Report entitled, "Growth and Budget for the Office of Business & Finance." The focus of the Report presented by Dr. Gaddis was based on contents of the "Report of Productivity" submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Office of Business & Finance. A question and answer period followed this presentation.

5. President's Report. President Baron discussed the President's Report (Attachment C).

6. Old Business
   a. The Centennial Professorship now totals $97,498.

7. New Business
   a. The following senators were elected by acclamation to serve on the Grievance Board for two years: Richard Conover (Forest & Recreation Resources), John Huffman (Sciences), and Brenda Vander Mey (Liberal Arts). Nominations for one more member to the Grievance Board will be received at the next Senate meeting.

   b. Senator Hare made a motion from the Policy Committee to accept the Faculty Manual Amendment to Alter the Membership of the Honorary Degrees Committee (Attachment D). Vote for acceptance was taken, and passed unanimously.

   c. Senator Hare made a motion from the Policy Committee, and supported by the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate, to accept the Faculty Manual Amendment regarding Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships (Attachment E). Discussion followed. Vote for acceptance was taken, and passed.

8. Adjournment. President Baron adjourned the meeting at 5:32 p.m.

Lucy Rollin, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Senators Absent: W. Bridges, J. Rathwell, W. Stringer, J. Mumford, M. Bridgwood, J. Liburdy, K. Dieter (Waldvogel for), E. Ruppert, R. Williams
Welfare Committee to Faculty Senate
January 12, 1993

Updates

The Welfare Committee has responded to the draft of the Early-Out plan. The sense of the Committee is that some type of Early-Out plan is needed. The draft plan indicates that the individual faculty member will initiate this type of action.

The Committee perceived the need to develop explicit criteria for deciding to accept or reject an individual's request for Early-Out. The Committee also wants to know what happens if the Provost denies the request for Early-Out.

Paul Michaud has spoken with me (Vander Mey) regarding the policy to allow 12-month faculty to shift to 9-month appointments. This plan has been approved in Columbia. Faculty making this shift will not receive a raise for 3 years.

Anyone whose appointment is under the division of Academic Affairs can request this shift. The request must be approved by the appropriate administrators. Generally, the request will be denied if the shift would create problems in continuing the operations and services of a unit. Deans can decide whether or not they endorse this shift policy.

The Committee has received a query regarding apparent unfair treatment of 9-month versus 12-month employees at retirement. This query has been forwarded to Paul Michaud.

Computer runs are completed on the distribution of effort data.

On Tuesday, January 26, 1993, the Welfare Committee will meet with the Policy Committee at 3:00 p.m. in Cooper Library LL3. We will discuss the request to change the flow of copies of the Grievance Hearing Panel's findings. Then, the Welfare Committee will move to LL8 (of Cooper Library) at 3:30 p.m. for their regularly scheduled meeting.
Policy Committee Report

January 12, 1993

The Policy Committee met January 5 and approved the following proposed amendments to the Faculty Manual:

1) An amendment that would specify conditions under which a department head could become the holder of an endowed chair or named professorship. The amendment specifies the selection and review process to be applied.

2) An amendment to include a form (similar to a CUBO form currently used by the Business Office) for appointment of academic administrators. Such a form would expedite and simplify the appointment process and document that Faculty Manual procedures were followed.

3) An amendment to change the composition of the Honorary Degree Selection Committee was approved. This change was requested by Provost Jennett.

The possibility of doing another Faculty Senate survey was discussed. The committee is requesting input from the Senate as to the desirability of a survey this spring as well as suggestions on questions to be asked and areas to be addressed. Inside Clemson has been requested to include a short news item requesting suggestions for the survey in their next issue. If Inside Clemson cannot print this request, it may be issued through interoffice mail.

The following meeting dates have been scheduled:

January 26, February 2, February 16, and March 23.

All meetings will be at 3 p.m. One of these meetings will be a joint meeting with the Welfare Committee.
1. **REMEMBER:** The Executive/Advisory Committee will prepare a slate of nominees for the Senate offices of Vice President-President/Elect and Secretary at its meeting on January 28th. The nominees will be made known to the Senate at our February meeting. The election of officers will take place at the March meeting of the Faculty Senate. If you wish to suggest a name, please inform your representative to the Advisory Committee. We have requested that for each nominee, there be an accompanying resume and/or statement. These resumes and/or statements will be made available to all senators. Each nominee will be given the opportunity to make an oral statement to the Senate at the February meeting.

   Nominations will be accepted from the floor at the March meeting. All nominees will have a first or second opportunity to speak to the Senate at this time. Nominees must be senators in the first or second year of their term.

2. Vice President Gogue will speak to the Senate at our February meeting. We will submit written questions to Dr. Gogue. Please forward your questions to Senator Lucy Rollin by January 26th.

3. President Lennon advised the Academic Council that this year the Mid-Year Check would be suspended. He is asking the Council to re-study the issue pursuant to the Council’s making a decision as to whether or not this academic policy will be retained and enforced.

4. I will meet with the Deans to discuss “Undergraduate Education”. If you have specific suggestions, please drop me a note - promptly.

5. The election of members to the Grievance Board will be held at the January 12th meeting. Four members must be elected to a two-year term. Nominees must be Full or Associate Professors; members or alternates of the Faculty Senate at the time of election; and be from different colleges. Colleges from which to elect are: Library, Engineering, Liberal Arts, Agricultural Sciences, Architecture, Sciences, and Forest and Recreation Resources. John Huffman has been nominated from the College of Sciences, and Richard Conover has been nominated from the College of Forest and Recreation Resources.
Faculty Manual Amendment
to Alter the Membership of the Honorary Degrees Committee

Presented by the Policy Committee
January 12, 1993

The following addition is to be made to the Faculty Manual, Section VI. Faculty Participation in University Governance. C. Committees Reporting to the President. 6. Honorary Degree Committee (page 45)

6. **Honorary Degree Selection Committee** evaluates candidates for honorary degrees and submits its recommendations to the President of the University. The committee consists of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall serve as Chairperson; the President of the Faculty Senate, who shall serve as Secretary; the most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; two Alumni Distinguished Professors nominated by the Alumni Distinguished Professors themselves, one Endowed Chair/Professor to be nominated by their own group; and the Chair-person of the Institutional Advancement Committee of the Board of Trustees.

The composition of the committee may then be removed from Part VIII. Summary of Selected Campus Policies. I. Honorary Degrees Policy (page 78), which will then read as follows:

1. **Honorary Degrees Policy**

Clemson University confers honorary degrees in recognition of eminent achievement in scholarship or creativity, or of high distinction in public service, including meritorious contributions to the University. The awarding of honorary degrees is to be regarded as a method by which the University expresses its ideals and recognizes exceptional attainments. The following policy, adopted by the Board of Trustees, governs the selection of honorary degree recipients.

Nominations of candidates for honorary degrees may be made by any interested person to the President of the University or to the Selection Committee by submitting in written form the accomplishments of the nominee.

The Honorary Degree Selection Committee (see VI. C. 6) shall evaluate the candidates and submit its recommendations for the awarding of honorary degrees to the President of the University. The President will forward his recommendation to the Board of Trustees for approval. Consideration for the awarding of honorary degrees shall be limited to occasions of special significance to Clemson and when the awarding would clearly express the ideals of the University or recognize exceptional attainment.

**Comments:**

The proposed change in the composition of the Honorary Degrees Selection Committee:

1. Increases the number of Alumni Distinguished Professors from one to two. The Alumni Distinguished Professors will select their own representatives rather than have the President appoint their representatives.

2. Adds one Endowed Chair/Professor to the committee.

3. Relocates the committee description with other committee descriptions.

This change was requested by Provost Jennett.
Faculty Manual Amendment
Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships
Presented by the Policy Committee
January 12, 1993

The following additions are to be made to the Faculty Manual on page 20 in the Section on Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships:

1) Page 20, paragraph 3, (Rank and Tenure Status) after University.
   Inasmuch as endowed chairs and titled professorships are established in recognition of exceptional levels of achievement in teaching, research, and public service, individuals whose principal responsibilities are administrative are not normally eligible for these appointments. Under exceptional conditions, a Department Head may receive an appointment to an endowed chair or titled professorship. Such an appointment must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of approval by the faculty of the affected department. This vote shall be by secret ballot and shall be administered by the departmental Tenure and Promotion or Personnel Committee.

2) Page 20, paragraph 4 (Conditions of Award) after department head.
   "If the holder of the chair or endowed professorship is the department head, the dean of the college shall initiate the review at the request of the departmental Tenure and Promotion or Personnel Committee.

3) Page 20 paragraph 5, after rank.
   "If the holder of the chair or endowed professorship is a department head, the appointments shall be independent.

Background for this proposal:

On September 15, Dean Keinath of Engineering met with the Policy Committee to discuss whether or not the Faculty Manual allows a chaired professorship to be coupled with the position of department head. Environmental Systems Engineering has a vacant endowed professorship and a vacant headship. In order to obtain a highly qualified person in waste management, the faculty would like to advertise the professorship and the headship together.

The intent of the Faculty Manual on department heads holding endowed chairs and titled professorships is not clear. In the first paragraph under F. Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships (page 19) the Manual reads, "These positions are established in recognition of exceptional levels of achievement. The priorities placed on excellence in teaching, research, and public service vary with the purposes of the particular professorship or chair.

Paragraph 4 (page 20) reads, "... a review (of performance, if allowed in the stipulation at the time of the award) may be initiated by the dean of the college if requested by both the departmental faculty Advisory Committee and the department head." This section implies that the department head will not hold the chair. Otherwise, there would be some other mechanism indicated for initiating the review. Since the department head chairs the Advisory Committee (F. Faculty Participation in Departmental Governance, pre-1989 Faculty Manual), some means of initiating a review other than the Departmental faculty Advisory Committee is necessary if the department head may hold the endowed chair or professorship.

Paragraph 3 (page 20) reads, "... The University community as a whole has a vested and vital interest in the academic contributions of holders of endowed chairs and titled professorships..." The Policy Committee believes that the proposed resolution will, in exceptional circumstances, allow highly qualified individuals to hold both a headship and an endowed chair or professorship.
1. **Call to Order.** Vice President/President-Elect Alan Schaffer called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The General Faculty Minutes dated December 16, 1992 were approved as corrected; and the Faculty Senate Minutes dated January 12, 1993 were approved as written.

3. **Special Order of the Day.** George J. Gogue, Vice President for Research, was introduced, and responded to questions previously submitted by the Faculty Senate. Answers to these questions are on file in the Faculty Senate Office, and will be made available upon request.

4. **Slate of Officers.** Alan Schaffer presented the Slate of Officers from the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate:

   - **Vice President/President-Elect:** James Davis (Commerce & Industry)
   - **Walt Owens (Liberal Arts)**
   - **Secretary:** David Leigh (Engineering)

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

5. **Committee Reports**

   a. **Committee Reports**

      **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Richard Conover stated that this Committee studied and endorsed the interdisciplinary course now before the Undergraduate Studies Commission from the Honors College; and the Provost's proposed change to the Faculty Manual regarding exceptions to the Admissions Policy which will be discussed under New Business.

      **Welfare Committee.** Senator Brenda Vander Mey stated that there was no report.

      **Finance Committee.** Senator James Davis reported that a joint report by the ad hoc Committee to Review the Vice Presidents' Administrative Growth Reports and the Finance Committee will be brought to the Senate in the near future. The Finance Committee will assist Vice President of Business & Finance, David Larson, with the evaluation of the administrative cost containment proposal.
Policy Committee. Senator Eleanor Hare submitted the Policy Committee Report (Attachment A). This Committee has prepared a draft letter which addresses the position of the Associate Vice Provost reporting to the Provost. Considerations by the Policy Committee have included proposed changes to the Grievance II procedure and the question of filing a grievance to expedite (require?) action on issues. The Policy Committee was asked to meet with the Athletic Council to draw up a position description of the faculty representative to the NCAA. This issue was referred to the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Research Committee. Senator Bill Bridges stated that there was no report.

b. University Commissions and Committees

1) ad hoc Committee on Campus Safety - Senator Vander Mey stated that plans have been finalized for Rape Awareness Week, March 8-12, 1993.

2) ad hoc Committee of the Joint City/University Committee - Senate Alternate Jerry Waldvogel reported that the report forming the strategic plan to improve University and community interactions has been made available to the Faculty Senate. Alan Schaffer announced that the University had declined the idea of annexation of the University by the City.

3) Commission on the Status of Women at Clemson University - Senate Alternate Joanne Deeken asked about the status of this Commission. Alan Schaffer responded that the Commission had been established by the President, and should begin to meet soon.

4) Faculty Manual Committee - Glenn Birrenkott, Chair of this Committee, submitted and explained minor changes to the Faculty Manual for approval by the Senate. Following the acceptance of friendly amendments, vote to accept amended changes was taken, and passed unanimously (Attachment B).


7. Old Business

a. William Baron (Engineering) and Alan Schaffer (Liberal Arts) were elected by acclamation to serve on the Grievance Board.

8. New Business

a. Senator Hare submitted a Faculty Manual Amendment to Amend Grievance II Procedures (Attachment D) from the Policy and Welfare Committees. Following discussion, vote to accept amendment was taken and passed unanimously.

b. Senator Vander Mey submitted a resolution regarding Confidentiality of Personnel Matters from the Welfare Committee. Discussion followed. Alternate Deeken offered a friendly amendment, which was accepted by Committee. Vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment E) (FS93-2-1 P).
c. Senator Conover submitted a Faculty Manual Amendment regarding the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee from the Scholastic Policies Committee. Following discussion which included friendly amendments, vote to accept amended amendment was taken, and passed unanimously (Attachment F).

d. Alan Schaffer informed the Senate that Dedication Ceremonies for the Brooks Performing Arts Center are planned for December 2-4, 1993, which will be during Reading and Dead Days. This issue was raised at the President's Cabinet Meeting, and President Lennon is aware of the problem.

9. Adjournment. Vice President/President-Elect Schaffer adjourned the meeting at 5:08 p.m.

Lucy Rollin, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Policy Committee Report
February 9, 1993

The following responses were received from the questions distributed with the January packet:

Last year's Faculty Senate Survey was effective in communicating faculty concerns and perceptions to the administration.

- strongly agree XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
- agree XXXXXXXX
- no opinion
- disagree
- strongly disagree

These areas, not covered in last year's survey, should be covered in a future survey.

College Adm. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Provost XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Other
- University mission vs. Competition with other State institutions
- Funds allocation and justification undergraduate cost and expenditures
- University policy, honesty and integrity of administration
- Strong need to look at chair system vs. headship system with Clemson now has
- The question on business growth
- Ag Division administration (Ag and Natural Resources)

Should the Senate do another survey this spring?

- Yes XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
- No Opinion X
- No XXXXXXXX (4 of these said next year/every other year)

Meetings of the Policy Committee are scheduled for February 18 and March 23 at 3 p.m.
ITEM 1: CHANGE OF TITLE

*Director of Libraries -- Dean
OLD (pp. 7)
The Provost also receives recommendations on curricular matters from University
curriculum committees and forwards recommendations to the President; approves the
bylaws of the collegiate faculties and reviews the minutes of their meetings; receives and
transmits to the Faculty proposed amendments to the Faculty Constitution; presides at
meetings of the University Faculty; evaluates the performance in office of the academic
deans; appoints search-and-screening committees for certain administrative positions;
recommends the appointment of academic administrators to the President; chairs the Council
of Academic Deans; serves as liaison officer between the Faculty Senate and the President;
and delegates authority to the Vice Provosts, the Assistant Vice President for Academic
Affairs, and the Director of Libraries.

NEW
The Provost also receives recommendations on curricular matters from University
curriculum committees and forwards recommendations to the President; approves the
bylaws of the collegiate faculties and reviews the minutes of their meetings; receives and
transmits to the Faculty proposed amendments to the Faculty Constitution; presides at
meetings of the University Faculty; evaluates the performance in office of the academic
deans; appoints search-and-screening committees for certain administrative positions;
recommends the appointment of academic administrators to the President; chairs the Council
of Academic Deans; serves as liaison officer between the Faculty Senate and the President;
and delegates authority to the Vice Provosts, the Assistant Vice President for Academic
Affairs, and the Dean of Libraries.

OLD (pp. 9)
J. The Director of Libraries

The Director of Libraries is the chief administrative officer of the Clemson University
Libraries. In dealing with the Library Faculty, the duties of the Director of Libraries are the
same as those of the Deans of the Colleges. The Director of Libraries is a member of the
Council of Deans.

The performance of the Director of Libraries is reviewed periodically by the Provost.
The Director of Libraries holds faculty rank and engages in teaching, research, and public
service functions of faculty to the extent feasible.

The Director of Libraries is assisted by an Associate Director of Libraries. The
Associate Director of Libraries reports directly to the Director. As delineated in the By-
Laws of the Library Faculty, the Associate Director of Libraries performs the duties of a
Department Head.
J. The Dean of Libraries

The Dean of Libraries is the chief administrative officer of the Clemson University Libraries. In dealing with the Library Faculty, the duties of the Dean of Libraries are the same as those of the Deans of the Colleges. The Dean of Libraries is a member of the Council of Deans.

The performance of the Dean of Libraries is reviewed periodically by the Provost. The Dean of Libraries holds faculty rank and engages in teaching, research, and public service functions of faculty to the extent feasible.

The Dean of Libraries is assisted by an Assistant Dean of Libraries. The Associate Dean of Libraries reports directly to the Dean. As delineated in the By-Laws of the Library Faculty, the Assistant Dean of Libraries performs the duties of a Department Head.

OLD (pp. 11)
For the selection of the dean of a college or the Director of Libraries, a committee shall be formed which includes at least one student, at least one department head (or equivalent) from within the college, and either an off-campus representative of an appropriate profession or a dean from another college within the University. The majority of the representatives to the committee shall be chosen by the faculty from within the affected administrative unit; the minority may be appointed by the Provost. The Provost shall make the appointment from the list submitted by the committee, subject to the approval of the President.

NEW
For the selection of the dean of a college or Libraries, a committee shall be formed which includes at least one student, at least one department head (or equivalent) from within the college, and either an off-campus representative of an appropriate profession or a dean from another college within the University. The majority of the representatives to the committee shall be chosen by the faculty from within the affected administrative unit; the minority may be appointed by the Provost. The Provost shall make the appointment from the list submitted by the committee, subject to the approval of the President.

OLD (pp. 41, Membership of Academic Council)
Membership consists of the President (chair), the Provost, the Academic Deans, The Director of the Libraries, the Vice President/Vice Provost for Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, the Vice President for Research, the chairs of the two Commissions, the President of the Faculty Senate, the Presidents of the Student Senate and Student Body, the President of the Graduate Student Association, a named Professor elected by the Faculty Senate, and the chair of the Organization of Department Heads.

NEW
Membership consists of the President (chair), the Provost, the Academic Deans, Dean of the Libraries, the Vice President/Vice Provost for Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, the Vice President for Research, the chairs of the two Commissions, the President of the Faculty Senate, the Presidents of
the Student Senate and Student Body, the President of the Graduate Student Association, a
named Professor elected by the Faculty Senate, and the chair of the Organization of
Department Heads.

OLD (pp. 49)
7. Libraries Advisory Committee. This committee reviews and advises on policies
for the University Libraries. Membership consists of the Director of Libraries (non-voting);
one faculty representative from each college; a Faculty Senator; an undergraduate student
representative; and a graduate student representative. The chair is elected annually from the
committee membership.

NEW
7. Libraries Advisory Committee. This committee reviews and advises on policies
for the University Libraries. Membership consists of the Dean of Libraries (non-voting);
one faculty representative from each college; a Faculty Senator; an undergraduate student
representative; and a graduate student representative. The chair is elected annually from the
committee membership.

OLD (pp. 54)
1. The Council of Academic Deans. This group advises the Provost and Vice
President for Academic Affairs on policy questions and serves as a forum for
communication between the Provost and the several colleges. Chaired by the Provost,
membership includes the Vice Provosts, the College Deans, the Director of University
Research, the Director of Libraries, the Director of Computing and Information
Technology, and the President of the Faculty Senate.

NEW
1. The Council of Academic Deans. This group advises the Provost and Vice
President for Academic Affairs on policy questions and serves as a forum for
communication between the Provost and the several colleges. Chaired by the Provost,
membership includes the Vice Provosts, the College Deans, the Dean of Libraries, the Director of Computing and Information
Technology, and the President of the Faculty Senate.

**OLD (pp. iii)
G. Committees Reporting to the Vice President for Finance

NEW
G. Committees Reporting to the Vice President for Business and Finance

OLD (pp.)
(NOTE - This committee reports to the Academic Council through the Commission on
Undergraduate Studies - VI.B.1.j.)
J. Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee. This committee is
concerned with the improvement and evaluation of teaching and with teaching resources,
including the Bookstore and audiovisual facilities. It supervises the student-teacher
evaluation program. Its membership consists of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate
Studies, a faculty representative from each college, and one graduate and three
undergraduate students (all from different colleges, rotated). The Director of Electronic and Photographic Services, a member of the Counseling Center, and the Manager of the Bookstore serve as non-voting resource members. The Provost appoints the chair.

(NOTE - This committee reports to the Vice-President for Business and Finance - VI.G.2.)

2. Bookstore Advisory Committee. This committee reviews and advises on policies for the University Bookstore. Membership consists of the Manager of the Bookstore (non-voting); one faculty representative from each college; an undergraduate student representative; and a graduate student representative. The chair is elected annually from the committee membership.

***OLD (pp. 46)
Subcommittees of the Facilities Planning Committee are: Safety and Fire Prevention, University Parking and Traffic, and University Committee on the Handicapped.

NEW
Subcommittees of the Facilities Planning Committee are: Safety and Fire Prevention, University Parking and Traffic, and the Committee on Access and Accommodations for Individuals with Disabilities.

OLD (pp. 46)
b. University Committee on the Handicapped. This committee functions to ensure that physically and mentally handicapped persons have the opportunity to participate fully in University programs and activities and are protected from discrimination in the pursuits of employment and education. The committee evaluates University programs and activities as they affect qualified handicapped individuals, monitors compliance by the University with applicable federal laws and regulations, and makes policy and procedure recommendations to the President. The committee consists of one representative from each college and the Library; one representative from the Office of Human Resources nominated by the Director of that office; one representative from the Physical Plant nominated by the Vice President for Business and Finance; one counselor from the Counseling Center nominated by the Vice President for Student Affairs; one handicapped student nominated by the Advisor to Handicapped Students for a one-year term; one Faculty Senate representative; the Advisor to Handicapped Students; and the Executive Officer, President's Office. The chair is authorized to request attendance by the Director of Public Safety, the Campus Master Planner, and the Athletic Director when an agenda item requires their expertise. Members are appointed by the President for three-year terms except as otherwise indicated. The chair is elected annually by the committee.

NEW
b. Committee on Access and Accommodations for Individuals with Disabilities. This committee functions to ensure that physically and mentally handicapped persons have the opportunity to participate fully in University programs and activities and are protected from discrimination in the pursuits of employment and education. The committee evaluates University programs and activities as they affect qualified handicapped individuals, monitors compliance by the University with applicable federal laws and regulations, and makes policy and procedure recommendations to the President. The committee consists of one representative from each college and the Library; one representative from the Office of Human Resources nominated
by the Director of that office; one representative from the Physical Plant nominated by the Vice President for Business and Finance; one counselor from the Counseling Center nominated by the Vice President for Student Affairs; one handicapped student nominated by the Advisor to Handicapped Students for a one-year term; one Faculty Senate representative; the Advisor to Handicapped Students; and the Executive Officer, President's Office. The chair is authorized to request attendance by the Director of Public Safety, the Campus Master Planner, and the Athletic Director when an agenda item requires their expertise. Members are appointed by the President for three-year terms except as otherwise indicated. The chair is elected annually by the committee.

OLD (pp. 69)
Clemson University has established a Committee on the Handicapped to assist the University's advisor to the Handicapped in counseling students. This Committee aids the advisor selecting curriculum and planning academic programs for students. (Committee responsibilities are listed in VI. Clc.)

NEW
Clemson University has established a Committee on Access and Accommodations for Individuals with Disabilities to assist the University's advisor to the Handicapped in counseling students. This Committee aids the advisor selecting curriculum and planning academic programs for students. (Committee responsibilities are listed in VI. Clc.)

****Alumni Professor -- Alumni Distinguished Professor

OLD (p 6)
Having the general supervision over all University activities, the President is an ex officio member of all University councils, commissions, and committees and serves as liaison officer between the Board of Trustees and the University Faculty and Staff. The President presides at meetings of the Academic Council and at University commencements. The President approves appointments to Alumni Professorships and endowed professorships and chairs and recommendations for tenure, promotion, dismissal, and termination. Appeals by faculty and students concerning grievances may be heard by the President after regular procedures have been followed. The President appoints the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, as well as the other executive officers, and reviews the appointee's performance in their offices.

NEW
Having the general supervision over all University activities, the President is an ex officio member of all University councils, commissions, and committees and serves as liaison officer between the Board of Trustees and the University Faculty and Staff. The President presides at meetings of the Academic Council and at University commencements. The President approves appointments to Alumni Distinguished Professorships and endowed professorships and chairs and recommendations for tenure, promotion, dismissal, and termination. Appeals by faculty and students concerning grievances may be heard by the President after regular procedures have been followed. The President appoints the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, as well as the other executive officers, and reviews the appointee's performance in their offices.

OLD (p 20)
For selection of Alumni Professors, each college elects an advisory committee with representatives from each department offering undergraduate courses. Each advisory committee forwards not more than three nominees for each vacancy to the Dean, who forwards not more than two names
for each vacancy to the Final Selection Committee. This committee, composed of the academic deans and chaired by the senior dean in terms of service as dean, recommends at least two candidates for each vacancy to the Provost. The Provost forwards all documentation, along with any comments of his own, to the President for final selection. If the President so directs, the Provost asks the committee for additional nominations.

NEW
For selection of Alumni Distinguished Professors, each college elects an advisory committee with representatives from each department offering undergraduate courses. Each advisory committee forwards not more than three nominees for each vacancy to the Dean, who forwards not more than two names for each vacancy to the Final Selection Committee. This committee, composed of the academic deans and chaired by the senior dean in terms of service as dean, recommends at least two candidates for each vacancy to the Provost. The Provost forwards all documentation, along with any comments of his own, to the President for final selection. If the President so directs, the Provost asks the committee for additional nominations.

OLD (p 48)
1. Alumni Professors Committee. Meets periodically to explore interdisciplinary concerns and advise the Provost on teaching awards, candidates for the Master Teacher in Residence, and such other matters as the Provost brings to their attention. Membership consists of all Alumni Professors with the chair elected by the members.

NEW
1. Alumni Distinguished Professors Committee. Meets periodically to explore interdisciplinary concerns and advise the Provost on teaching awards, candidates for the Master Teacher in Residence, and such other matters as the Provost brings to their attention. Membership consists of all Alumni Distinguished Professors with the chair elected by the members.

ITEM 2: CHANGE OF TITLE AND TERM

OLD (pp. 44-45)
C. Committees Reporting to the President

1. Campus Names Committee. Officially named the Special Advisory Committee on Names to the Board of Trustees, this committee recommends appropriate names for University lands and facilities. The faculty members of this committee are nominated by the chair of the committee from members of the faculty who have long terms of service with the University. They are appointed by the President of the University for indefinite terms. Non-faculty members are Presidential appointees. The chair is appointed by the President.

NEW
C. Committees Reporting to the President

1. Special Advisory Committee on Names to the Board of Trustees. This committee recommends appropriate names for University lands and facilities. The faculty members of this committee are nominated by the chair of the committee from members of the faculty who have
long terms of service with the University. Faculty and non-faculty members are appointed by the President of the University to annually renewable terms. The chair is appointed by the President.

ITEM 3: CHANGE TO WHOM COMMITTEE REPORTS

OLD (pp. 52)
F. Committees Reporting to the Vice President for Student Affairs
4. Financial Aid Committee. This committee reviews and recommends policy on financial aid to the Vice President for Student Affairs. Members are the Director of Financial Aid; a graduate student representative; one undergraduate student selected by the Student Senate President; one undergraduate student elected by the Minority Council; and four faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate to two-year terms.

NEW
D. Committees Reporting to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Financial Aid Committee. This committee reviews and recommends policy on financial aid to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Members are the Director of Financial Aid; a graduate student representative; one undergraduate student selected by the Student Senate President; one undergraduate student elected by the Minority Council; and four faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate to two-year terms.

ITEM 4: CHANGE OF COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEE AND SEPARATION OF COMMITTEE FROM POLICY

OLD (pp. 78, as part of the Honorary Degrees Policy)
A selection committee shall be established consisting of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall serve as Chairperson; the President of the Faculty Senate, who shall serve as Secretary; the most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; an Alumni Professor appointed by the President; and the Chairman of the Institutional Advancement Committee of the Board of Trustees. The Committee shall evaluate the candidates and submit its recommendations for the awarding of honorary degrees to the President of the University. The President will forward his recommendation to the Board of Trustees for approval. Consideration for the awarding of honorary degrees shall be limited to occasions of special significance to Clemson and when the awarding would clearly express the ideals of the University or recognize exceptional attainment.

NEW (Move text to pp. 48 (relative))
C. Committees Reporting to the President
6. Honorary Degrees Selection Committee
A selection committee shall be established consisting of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall serve as Chairperson; the President of the
Faculty Senate, who shall serve as Secretary; the most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; two Alumni Distinguished Professors nominated by the Alumni Distinguished Professors themselves, one Endowed Chair/Titled Professor to be nominated by their own group; and the Chairperson of the Institutional Advancement Committee of the Board of Trustees. The Committee shall evaluate the candidates and submit its recommendations for the awarding of honorary degrees to the President of the University. The President will forward his recommendation to the Board of Trustees for approval.

NEW (pp. 78, delete some text & add committee name)

I. Honorary Degrees Policy

Clemson University confers honorary degrees in recognition of eminent achievement in scholarship or creativity, or of high distinction in public service, including meritorious contributions to the University. The awarding of honorary degrees is to be regarded as a method by which the University expresses its ideals and recognizes exceptional attainments. The following policy, adopted by the Board of Trustees, governs the selection of honorary degree recipients.

Nominations of candidates for honorary degrees may be made by any interested person to the President of the University or to the Honorary Degrees Selection Committee by submitting in written form the accomplishments of the nominee.

Consideration for the awarding of honorary degrees shall be limited to occasions of special significance to Clemson and when the awarding would clearly express the ideals of the University or recognize exceptional attainment.
PRESIDENT’S REPORT
FEBRUARY, 1993

1. The February, 1993 Faculty Senate Meeting is very important. Please note the following items for consideration:

   a) Presentation of the Slate of Faculty Senate Officers:

      Vice President/President-Elect: Jim Davis
      Walt Owens

      Additional nominations may be made from the floor for the office of VP/PE. Nominations from the floor will be received for the office of Secretary.

      Elections will be held at the March, 1993 Faculty Senate Meeting.

   b) Two members will be elected at the February Faculty Senate Meeting to the Grievance Board for a two-year term. Nominees must be Full or Associate Professors; members or alternates of the Faculty Senate at the time of election; and must be from different colleges. Colleges from which to elect are:

      Agricultural Sciences
      Architecture
      Engineering
      Liberal Arts

   c) According to the Faculty Manual, a named professor is to be elected by the Faculty Senate to a three-year term on the Academic Council. Gordon Halfacre, Alumni Distinguished Professor from the Department of Horticulture, will complete his term in April, 1993. The Executive/Advisory Committee will present a slate to the Senate at the March meeting, at which time elections will be held.

2. Plans are now being arranged for the Faculty Senate Annual Spring Reception to honor retiring senators, continuing senators, and to welcome newly-elected senators. Invitations will be mailed at a later date; however, please plan to attend this event which will follow the April 13th Senate meeting.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

3. David Underwood advised me that a pilot study has been completed wherein the faculty in two departments did an evaluation, via a written questionnaire, of their department heads. This was done by and for the University’s Assessment Committee. They believe the effort was purposeful and will suggest to the deans that this process be used for all department heads. They will also suggest that it be done soon for department heads and, that eventually, it be done for deans. David has pointed out to me that this will be the first forced effect at Clemson, in “bottom up” assessment. If you see David, say thanks.

4. Attached is a draft “Founding Statement” for a newly-formed Conference of South Carolina University Faculty Chairs. Please give me written comments. Do we want to endorse this group? Do we want our Senate President to represent us in the conference?
Conference of South Carolina University Faculty Chairs

Founding Statement of Goal, Purposes and 1993 Plan of Action

(Draft for discussion at a Conference Meeting on February 12, 1993)

The Conference of South Carolina University Faculty Chairs is composed of the elected faculty chairs at all public universities in South Carolina. It was founded in December, 1992 with a goal to provide a strong faculty voice advocating for public higher education in the State of South Carolina. The specific purposes of the Conference are:

1. to exchange information on matters of mutual interest among the faculties of member institutions;
2. to make representations to university administrations, the Commission on Higher Education, legislators and legislative bodies and other public officials in furtherance of the goal of the Conference;
3. to inform the news media and public-at-large on the necessity and value of a strong commitment to public higher education;
4. to undertake other activities deemed appropriate by the Conference and its Executive Committee in furtherance of the goal of the Conference.

The full Conference meets at least twice each year and more often as necessary. An Executive Committee, representative of the diversity of public universities in the State, meets in the interim.

At its second meeting, held in early January, 1993, the Conference concluded that the first priority should be given to direct advocacy for increased support for higher education in the State of South Carolina. It was the unanimous conclusion of the Conference that during the past several years declining legislative and executive support for higher education had begun a process seriously eroding the fabric of higher education in South Carolina. Decreased state assistance and commitment continues to cause excessive tuition and fee hikes, deferred maintenance on physical facilities, a shortage of laboratory and computer equipment including software, a shortage of classroom and office space, inadequate library space, book holdings and specialized journals, inadequate faculty resources and excessive reliance on part-time faculty, overcrowded classrooms, disincentives for high quality out-of-state students decreasing the diversity of the student body, and more restricted access to a university education for South Carolina students who, if they leave the state for higher education, are likely to be lost to the future of the state forever.

This background of the erosion of the fabric of higher education amounts to living off of your capital. Once it is used up, there is nothing left. This will happen to South Carolina unless the state legislature and other elected officials acknowledge the necessity of increasing support for higher education in South Carolina.

From the perspective of the Faculty Chairs in 1993, public university education in South Carolina is at a crossroads. Down one road is more of the same as in the recent past and therefore continuing erosion and decline and with it a depressed and depressing future for every single South Carolinian. Down the other road is a commitment to establishing public university education as a priority of the first order. The Conference believes that the elected executive and legislative officers of this State will choose the second road and with it a brighter and growing future for every citizen and for the State as a whole. As a result, the Conference will work through all appropriate means to achieve that goal.
Faculty Manual Amendment
to Change Process for Distribution of
Hearing Panel's Findings

Presented by the Policy & Welfare Committees
January 9, 1993

Delete the underlined sentence from 3 e.iii. (page 38) of the Faculty Manual, Section V, Grievance Procedures:

iii. Within fifteen days of the final hearing, the Panel shall submit its findings and recommendations to the Provost along with appropriate documents, and records. Simultaneously, a copy of the Panel's findings and recommendations shall be forwarded to the grievant.

Delete the word "final" from "The Provost shall render a final decision no later than ..." Substitute "all named parties" for "other parties directly concerned" and add the phrase "together with the report of the Hearing Panel." After editing, 3.f (page 38) of the Faculty Manual, Section V, Grievance Procedures will read as follows:

f. Upon receipt of the Hearing Panel's recommendation, the Provost shall review the matter, requesting any persons involved to provide additional information as needed. The Provost shall render a decision no later than fifteen days after the receipt of the Panel's recommendation. The decision and findings of the Provost, together with the report of the Hearing Panel, shall be transmitted in writing to the faculty member, the Hearing Panel, and all named parties.

Comments:
The proposed change

1. Moves the time at which the grievant receives a copy of the report of the Hearing Panel from when the Provost receives the report to when the Provost distributes a decision.

2. Provides for all named parties to receive a copy of the report of the Hearing Panel. Currently, only the grievant and the Provost receive this report.

Passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on February 9, 1993.
RESOLUTION REGARDING CONFIDENTIALITY OF PERSONNEL MATTERS

FS93-2-1 P

Resolved, all personnel matters are confidential and matters of trust to the extent allowed by law.

This statement will become the new second paragraph in the Faculty Manual, Section D., “Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure and Promotion,” page 25. The current second paragraph will then become the new third paragraph, and so on.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate on February 9, 1993.
b. Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee. The Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee is responsible for establishing the predicted grade-point ratio for admission to each college within the University. This grade-point ratio will be established in consultation with the Dean of each college, the Provost, and the Vice Provost for Admissions and Registration. Students failing to meet this minimum will be admitted only upon the approval of the Admissions Exceptions Committee. The only exceptions to this procedure may be student-athletes receiving athletic aid who meet NCAA freshman eligibility requirements. Members are the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies (chair); the chair of the Student Senate Committee on Academic Affairs; a Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee representative; a representative of the Student Minority Council; the Vice Provost for Admissions and Registration; and one faculty representative from each college. Non-voting members are the Director of Admissions, the Director of Housing, and the Registrar. There are two sub-committee of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee:

Passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on February 9, 1993.
1. What percentage of the lectures in Environmental Science are you teaching?

   I think some of you probably know that this semester I’m involved in teaching a class, a sophomore level course, introductory course in Environmental Systems Engineering. It meets for three hours each Monday and the way we have organized the class, is basically, I teach a third of the course, President Lennon teaches a third of the course and a third of the course is either through examination, field trips, or external speakers. We have come up with that kind of combination at this point within the course. It’s been interesting to me because I’ve taught a graduate course several times since I have been at Clemson, but it’s been nearly 15 years since I had taught an undergraduate course. The topics were particularly suited. I spent, I think some of you know, 15 years in the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. Some of the issues that are related to the course are particularly appropriate, and deal with air quality, water quality, ecological principles, and that sort of thing, so it’s been a lot of fun. We had the same difficulty trying to get sophomores to ask us questions, trying to engage them, trying to get them excited in some respects, I’m not sure we have done all that well, but we try. It’s been a lot of fun. The percentage time for me would be one-third.

2. Have you made any attempts to implement Total Quality Management in your area? If so, what are they and have they been successful?

   We have made some attempts. I’m not sure that I would be so bold as to tell you that they have been successful. We started about two years ago in the College of Engineering trying to create a certification program. Think about it as a faculty member trying to develop a proposal—you go through a department head, a dean, come over to the Research Office and get 2-3 signatures involved, and it finally gets off campus. The College of Engineering asked us on a trial basis to certify their people, to train the people in the their Dean’s Office. There are 42 federal laws that effect research. They would take responsibility for dealing with those 42 laws. That has been tried, it is underway, it’s available to any college that wishes to do it. I think it’s an important step in empowering people to deal with that part of the University. That’s a proposal and until the contract is signed after you win the awards, so we can always make adjustments during the negotiation period. One of the things that we started, I think many of you know, that for about a year I acted in an interim capacity in the Graduate Office in the Dean’s role. One of the things that we tried to do, and I hope it will follow through, was at a meeting with one of the deans of the University of Wisconsin. His comment to me was, “it takes us 90 days to process an application to the Graduate School. In 1990, we decided that we were going to change that and do it in 5 days.” How do you go from 90 to 5 days? They explained that the system was very simple. The application for Graduate School is one form, one page long. At the top is says tell us your name and what you want to study. Second questions said: At Wisconsin we calculate GPRs in the following manner: calculate yours on this side of the page. Third question said: Tell us what you made on the GRE, GMAT, or whatever and write the number down. Then is said, tell us where you went to school, what degrees you have. Then, please list one person that could verify the information so that if we have a question, we could ask. Then it said, if you have below a certain GPR and below a certain GRE, whatever, your likelihood of being accepted here is very low unless there is an extenuating circumstances. If you think you have an extenuating circumstance, tell us. Decisions were made quickly. A letter went out saying Dear Alan, you have been accepted in the Grad School of the University of Wisconsin in the Fall of 1993. This acceptance is based on what you submitted in this particular application. It is now upon you to verify within the next 60 days. All they did was verify their acceptance, rather than verify the entire population, and then
make a selection. They saved about $400,000. Their number of applications are much higher than Clemson’s. That was a concept, I don’t know where it is within the Graduate School, but that was one area in TQM that I thought was exciting, and I thought would serve as an interesting way for us to reduce numbers of people, save some money, but the most important thing, perhaps, was that the quality of the graduate students went up because there was a tendency for that individual that got contacted very quickly and was told that they were accepted, would forget about some of the other places that they had applied.

Another area in TQM is in the compliance area. I know that none of you in this room likes compliance. It’s a policeman job, policing forty-something laws, it is boring work, not interesting, it can get you in lots of trouble if you don’t do it. We’ve talked about would it be possible for the whole state of SC to have one compliance body. Does Clemson really need all that skill for each of those? You have a number of schools that will duplicate that compliance structure. Would there be some economy of scale to have a single compliance function, one person that knows the rules on the subjects necessary to make sure you have the protocol and policy. One person that knows what the rules are in the use of carcinogens in the use of a laboratory. We haven’t had much luck with that. It has not gone very far.

3. How has your area been impacted by the last couple of years’ budget restrictions?

As an administrative unite we have taken the maximum percent of the cuts just as all the other vice presidential areas have. We have lost about $180,000 that was typically used to match equipment, so if a faculty member wrote an award that called for institution or university matched equipment, we have a little money that we could put into that. Minor things would be cutbacks in travel, not filling vacant positions, that’s not unusual, the whole campus is involved in that.

4. What is your perception of your area’s relationship to the academic side of campus?

I’m not sure what exactly what was meant by that. I tend to view research and scholarship in the discovery process to be very much a part of the academic part of the campus. Does somebody want to amplify on the question?

5. Has consideration been given to modifying the return of research overhead to the academic departments? How can you assure the faculty that the funds get past the deans’ office?

We have look at several different ways to allocate indirect costs. The model that I think is the most innovative is one that I don’t think will get a great deal of support for, but it is a good model to think about. One university allows the faculty members to develop a proposal to control a high percentage of indirect costs to give to anybody else on campus but themselves. I write a proposal, I win the the award, and then the indirect cost of $50,000. I have been a little entrepreneur. If the Research Office was particularly helpful to me, I’d give them $5,000. If the procurement people really went out of their way and did a good job for me to meet a deadline, I’ll ship some of the money to their office. There’s one place that does that, that might be a good model to think about. It gets an awful lot of response in this within the system. The other area I suspect to see some changes is in the interdisciplinary areas. You’ve got a group in plant sciences, cut across 4-5 different departments, a variety of different, several colleges involved, awfully difficult for them to sort out distribution of the reallocation of that indirect unless some portion of the money goes back to that team or group. It will be focused initially around some of the areas of strategic planning.
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS:

Huffman: The question of research incentive funds which are supposed to be 25% of the grant returned to the dean’s office. In the College of Sciences the current year budget we received $78,000 to correspond with total grants for 90-91 of $312,000. We generated a lot more than $312,000 in 90-91 in Sciences. Where did the money go?

I have no idea. I don't deal at all in allocation. That's a question that you would have to ask David Larson. You have to know that the state formula was not in effect, so in reality the state didn't pay for it in the last two years, and secondly, had they paid it, they'd pay it as a percentage of formula. So, the formula is 100% funded if you pay the quarter of the dollar. There's a weighted number there, and that may have been used in the allocations. You are exactly in terms in concept 25% money, research incentive money 100% of that goes back to the College dean. The second factor, and this is where it sometimes gets a bit more difficult, indirect costs if full indirect costs are collected, the dean gets 40% of that. There's a policy that says if it's less than full percent, you might not get anything back, or less than 30% I don't think you get anything back.

Schaffer: The idea of having a single compliance officer sounds like a very good move. What's the resistance?

I think you'd probably envision it becoming a road block in getting people to respond to your paperwork quickly enough, turn around time that you need. It would be more costly at the outset, whether or not it became a power to itself and grew.

Schaffer: What do you think of as the most successful thing you have been able to do as VP of Research?

The part that I'm proudest of, would be that in 1986, the numbers that I have seen, remember that accounting systems have changed so it's a little difficult to know whether or not you are really seeing the truth in the numbers I give you, so keep this in mind. Less than 20% of our faculty were involved in externally-supported research, grants, contracts, scholarships. Last year it was a little over 60% of our faculty were in some way involved. To me, that's impressive to have grown to that point. When I look at the College of Education and look at 1986-87 research $143,000, last year is a little over 4 million dollars. I realize that's controversial, but it tells me that probably more people are participating in that form of scholarship.

Schaffer: What do you see as your worst failure?

Probably the ability to staff the compliance office is not very good. It is never a positive thing. Probably back in the mid-80s when the budgets were a little better, I should have been more aggressive and gotten the office staffed the way it should be. In the health physics area, I have one FTE. At a college in SC, I will find 7 maybe 8 FTEs assigned. It tells me that we have to really have to pay attention in the health and safety areas.
1. **Call to Order.** Vice President/President-Elect Alan Schaffer called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The General Faculty Minutes dated December 16, 1992 were approved as corrected; and the Faculty Senate Minutes dated January 12, 1993 were approved as written.

3. **Special Order of the Day.** George J. Gogue, Vice President for Research, was introduced, and responded to questions previously submitted by the Faculty Senate. Answers to these questions are on file in the Faculty Senate Office, and will be made available upon request.

4. **Slate of Officers.** Alan Schaffer presented the Slate of Officers from the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate:

   - **Vice President/President-Elect:** James Davis (Commerce & Industry)
   - **Walt Owens (Liberal Arts)**
   - **Secretary:** David Leigh (Engineering)

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

5. **Committee Reports**

   a. **Committee Reports**

      - **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Richard Conover stated that this Committee studied and endorsed the interdisciplinary course now before the Undergraduate Studies Commission from the Honors College; and the Provost's proposed change to the Faculty Manual regarding exceptions to the Admissions Policy which will be discussed under New Business.

      - **Welfare Committee.** Senator Brenda Vander Mey stated that there was no report.

      - **Finance Committee.** Senator James Davis reported that a joint report by the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Vice Presidents' Administrative Growth Reports and the Finance Committee will be brought to the Senate in the near future. The Finance Committee will assist Vice President of Business & Finance, David Larson, with the evaluation of the administrative cost containment proposal.
Policy Committee. Senator Eleanor Hare submitted the Policy Committee Report (Attachment A). This Committee has prepared a draft letter which addresses the position of the Associate Vice Provost reporting to the Provost. Considerations by the Policy Committee have included proposed changes to the Grievance II procedure and the question of filing a grievance to expedite (require?) action on issues. The Policy Committee was asked to meet with the Athletic Council to draw up a position description of the faculty representative to the NCAA. This issue was referred to the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Research Committee. Senator Bill Bridges stated that there was no report.

b. University Commissions and Committees

1) ad hoc Committee on Campus Safety - Senator Vander Mey stated that plans have been finalized for Rape Awareness Week, March 8-12, 1993.

2) ad hoc Committee of the Joint City/University Committee - Senate Alternate Jerry Waldvogel reported that the report forming the strategic plan to improve University and community interactions has been made available to the Faculty Senate. Alan Schaffer announced that the University had declined the idea of annexation of the University by the City.

3) Commission on the Status of Women at Clemson University - Senate Alternate Joanne Deeken asked about the status of this Commission. Alan Schaffer responded that the Commission had been established by the President, and should begin to meet soon.

4) Faculty Manual Committee - Glenn Birrenkott, Chair of this Committee, submitted and explained minor changes to the Faculty Manual for approval by the Senate. Following the acceptance of friendly amendments, vote to accept amended changes was taken, and passed unanimously (Attachment B).


7. Old Business

a. William Baron (Engineering) and Alan Schaffer (Liberal Arts) were elected by acclamation to serve on the Grievance Board.

8. New Business

a. Senator Hare submitted a Faculty Manual Amendment to Amend Grievance II Procedures (Attachment D) from the Policy and Welfare Committees. Following discussion, vote to accept amendment was taken and passed unanimously.

b. Senator Vander Mey submitted a resolution regarding Confidentiality of Personnel Matters from the Welfare Committee. Discussion followed. Alternate Deeken offered a friendly amendment, which was accepted by Committee. Vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment E) (FS93-2-1 P).
c. Senator Conover submitted a **Faculty Manual** Amendment regarding the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee from the Scholastic Policies Committee. Following discussion which included friendly amendments, vote to accept amended amendment was taken, and passed unanimously (Attachment F).

d. Alan Schaffer informed the Senate that Dedication Ceremonies for the Brooks Performing Arts Center are planned for December 2-4, 1993, which will be during Reading and Dead Days. This issue was raised at the President's Cabinet Meeting, and President Lennon is aware of the problem.

9. **Adjournment.** Vice President/President-Elect Schaffer adjourned the meeting at 5:08 p.m.

[Signatures]

Lucy Rollin, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Policy Committee Report
February 9, 1993

The following responses were received from the questions distributed with the January packet:

Last year's Faculty Senate Survey was effective in communicating faculty concerns and perceptions to the administration.

- strongly agree XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
- agree XXXXXX
- no opinion
- disagree
- strongly disagree

These areas, not covered in last year's survey, should be covered in a future survey.

- College Adm. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
- Provost XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- University mission vs. Competition with other State institutions</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Funds allocation and justification undergraduate cost and expenditures</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- University policy, honesty and integrity of administration</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strong need to look at chair system vs. headship system with Clemson now has</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The question on business growth</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ag Division administration (Ag and Natural Resources)</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should the Senate do another survey this spring?

- Yes XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
- No Opinion X
- No XXXXXXX (4 of these said next year/every other year)

Meetings of the Policy Committee are scheduled for February 18 and March 23 at 3 p.m.
ITEM 1: CHANGE OF TITLE

*Director of Libraries -- Dean

OLD (pp. 7)
The Provost also receives recommendations on curricular matters from University curriculum committees and forwards recommendations to the President; approves the bylaws of the collegiate faculties and reviews the minutes of their meetings; receives and transmits to the Faculty proposed amendments to the Faculty Constitution; presides at meetings of the University Faculty; evaluates the performance in office of the academic deans; appoints search-and-screening committees for certain administrative positions; recommends the appointment of academic administrators to the President; chairs the Council of Academic Deans; serves as liaison officer between the Faculty Senate and the President; and delegates authority to the Vice Provosts, the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Director of Libraries.

NEW
The Provost also receives recommendations on curricular matters from University curriculum committees and forwards recommendations to the President; approves the bylaws of the collegiate faculties and reviews the minutes of their meetings; receives and transmits to the Faculty proposed amendments to the Faculty Constitution; presides at meetings of the University Faculty; evaluates the performance in office of the academic deans; appoints search-and-screening committees for certain administrative positions; recommends the appointment of academic administrators to the President; chairs the Council of Academic Deans; serves as liaison officer between the Faculty Senate and the President; and delegates authority to the Vice Provosts, the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Dean of Libraries.

OLD (pp. 9)
J. The Director of Libraries

The Director of Libraries is the chief administrative officer of the Clemson University Libraries. In dealing with the Library Faculty, the duties of the Director of Libraries are the same as those of the Deans of the Colleges. The Director of Libraries is a member of the Council of Deans.

The performance of the Director of Libraries is reviewed periodically by the Provost. The Director of Libraries holds faculty rank and engages in teaching, research, and public service functions of faculty to the extent feasible.

The Director of Libraries is assisted by an Associate Director of Libraries. The Associate Director of Libraries reports directly to the Director. As delineated in the By-Laws of the Library Faculty, the Associate Director of Libraries performs the duties of a Department Head.
NEW
J. The Dean of Libraries

The Dean of Libraries is the chief administrative officer of the Clemson University Libraries. In dealing with the Library Faculty, the duties of the Dean of Libraries are the same as those of the Deans of the Colleges. The Dean of Libraries is a member of the Council of Deans.

The performance of the Dean of Libraries is reviewed periodically by the Provost. The Dean of Libraries holds faculty rank and engages in teaching, research, and public service functions of faculty to the extent feasible.

The Dean of Libraries is assisted by an Assistant Dean of Libraries. The Associate Dean of Libraries reports directly to the Dean. As delineated in the By-Laws of the Library Faculty, the Assistant Dean of Libraries performs the duties of a Department Head.

OLD (pp. 11)
For the selection of the dean of a college or the Director of Libraries, a committee shall be formed which includes at least one student, at least one department head (or equivalent) from within the college, and either an off-campus representative of an appropriate profession or a dean from another college within the University. The majority of the representatives to the committee shall be chosen by the faculty from within the affected administrative unit; the minority may be appointed by the Provost. The Provost shall make the appointment from the list submitted by the committee, subject to the approval of the President.

NEW For the selection of the dean of a college or Libraries, a committee shall be formed which includes at least one student, at least one department head (or equivalent) from within the college, and either an off-campus representative of an appropriate profession or a dean from another college within the University. The majority of the representatives to the committee shall be chosen by the faculty from within the affected administrative unit; the minority may be appointed by the Provost. The Provost shall make the appointment from the list submitted by the committee, subject to the approval of the President.

OLD (pp. 41, Membership of Academic Council)
Membership consists of the President (chair), the Provost, the Academic Deans, The Director of the Libraries, the Vice President/Vice Provost for Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, the Vice President for Research, the chairs of the two Commissions, the President of the Faculty Senate, the Presidents of the Student Senate and Student Body, the President of the Graduate Student Association, a named Professor elected by the Faculty Senate, and the chair of the Organization of Department Heads.

NEW Membership consists of the President (chair), the Provost, the Academic Deans, Dean of the Libraries, the Vice President/Vice Provost for Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, the Vice President for Research, the chairs of the two Commissions, the President of the Faculty Senate, the Presidents of
the Student Senate and Student Body, the President of the Graduate Student Association, a named Professor elected by the Faculty Senate, and the chair of the Organization of Department Heads.

OLD (pp. 49)
7. Libraries Advisory Committee. This committee reviews and advises on policies for the University Libraries. Membership consists of the Director of Libraries (non-voting); one faculty representative from each college; a Faculty Senator; an undergraduate student representative; and a graduate student representative. The chair is elected annually from the committee membership.

NEW
7. Libraries Advisory Committee. This committee reviews and advises on policies for the University Libraries. Membership consists of the Dean of Libraries (non-voting); one faculty representative from each college; a Faculty Senator; an undergraduate student representative; and a graduate student representative. The chair is elected annually from the committee membership.

OLD (pp. 54)
1. The Council of Academic Deans. This group advises the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs on policy questions and serves as a forum for communication between the Provost and the several colleges. Chaired by the Provost, membership includes the Vice Provosts, the College Deans, the Director of University Research, the Director of Libraries, the Director of Computing and Information Technology, and the President of the Faculty Senate.

NEW
1. The Council of Academic Deans. This group advises the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs on policy questions and serves as a forum for communication between the Provost and the several colleges. Chaired by the Provost, membership includes the Vice Provosts, the College Deans, the Dean of Libraries, the Director of Computing and Information Technology, and the President of the Faculty Senate.

**OLD (pp. iii)
G. Committees Reporting to the Vice President for Finance

NEW
G. Committees Reporting to the Vice President for Business and Finance

OLD (pp. )
(NOTE - This committee reports to the Academic Council through the Commission on Undergraduate Studies - VI.B.1.j.)

j. Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee. This committee is concerned with the improvement and evaluation of teaching and with teaching resources, including the Bookstore and audiovisual facilities. It supervises the student-teacher evaluation program. Its membership consists of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, a faculty representative from each college, and one graduate and three
undergraduate students (all from different colleges, rotated). The Director of Electronic and Photographic Services, a member of the Counseling Center, and the Manager of the Bookstore serve as non-voting resource members. The Provost appoints the chair.

(NOTE - This committee reports to the Vice-President for Business and Finance - VI.G.2.)

2. Bookstore Advisory Committee. This committee reviews and advises on policies for the University Bookstore. Membership consists of the Manager of the Bookstore (non-voting); one faculty representative from each college; an undergraduate student representative; and a graduate student representative. The chair is elected annually from the committee membership.

***OLD (pp. 46)
Subcommittees of the Facilities Planning Committee are: Safety and Fire Prevention, University Parking and Traffic, and University Committee on the Handicapped.

NEW
Subcommittees of the Facilities Planning Committee are: Safety and Fire Prevention, University Parking and Traffic, and the Committee on Access and Accommodations for Individuals with Disabilities.

OLD (pp. 46)
b. University Committee on the Handicapped. This committee functions to ensure that physically and mentally handicapped persons have the opportunity to participate fully in University programs and activities and are protected from discrimination in the pursuits of employment and education. The committee evaluates University programs and activities as they affect qualified handicapped individuals, monitors compliance by the University with applicable federal laws and regulations, and makes policy and procedure recommendations to the President. The committee consists of one representative from each college and the Library; one representative from the Office of Human Resources nominated by the Director of that office; one representative from the Physical Plant nominated by the Vice President for Business and Finance; one counselor from the Counseling Center nominated by the Vice President for Student Affairs; one handicapped student nominated by the Advisor to Handicapped Students for a one-year term; one Faculty Senate representative; the Advisor to Handicapped Students; and the Executive Officer, President's Office. The chair is authorized to request attendance by the Director of Public Safety, the Campus Master Planner, and the Athletic Director when an agenda item requires their expertise. Members are appointed by the President for three-year terms except as otherwise indicated. The chair is elected annually by the committee.

NEW
b. Committee on Access and Accommodations for Individuals with Disabilities. This committee functions to ensure that physically and mentally handicapped persons have the opportunity to participate fully in University programs and activities and are protected from discrimination in the pursuits of employment and education. The committee evaluates University programs and activities as they affect qualified handicapped individuals, monitors compliance by the University with applicable federal laws and regulations, and makes policy and procedure recommendations to the President. The committee consists of one representative from each college and the Library; one representative from the Office of Human Resources nominated
by the Director of that office; one representative from the Physical Plant nominated by the Vice President for Business and Finance; one counselor from the Counseling Center nominated by the Vice President for Student Affairs; one handicapped student nominated by the Advisor to Handicapped Students for a one-year term; one Faculty Senate representative; the Advisor to Handicapped Students; and the Executive Officer, President’s Office. The chair is authorized to request attendance by the Director of Public Safety, the Campus Master Planner, and the Athletic Director when an agenda item requires their expertise. Members are appointed by the President for three-year terms except as otherwise indicated. The chair is elected annually by the committee.

OLD (pp. 69)
Clemson University has established a Committee on the Handicapped to assist the University’s advisor to the Handicapped in counseling students. This Committee aids the advisor selecting curriculum and planning academic programs for students. (Committee responsibilities are listed in VI. Clc.)

NEW
Clemson University has established a Committee on Access and Accommodations for Individuals with Disabilities to assist the University’s advisor to the Handicapped in counseling students. This Committee aids the advisor selecting curriculum and planning academic programs for students. (Committee responsibilities are listed in VI. Clc.)

****Alumni Professor -- Alumni Distinguished Professor

OLD (p 6)
Having the general supervision over all University activities, the President is an ex officio member of all University councils, commissions, and committees and serves as liaison officer between the Board of Trustees and the University Faculty and Staff. The President presides at meetings of the Academic Council and at University commencements. The President approves appointments to Alumni Professorships and endowed professorships and chairs and recommendations for tenure, promotion, dismissal, and termination. Appeals by faculty and students concerning grievances may be heard by the President after regular procedures have been followed. The President appoints the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, as well as the other executive officers, and reviews the appointee’s performance in their offices.

NEW
Having the general supervision over all University activities, the President is an ex officio member of all University councils, commissions, and committees and serves as liaison officer between the Board of Trustees and the University Faculty and Staff. The President presides at meetings of the Academic Council and at University commencements. The President approves appointments to Alumni Distinguished Professorships and endowed professorships and chairs and recommendations for tenure, promotion, dismissal, and termination. Appeals by faculty and students concerning grievances may be heard by the President after regular procedures have been followed. The President appoints the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, as well as the other executive officers, and reviews the appointee’s performance in their offices.

OLD (p 20)
For selection of Alumni Professors, each college elects an advisory committee with representatives from each department offering undergraduate courses. Each advisory committee forwards not more than three nominees for each vacancy to the Dean, who forwards not more than two names
for each vacancy to the Final Selection Committee. This committee, composed of the academic deans and chaired by the senior dean in terms of service as dean, recommends at least two candidates for each vacancy to the Provost. The Provost forwards all documentation, along with any comments of his own, to the President for final selection. If the President so directs, the Provost asks the committee for additional nominations.

NEW
For selection of Alumni Distinguished Professors, each college elects an advisory committee with representatives from each department offering undergraduate courses. Each advisory committee forwards not more than three nominees for each vacancy to the Dean, who forwards not more than two names for each vacancy to the Final Selection Committee. This committee, composed of the academic deans and chaired by the senior dean in terms of service as dean, recommends at least two candidates for each vacancy to the Provost. The Provost forwards all documentation, along with any comments of his own, to the President for final selection. If the President so directs, the Provost asks the committee for additional nominations.

OLD (p 48)
1. Alumni Professors Committee. Meets periodically to explore interdisciplinary concerns and advise the Provost on teaching awards, candidates for the Master Teacher in Residence, and such other matters as the Provost brings to their attention. Membership consists of all Alumni Professors with the chair elected by the members.

NEW
1. Alumni Distinguished Professors Committee. Meets periodically to explore interdisciplinary concerns and advise the Provost on teaching awards, candidates for the Master Teacher in Residence, and such other matters as the Provost brings to their attention. Membership consists of all Alumni Distinguished Professors with the chair elected by the members.

ITEM 2: CHANGE OF TITLE AND TERM

OLD (pp. 44-45)
C. Committees Reporting to the President

1. Campus Names Committee. Officially named the Special Advisory Committee on Names to the Board of Trustees, this committee recommends appropriate names for University lands and facilities. The faculty members of this committee are nominated by the chair of the committee from members of the faculty who have long terms of service with the University. They are appointed by the President of the University for indefinite terms. Non-faculty members are Presidential appointees. The chair is appointed by the President.

NEW
C. Committees Reporting to the President

1. Special Advisory Committee on Names to the Board of Trustees. This committee recommends appropriate names for University lands and facilities. The faculty members of this committee are nominated by the chair of the committee from members of the faculty who have
long terms of service with the University. Faculty and non-faculty members are appointed by the President of the University to annually renewable terms. The chair is appointed by the President.

ITEM 3: CHANGE TO WHOM COMMITTEE REPORTS

OLD (pp. 52)
F. Committees Reporting to the Vice President for Student Affairs
4. Financial Aid Committee. This committee reviews and recommends policy on financial aid to the Vice President for Student Affairs. Members are the Director of Financial Aid; a graduate student representative; one undergraduate student selected by the Student Senate President; one undergraduate student elected by the Minority Council; and four faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate to two-year terms.

NEW
D. Committees Reporting to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
   Financial Aid Committee. This committee reviews and recommends policy on financial aid to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Members are the Director of Financial Aid; a graduate student representative; one undergraduate student selected by the Student Senate President; one undergraduate student elected by the Minority Council; and four faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate to two-year terms.

ITEM 4: CHANGE OF COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEE AND SEPARATION OF COMMITTEE FROM POLICY

OLD (pp. 78, as part of the Honorary Degrees Policy)
A selection committee shall be established consisting of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall serve as Chairperson; the President of the Faculty Senate, who shall serve as Secretary; the most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; an Alumni Professor appointed by the President; and the Chairman of the Institutional Advancement Committee of the Board of Trustees. The Committee shall evaluate the candidates and submit its recommendations for the awarding of honorary degrees to the President of the University. The President will forward his recommendation to the Board of Trustees for approval. Consideration for the awarding of honorary degrees shall be limited to occasions of special significance to Clemson and when the awarding would clearly express the ideals of the University or recognize exceptional attainment.

NEW (Move text to pp. 48 (relative))
C. Committees Reporting to the President
6. Honorary Degrees Selection Committee
A selection committee shall be established consisting of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall serve as Chairperson; the President of the
Faculty Senate, who shall serve as Secretary; the most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; two Alumni Distinguished Professors nominated by the Alumni Distinguished Professors themselves, one Endowed Chair/Titled Professor to be nominated by their own group; and the Chairperson of the Institutional Advancement Committee of the Board of Trustees. The Committee shall evaluate the candidates and submit its recommendations for the awarding of honorary degrees to the President of the University. The President will forward his recommendation to the Board of Trustees for approval.

NEW (pp. 78, delete some text & add committee name)
I. Honorary Degrees Policy

Clemson University confers honorary degrees in recognition of eminent achievement in scholarship or creativity, or of high distinction in public service, including meritorious contributions to the University. The awarding of honorary degrees is to be regarded as a method by which the University expresses its ideals and recognizes exceptional attainments. The following policy, adopted by the Board of Trustees, governs the selection of honorary degree recipients.

Nominations of candidates for honorary degrees may be made by any interested person to the President of the University or to the Honorary Degrees Selection Committee by submitting in written form the accomplishments of the nominee.

Consideration for the awarding of honorary degrees shall be limited to occasions of special significance to Clemson and when the awarding would clearly express the ideals of the University or recognize exceptional attainment.
PRESIDENT'S REPORT
FEBRUARY, 1993

1. The February, 1993 Faculty Senate Meeting is very important. Please note the following items for consideration:

   a) Presentation of the Slate of Faculty Senate Officers:

      Vice President/President-Elect: Jim Davis
                                         Walt Owens

      Additional nominations may be made from the floor for the office of VP/PE. Nominations from the floor will be received for the office of Secretary.

      Elections will be held at the March, 1993 Faculty Senate Meeting

   b) Two members will be elected at the February Faculty Senate Meeting to the Grievance Board for a two-year term. Nominees must be Full or Associate Professors; members or alternates of the Faculty Senate at the time of election; and must be from different colleges. Colleges from which to elect are:

      Agricultural Sciences  
      Architecture           
      Engineering           
      Liberal Arts          

   c) According to the Faculty Manual, a named professor is to be elected by the Faculty Senate to a three-year term on the Academic Council. Gordon Halfacre, Alumni Distinguished Professor from the Department of Horticulture, will complete his term in April, 1993. The Executive/Advisory Committee will present a slate to the Senate at the March meeting, at which time elections will be held.

2. Plans are now being arranged for the Faculty Senate Annual Spring Reception to honor retiring senators, continuing senators, and to welcome newly-elected senators. Invitations will be mailed at a later date; however, please plan to attend this event which will follow the April 13th Senate meeting.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

3. David Underwood advised me that a pilot study has been completed wherein the faculty in two departments did an evaluation, via a written questionnaire, of their department heads. This was done by and for the University's Assessment Committee. They believe the effort was purposeful and will suggest to the deans that this process be used for all department heads. They will also suggest that it be done soon for department heads and, that eventually, it be done for deans. David has pointed out to me that this will be the first forced effect at Clemson, in “bottom up” assessment. If you see David, say thanks.

4. Attached is a draft “Founding Statement” for a newly-formed Conference of South Carolina University Faculty Chairs. Please give me written comments. Do we want to endorse this group? Do we want our Senate President to represent us in the conference?
Conference of South Carolina University Faculty Chairs

Founding Statement of Goal, Purposes and 1993 Plan of Action

(Draft for discussion at a Conference Meeting on February 12, 1993)

The Conference of South Carolina University Faculty Chairs is composed of the elected faculty chairs at all public universities in South Carolina. It was founded in December, 1992 with a goal to provide a strong faculty voice advocating for public higher education in the State of South Carolina. The specific purposes of the Conference are:

1. to exchange information on matters of mutual interest among the faculties of member institutions;
2. to make representations to university administrations, the Commission on Higher Education, legislators and legislative bodies and other public officials in furtherance of the goal of the Conference;
3. to inform the news media and public-at-large on the necessity and value of a strong commitment to public higher education;
4. to undertake other activities deemed appropriate by the Conference and its Executive Committee in furtherance of the goal of the Conference.

The full Conference meets at least twice each year and more often as necessary. An Executive Committee, representative of the diversity of public universities in the State, meets in the interim.

At its second meeting, held in early January, 1993, the Conference concluded that the first priority should be given to direct advocacy for increased support for higher education in the State of South Carolina. It was the unanimous conclusion of the Conference that during the past several years declining legislative and executive support for higher education had begun a process seriously eroding the fabric of higher education in South Carolina. Decreased state assistance and commitment continues to cause excessive tuition and fee hikes, deferred maintenance on physical facilities, a shortage of laboratory and computer equipment including software, a shortage of classroom and office space, inadequate library space, book holdings and specialized journals, inadequate faculty resources and excessive reliance on part-time faculty, overcrowded classrooms, disincentives for high quality out-of-state students decreasing the diversity of the student body, and more restricted access to a university education for South Carolina students who, if they leave the state for higher education, are likely to be lost to the future of the state forever.

This background of the erosion of the fabric of higher education amounts to living off of your capital. Once it is used up, there is nothing left. This will happen to South Carolina unless the state legislature and other elected officials acknowledge the necessity of increasing support for higher education in South Carolina.

From the perspective of the Faculty Chairs in 1993, public university education in South Carolina is at a crossroads. Down one road is more of the same as in the recent past and therefore continuing erosion and decline and with it a depressed and depressing future for every single South Carolinian. Down the other road is a commitment to establishing public university education as a priority of the first order. The Conference believes that the elected executive and legislative officers of this State will choose the second road and with it a brighter and growing future for every citizen and for the State as a whole. As a result, the Conference will work through all appropriate means to achieve that goal.
Faculty Manual Amendment
to Change Process for Distribution of
Hearing Panel's Findings

Presented by the Policy & Welfare Committees
January 9, 1993

Delete the underlined sentence from 3 e.iii. (page 38) of the Faculty Manual, Section V.

Grievance Procedures:

   iii. Within fifteen days of the final hearing, the Panel shall submit its
         findings and recommendations to the Provost along with appropriate
         documents, and records. Simultaneously, a copy of the Panel's
         findings and recommendations shall be forwarded to the grievant.

Delete the word "final" from "The Provost shall render a final decision no later than ..." Substitute
"all named parties" for "other parties directly concerned" and add the phrase "together with the
report of the Hearing Panel." After editing, 3.f (page 38) of the Faculty Manual, Section V.

Grievance Procedures will read as follows:

   f. Upon receipt of the Hearing Panel's recommendation, the Provost
      shall review the matter, requesting any persons involved to provide
      additional information as needed. The Provost shall render a
decision no later than fifteen days after the receipt of the Panel's
      recommendation. The decision and findings of the Provost, together
      with the report of the Hearing Panel, shall be transmitted in writing
to the faculty member, the Hearing Panel, and all named parties.

Comments:

The proposed change

   1. Moves the time at which the grievant receives a copy of the report of the Hearing
      Panel from when the Provost receives the report to when the Provost distributes a
decision.

   2. Provides for all named parties to receive a copy of the report of the Hearing Panel
      Currently, only the grievant and the Provost receive this report.

Passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate
on February 9, 1993.
RESOLUTION REGARDING CONFIDENTIALITY OF PERSONNEL MATTERS

FS93-2-1 P

Resolved, all personnel matters are confidential and matters of trust to the extent allowed by law.

This statement will become the new second paragraph in the Faculty Manual. Section D., "Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure and Promotion," page 25. The current second paragraph will then become the new third paragraph, and so on.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate on February 9, 1993.
b. Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee. The Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee is responsible for establishing the predicted grade-point ratio for admission to each college within the University. This grade-point ratio will be established in consultation with the Dean of each college, the Provost, and the Vice Provost for Admissions and Registration. Students failing to meet this minimum will be admitted only upon the approval of the Admissions Exceptions Committee. The only exceptions to this procedure may be student-athletes receiving athletic aid who meet NCAA freshman eligibility requirements. Members are the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies (chair); the chair of the Student Senate Committee on Academic Affairs; a Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee representative; a representative of the Student Minority Council; the Vice Provost for Admissions and Registration; and one faculty representative from each college. Non-voting members are the Director of Admissions, the Director of Housing, and the Registrar. There are two sub-committee of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee:

Passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on February 9, 1993.
QUESTIONS FOR JAY GOGUE
VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH
FEBRUARY 9, 1993

1. What percentage of the lectures in Environmental Science are you teaching?

   I think some of you probably know that this semester I'm involved in teaching a class, a sophomore level course, introductory course in Environmental Systems Engineering. It meets for three hours each Monday and the way we have organized the class, is basically, I teach a third of the course, President Lennon teaches a third of the course and a third of the course is either through examination, field trips, or external speakers. We have come up with that kind of combination at this point within the course. It's been interesting to me because I've taught a graduate course several times since I have been at Clemson, but it's been nearly 15 years since I had taught an undergraduate course. The topics were particularly suited. I spent, I think some of you know, 15 years in the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. Some of the issues that are related to the course are particularly appropriate, and deal with air quality, water quality, ecological principles, and that sort of thing, so it's been a lot of fun. We had the same difficulty trying to get sophomores to ask us questions, trying to engage them, trying to get them excited in some respects, I'm not sure we have done all that well, but we try. It's been a lot of fun. The percentage time for me would be one-third.

2. Have you made any attempts to implement Total Quality Management in your area? If so, what are they and have they been successful?

   We have made some attempts. I'm not sure that I would be so bold as to tell you that they have been successful. We started about two years ago in the College of Engineering trying to create a certification program. Think about it as a faculty member trying to develop a proposal - you go through a department head, a dean, come over to the Research Office and get 2-3 signatures involved, and it finally gets off campus. The College of Engineering asked us on a trial basis to certify their people, to train the people in the their Dean's Office. There are 42 federal laws that effect research. They would take responsibility for dealing with those 42 laws. That has been tried, it is underway, it's available to any college that wishes to do it. I think it's an important step in empowering people to deal with that part of the University. That's a proposal and until the contract is signed after you win the awards, so we can always make adjustments during the negotiation period. One of the things that we started, I think many of you know, that for about a year I acted in an interim capacity in the Graduate Office in the Dean's role. One of the things that we tried to do, and I hope it will follow through, was at a meeting with one of the deans of the University of Wisconsin. His comment to me was, "it takes us 90 days to process an application to the Graduate School. In 1990, we decided that we were going to change that and do it in 5 days." How do you go from 90 to 5 days? They explained that the system was very simple. The application for Graduate School is one form, one page long. At the top is says tell us your name and what you want to study. Second questions said: At Wisconsin we calculate GPRs in the following manner: calculate your on this side of the page. Third question said: Tell us what you made on the GRE, GMAT, or whatever and write the number down. Then is said, tell us where you went to school, what degrees you have. Then, please list one person that could verify the information so that if we have a question, we could ask. Then it said, if you have below a certain GPR and below a certain GRE, whatever, your likelihood of being accepted here is very low unless there is an extenuating circumstances. If you think you have an extenuating circumstance, tell us. Decisions were made quickly. A letter went out saying Dear Alan, you have been accepted in the Grad School of the University of Wisconsin in the Fall of 1993. This acceptance is based on what you submitted in this particular application. It is now upon you to verify within the next 60 days. All they did was verify their acceptance, rather than verify the entire population, and then
make a selection. They saved about $400,000. Their number of applications are much higher than Clemson's. That was a concept, I don't know where it is within the Graduate School, but that was one area in TQM that I thought was exciting, and I thought would serve as an interesting way for us to reduce numbers of people, save some money, but the most important thing, perhaps, was that the quality of the graduate students went up because there was a tendency for that individual that got contacted very quickly and was told that they were accepted, would forget about some of the other places that they had applied.

Another area in TQM is in the compliance area. I know that none of you in this room likes compliance. It's a policeman job, policing forty-something laws, it is boring work, not interesting, it can get you in lots of trouble if you don't do it. We've talked about would it be possible for the whole state of SC to have one compliance body. Does Clemson really need all that skill for each of those? You have a number of schools that will duplicate that compliance structure. Would there be some economy of scale to have a single compliance function, one person that knows the rules on the subjects necessary to make sure you have the protocol and policy. One person that knows what the rules are in the use of carcinogens in the use of a laboratory. We haven't had much luck with that. It has not gone very far.

3. How has your area been impacted by the last couple of years' budget restrictions?

As an administrative unite we have taken the maximum percent of the cuts just as all the other vice presidential areas have. We have lost about $180,000 that was typically used to match equipment, so if a faculty member wrote an award that called for institution or university matched equipment, we have a little money that we could put into that. Minor things would be cutbacks in travel, not filling vacant positions, that's not unusual, the whole campus is involved in that.

4. What is your perception of your area's relationship to the academic side of campus?

I'm not sure what exactly what was meant by that. I tend to view research and scholarship in the discovery process to be very much a part of the academic part of the campus. Does somebody want to amplify on the question?

5. Has consideration been given to modifying the return of research overhead to the academic departments? How can you assure the faculty that the funds get past the deans' office?

We have look at several different ways to allocate indirect costs. The model that I think is the most innovative is one that I don't think will get a great deal of support for, but it is a good model to think about. One university allows the faculty members to develop a proposal to control a high percentage of indirect costs to give to anybody else on campus but themselves. I write a proposal, I win the the award, and then the indirect cost of $50,000. I have been a little entrepreneur. If the Research Office was particularly helpful to me, I'd give them $5,000. If the procurement people really went out of their way and did a good job for me to meet a deadline, I'll ship some of the money to their office. There's one place that does that, that might be a good model to think about. It gets an awful lot of response in this within the system. The other area I suspect to see some changes is in the interdisciplinary areas. You've got a group in plant sciences, cut across 4-5 different departments, a variety of different, several colleges involved, awfully difficult for them to sort out distribution of the reallocation of that indirect unless some portion of the money goes back to that team or group. It will be focused initially around some of the areas of strategic planning.
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS:

**Huffman:** The question of research incentive funds which are supposed to be 25% of the grant returned to the dean’s office. In the College of Sciences the current year budget we received $78,000 to correspond with total grants for 90-91 of $312,000. We generated a lot more than $312,000 in 90-91 in Sciences. Where did the money go?

I have no idea. I don’t deal at all in allocation. That’s a question that you would have to ask David Larson. You have to know that the state formula was not in effect, so in reality the state didn’t pay for it in the last two years, and secondly, had they paid it, they’d pay it as a percentage of formula. So, the formula is 100% funded if you pay the quarter of the dollar. There’s a weighted number there, and that may have been used in the allocations. You are exactly in terms in concept 25% money, research incentive money 100% of that goes back to the College dean. The second factor, and this is where it sometimes gets a bit more difficult, indirect costs if full indirect costs are collected, the dean gets 40% of that. There’s a policy that says if it’s less than full percent, you might not get anything back, or less than 30% I don’t think you get anything back.

**Schaffer:** The idea of having a single compliance officer sounds like a very good move. What’s the resistance?

I think you’d probably envision it becoming a road block in getting people to respond to your paperwork quickly enough, turn around time that you need. It would be more costly at the outset, whether or not it became a power to itself and grew.

**Schaffer:** What do you think of as the most successful thing you have been able to do as VP of Research?

The part that I’m proudest of, would be that in 1986, the numbers that I have seen, remember that accounting systems have changed so it’s a little difficult to know whether or not you are really seeing the truth in the numbers I give you, so keep this in mind. Less than 20% of our faculty were involved in externally-supported research, grants, contracts, scholarships. Last year it was a little over 60% of our faculty were in some way involved. To me, that’s impressive to have grown to that point. When I look at the College of Education and look at 1986-87 research $143,000, last year is a little over 4 million dollars. I realize that’s controversial, but it tells me that probably more people are participating in that form of scholarship.

**Schaffer:** What do you see as your worst failure?

Probably the ability to staff the compliance office is not very good. It is never a positive thing. Probably back in the mid-80s when the budgets were a little better, I should have been more aggressive and gotten the office staffed the way it should be. In the health physics area, I have one FTE. At a college in SC, I will find 7 maybe 8 FTEs assigned. It tells me that we have to really have to pay attention in the health and safety areas.
1. **Call to Order.** President William Baron called the meeting to order at 3:39 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated February 9, 1993 were approved as written.

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 candidates; there being none, elections were held by secret ballot. Walt Owens was elected Vice President/President-Elect and David Leigh was elected Secretary.

   **Election of Named Professor to the Academic Council** - Don McKale, Class of 1941 Memorial Professor of Humanities, was elected by secret ballot to the Academic Council for a three-year term.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Committee Reports**

   **Welfare Committee.** Senator Brenda Vander Mey submitted and briefly discussed Notes from the Welfare Committee (Attachment A); and requested a sense of the Senate for two items under New Business.

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Dick Conover submitted this Committee's Report (Attachment B); and announced that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is proposing that the University change or dismiss the rule that all undergraduate majors should provide for ten hours of free electives or for the ROTC Program.

   **Finance Committee.** Senator Jim Davis reported that this Committee continues to address issues regarding remuneration for the President's wife from the Development Office and pay for two dismissed employees.

   **Policy Committee.** Senator Eleanor Hare submitted the Policy Committee Report (Attachment C).

   **Research Committee.** No report.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**

   1) **ad hoc Committee on Campus Safety** - Senator Vander Mey provided the schedule of events during the successful Rape Awareness Week.

   2) **Open Forum** - Senator John Huffman reported that this method of communication has been reactivated, and for faculty to expect an issue in the near future.
3) **Strategic Planning Committee - Communication Focus Groups** - Senate Alternate Jerry Waldvogel informed the Senate that issues and recommendations have been offered from the seven focus groups to improve communication within the University. The Senate was encouraged to monitor the pulse of this process to ensure recommendations come to fruition (Attachment D).

4) **Faculty Manual Committee** - Glenn Birrenkott, Chair of this Committee, presented its Final Report for 1992-93 (Attachment E). Special thanks were given to Beth Helsel, Marsha McCurley, and Ches Martin for their assistance in putting the Faculty Manual on DORIS.

Dr. Birrenkott then submitted Faculty Manual changes to the Senate for approval (Attachment F). Following an explanation of each item, motion to accept changes was received and seconded. Vote to accept changes passed unanimously.

5) **ad hoc Committee to Review the Vice Presidents' Administrative Growth Reports** - Senator Huffman submitted a Summary Report from this Committee (Attachment G), noting much growth in the areas of Research and Business & Finance and nominal growth in Administration and Student Affairs. Because this Committee was unable to assess the growth in the area of Academic Affairs, additional information was requested. It is expected that a new report will be submitted and studied. Discussion followed, during which President Baron stated that the Faculty Senate will respond to these reports, and requested that input be directed to him.

5. **President's Report.** President Baron presented the President's Report (Attachment H). Items discussed included: the possible new University Smoking Policy, undergraduate education, the issue of termination of two University employees, and the distribution of one percent monies.

6. **Old Business**

   a. Senator Jim Rathwell (Agricultural Sciences) was elected to serve on the Grievance Board for a two-year term.

7. **New Business**

   a. Senator Syble Oldaker submitted a memorandum dated March 1, 1993 from Professor Richard R. Montanucci (Attachment I), and made a motion that it be forwarded to the Solicitor with a cover letter from the President of the Faculty Senate asking for a response. Motion was seconded. Discussion followed. Vote to forward letter was taken and passed unanimously.

   b. On behalf of the Welfare Committee, Senator Jerry Waddle requested and received the sense of the Senate on two items: (1) the Bill proposed by Lewis Vaughn regarding dual employment of state employees; and (2) a letter regarding the acceptance of deferred compensation by President Lennon.

   c. Based on the response of a recent poll of senators to provide an update of the 1992 Faculty Survey this year, Senator Mary Lynn Moon submitted a Draft Survey from the Policy Committee for consideration. President Baron suggested that the Senate not
consider this item today. A vote was taken to consider this issue today and passed. The floor was opened for discussion. An amendment to Question 13 was accepted. Senator Moon moved that the Faculty Senate accept this document from the Faculty Senate Policy Committee as amended to be completed and sent out to the faculty and the results collated. Motion was seconded. Vote to accept, complete, and disseminate amended document was taken, and passed.

8. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 5:52 p.m.

Lucy Rollin, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Notes From the Welfare Committee

March 8, 1993

The Committee will present its final report on Distribution of Effort of faculty at the April, 1993 meeting of Faculty Senate. Senators Vander Mey and Rathwell have been analyzing a wealth of materials regarding this topic. Much of the material was provided by David Fleming, who attended a recent conference on this issue.

The Committee reviewed the policy for conversion from 12-month to 9-month faculty appointment. (See Appendix A.)

The Committee discussed a bill proposed by Lewis Vaughn. (See Appendix B.) If passed, this bill will prohibit dual employment of state employees. Some members were unclear as to whether faculty would be affected. In a telephone conversation with Senator Vander Mey, Paul Michaud indicated that they probably would be. The Administration here at Clemson has written to Vaughn, indicating that this bill would be detrimental to Clemson's operations.

The Committee asks for a sense of the Senate regarding this matter.

One member of the Committee was informally approached by a faculty member who felt that the Senate should write a letter of condemnation to President Lennon regarding his acceptance of his Deferred Compensation. (The information on this compensation was distributed to Faculty Senate by Gary Ransdell on February 10, 1993. This condensation also was made public four years ago and then again this February.)

The Committee asks for a sense of the Senate regarding this matter.

The next Welfare Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 23, 1993, at 3:30 p.m. in 110 Brackett. PLEASE NOTE THIS DATE; IT IS MERELY THE SECOND DAY AFTER SPRING BREAK. PLEASE MARK THIS MEETING ON YOUR CALENDAR. THANK YOU.
ADDENDUM TO POLICY FOR CONVERSION FROM
TWELVE-MONTH TO NINE-MONTH APPOINTMENT

Traditionally, the appointment of faculty in the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources has been on a 12-month basis. This term of employment has been considered to be appropriate given the year-round responsibilities associated with research and extension. However, from the perspective of personnel management, the current appointment preference of some individuals with 12-month faculty appointments to convert to a 9-month appointment, and the need to compete in a national system that is moving toward more 9-month appointments suggest a policy change is in order.

This policy addendum provides a system that will permit a faculty member to convert from a 12-month appointment to a 9-month appointment without a mandatory salary reduction that would strain the financial obligations of the faculty member, but at the same time be fair to the faculty member and to the state of South Carolina as regards the financial arrangements.

The policy addendum provides that a faculty member with a 12-month appointment may convert to a 9-month appointment under the following provisions.

1. The faculty member requesting the change must have the recommendation of his/her department head and the approval of the administration of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

2. The faculty member requesting and obtaining approval for a 12-month to 9-month appointment conversion will receive the 12-month salary in effect as of June 30 of the year of the effective date of the appointment change for three 9-month contracts with the 9-month contract being normally for the August 15 to May 16 period. Salary
raises after the 36-month (three 9-month contracts) will be based upon merit.

3. The traditional 9-month contract period is August 15 to May 16; however, the 9-month contract period resulting from a 12-month appointment change may be flexible but any change from the August 15-May 16 period must be recommended by the department head and approved by the administration of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

4. The individual converting to a 9-month appointment may receive payment at the time of change in appointment for any accrued annual leave up to 45 days or request that accrued leave be held for credit toward retirement annuity.

5. Individuals who at their initiative or at the request of the administration of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources desire that the 9-month appointment be changed to a 12-month appointment may do so under the following conditions:

(a) the change must be recommended by the department head and approved by the administration of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources; and

(b) the 12-month appointment will carry a salary not greater than the salary at the effective date of the change plus an amount equal to the sum of the average salary raises during the three (3) 9-month contract periods.
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A BILL

TO AMEND THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, 1976,
BY ADDING SECTION 2-1-106 SO AS TO PROVIDE THAT NO
PERSON EMPLOYED IN STATE GOVERNMENT IN A FULL-TIME
SALARIED OFFICE OR POSITION MAY RECEIVE
COMPENSATION FROM ANY OTHER AGENCY OR DEPARTMENT OF
STATE GOVERNMENT, INCLUDING INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER
LEARNING, TO DEFINE COMPENSATION FOR THIS PURPOSE,
AND TO PROVIDE EXCEPTIONS.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State
of South Carolina:

SECTION 1. The 1976 Code is amended by adding:

"Section 2-1-106. (A) No person employed in
state government in a full-time salaried office or
position may receive compensation from any other
agency or department of state government, including
institutions of higher learning. Compensation as
used in this subsection does not include per diem,
mileage, and subsistence received in the
performance of responsibilities.

(B) The provisions of this section do not apply
to the compensation received for service in a state
public office which is filled by popular election."

SECTION 2. This act takes effect upon approval
by the Governor.

-----XX-----

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671
REPORT FROM SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE-FEBRUARY 26, 1993

Our Committee held an extensive discussion of these topics and agreed to provide them for your information:

A. The last Friday of the semester before final exams is now a “reading day”. (No classes can meet). The Undergraduate Studies Commission just voted (about 10-3) “not to revisit” this issue now, despite the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee’s request. Senior Vice Provost Reel wrote to the President on February 15 as follows:

The University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is very concerned that the decision to create a “Reading Day” (i.e.: The last Friday before exams during which no lecture classes are held) has thrown the semester teaching schedule off, because it shortened the time allocated for teaching by 50 minutes. They request that the decision be reconsidered this Spring and that, because it affects the amount of time, they desire to be included in the decision recommending process.

President Baron asked for our Committee’s response. We decided (3-1 vote) to support the reading day as a valuable aid to the serious students who need and use the day to prepare before final exams, whether all students do this or not. However, we feel the Senate should have more information on our colleagues’ opinions concerning this and are asking the Policy Committee to include this issue among the Clemson University policy issues in the next Faculty Survey. Dr. Rice is drafting a specific proposed question about this for the Policy Committee.

B. The Undergraduate Studies Commission just passed (7-5 vote) the following policy, to go into the schedule books and announcements as soon as possible if approved by the Academic Council:

All students are required to attend the first scheduled day of classes and labs for which they are registered. If a student can not attend a class, then the student is responsible for contacting the instructor of that class to indicate the student’s intent to remain in that class. If a student does not attend the first class meeting or else make contact with the instructor by the second class/lab meeting or the last day to add, whichever comes first, then the instructor has the option to drop that student from the class/lab.

This policy’s purpose is to authorize instructors with full rosters to drop the “no-shows” soon enough to enable other students who need the class to add it within the first week. While the three students on the Undergraduate Studies Commission supported the concept, they voted against this statement due to fear that a professor would drop someone who tried to reach him and was unable to.

Most of our Committee support this statement on the grounds that a student who cannot reach a professor can send word to him through someone else or ask his department to leave him a message. One member, however, felt that he and the departmental secretary will be pestered by too many students phoning him to be excused from the first class.

C. This year, Mr. Jim Burns, Chair of the Student Senate Academic Affairs Committee (who also serves on the Undergraduate Studies Commission), has been attending our Scholastic Policies Committee meetings as an ex-officio advisor. He has been very helpful as a source of student concerns on undergraduate scholastic issues. We recommend that in future years this Committee continue to include representation from the Student Senate in this way.
The Policy Committee met February 18 and March 4.

At the request of faculty in the Microbiology Department, a mini-survey was conducted. Results are being sent to the departmental faculty, Department Head, Dean and Provost.

A letter was sent to Provost Jennett suggesting a method of avoiding a conflict with the Faculty Manual in the appointment of non-academic administrators in his office.

A form for tracking the appointment of academic administrators is being developed for approval at the April Senate meeting. The form is intended to become a part of the Faculty Manual.

A draft of a Faculty Senate Survey has been prepared for consideration by the Senate. This survey incorporates faculty suggestions and policy issues currently under consideration by the University.

Next meeting date: March 23 at 3 p.m. in LL-3, Cooper Library.
Summary of the Communication Focus Groups

Introduction
Following from the December 1992 Strategic Planning Committee Meeting, 7 focus groups with faculty, staff, and administrators were held in February 1993 to discuss strategies for improving vertical communication within the University. A total of 65 individuals: the 7 vice presidents, 10 collegiate deans, 12 other administrators (including 8 academic department heads), 27 faculty, and 9 staff members participated. Each focus group lasted one hour and the participants discussed the following four questions:

1. What hinders downward communication at Clemson University?
2. What strategies would improve downward communication at Clemson?
3. What hinders upward communication at Clemson University?
4. What strategies would improve upward communication at Clemson?

A compilation of comments from the groups is presented in a separate document. Based on those comments, the following issues and recommendations are offered.

Issues and Recommendations
Informal communication with higher-level administration. Informal communication with higher-level administrators needs to be increased and enhanced. Participants described a sense that their input is not heard, that input is not seriously considered, and that decisions are made with input requested after the fact. This has contributed to a "lack of trust" which was a common theme throughout the focus groups. Most participants felt that communication with immediate supervisors was adequate to good. The lack of a university/faculty club was cited as one roadblock to improving communication and trust across the campus.

Meetings. A general consensus was that there are too many meetings and that these meetings are inefficient. Participants felt that fewer, better-conducted meetings would improve communication. Some participants expressed frustration that committees tend "to trip over each other" with no clear sense of which committee is responsible for various actions and decisions. The need to remind committee members of their responsibility to transmit meeting information to their constituents was also cited.

Written communication. Participants expressed a desire for fewer written communications. One of the biggest complaints was the large volume of written information received and that this information is not targeted to the proper audience. The use of mass mailings was viewed as inefficient and a waste of resources. The use of e-mail was suggested, if: 1) everyone can get access to e-mail and 2) a method is established for individuals to indicate what correspondence they would like to receive. In all cases, brevity of communication was suggested with the inclusion of the name of a contact person for more information.

University-wide meetings. Participants felt the president and upper-level administration are missing opportunities for meaningful dialogue with the university community. The dwindling attendance at general faculty meetings was cited as a prime example. Participants expressed the desire for these meetings to be more substantive with meaningful dialogue. The "show and tell" portions of these meetings were viewed unfavorably. University-wide communications from the upper-level administration should be used to foster dialogue and to seek input from the campus community.

Training. Training for administrative personnel in fostering communication is needed. While some participants felt some administrators did not care to improve communications, many would benefit from such training especially in terms of listening skills and soliciting input from others. The fact that listening is a two-way street was mentioned by several participants.

University Culture. Perhaps the strongest message was the need to improve the culture of the campus. The lack of trust was cited frequently. A sense that official policy states one thing but university actions are pointed in another direction was evident. Leadership from the President and upper-level administration must provide a consistent message that is being translated into actions. Morale has been affected when words are not translated into observable actions. A clear indication that decisions are followed by actions is needed.

Perceived lack of decisiveness on the part of the upper-level administration is an important issue. Most focus groups agreed that hard decisions can be accepted if they are supported by facts and follow from broad-based input. The groups indicated a need for the university leadership "to lead," engage the faculty in meaningful and sincere dialogue, and make and implement decisions.

Postscript
This summary was written by Ron Nowaczyk and Jerry Trapnell who conducted the focus groups at the request of Stassen Thompson, Chairman of the University Strategic Planning Committee. The focus groups and this summary benefited from the assistance and advice of Kathy Clarkson, Cathy Sams, David Underwood and Sandy Underwood. However, the views in this summary are those of the authors and should not be viewed as a committee or university report.
The Faculty Manual committee met this academic year after a year of relatively little activity. All of the current members (D. Brosnan, J. Cheezem, E. Hare, R. Waller, C. Sturkie and G. Birrenkott) worked hard at sifting through the proposed changes and incorporating them into the FM. We submitted semantic or minor editorial changes to the Faculty Senate at the February meeting and the more substantial changes at the March meeting. In addition to the proposed changes there were several other noteworthy accomplishments this year. The current Faculty Manual is now available on DORIS through the efforts of Beth Helsel, Marsha McCurley and Ches Martin. These three worked very hard. I would like to single Marsha out for her role in indexing the Faculty Manual. The Faculty Manual is also available on diskette in both Mac and DOS formats.

But, there are still several issues which need to be addressed by the Faculty Senate and administration.

1. Availability and distribution of the Faculty Manual.
Acceptance of changes to the FM in February by the Faculty Senate and Provost resulted in all faculty having out-of-date, spiral-bound versions of the FM. Insertion of changes in these notebooks is not feasible. Coupled with the administration's desire to document with a signature, each faculty members' receipt of a manual with grievance procedures, CU faces a large printing and binding charge. The old, pre-1991, FM was contained in a 3-ring binder which made updates relatively inexpensive and painless. This would seem to be a more logical method of hardcopy distribution of a document which is subject to change and would be consistent with other manuals distributed by CU. In addition, maintenance of the most current version of the FM on DORIS will allow all Clemson faculty and administrators to peruse and search by keywords and indexed items. Other electronic forms of distribution could be on diskette, to all departments or on reserve in the library, or as an FTPable file on the mainframe or VAX.

2. Procedures for updating the Manual
The following is a flow diagram of how changes are to be made to the FM (pp 1-2 of the current Manual). As you can see - a change must be approved twice by both the Faculty Senate and Provost. It is as cumbersome as it looks! Could the process be streamlined? and who tracks where a potential change is in the process? Would routing slips help to track changes?
3. Including "clinical faculty" in the Faculty Manual (description, etc.) (From the College of Nursing).

4. Evaluation of department heads during second year has not been resolved and did not make it into the Manual this year.

5. All Faculty Manual changes approved by the Faculty Senate and the Provost through February, 1993 have been, as of this meeting, returned to the Faculty Senate for final confirmation.
PROPOSED CHANGES TO FACULTY MANUAL
Faculty Manual Committee - March, 1993

**Item #1** Add new section to the Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University, Article II, Section 7

Section 7. Permanent Committees
Permanent committees, in addition to the standing committees provided for in the Constitution, may be created for purposes which extend beyond those normally associated with ad hoc committees.

The permanent committees of the Faculty Senate and their duties are:

**The Finance Committee.** The Finance Committee investigates and reports to the Faculty Senate relevant financial matters of the University.

**Item #2. Change of Description - Fine Arts Committee**

**OLD**
6. **Fine Arts Committee.** This committee plans, coordinates, and publicizes the annual program of University concerts, films, lectures, plays, and art exhibits. It consists of a chair appointed by the Provost; the Deans of the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Architecture; one Faculty Senator; one faculty representative from each academic college; one undergraduate; and one graduate student.

**NEW**
6. **Fine Arts Committee.** This committee is charged with the general oversight, coordination and promotion of the cultural and artistic enrichment of campus life. It reviews the annual program of University fine arts activity and provides advise and guidance in the planning and execution of this program. The Fine Arts Committee shall appoint representatives to the advisory committees of campus organizations which regularly program fine arts events. Membership consists of one faculty representative from each college; a representative of the classified staff selected by the Staff Commission; a faculty senator; an undergraduate student representative; a graduate student representative; and an appointee of the Provost. The committee annually elects its own chair.

**Item #3. Change makeup of the Athletic Council**

**OLD** (Part VI. F.2.f)

f. One member of the Faculty Senate appointed by the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate.

**NEW**

f. The President of the Faculty Senate or a member of the Faculty Senate nominated by the President of the Senate and elected by the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate.
Item #4. Athletic Department now answers to President through VP for Administration

OLD
6. Vice President for Student Affairs:
   a. Admissions, Registration, and Financial Aid; b. Athletic Department; c. Career Services; d. Counseling Center; e. Housing; f. Intramural Sports; g. Student Development; h. Student Health Services; i. Student Union.

NEW
6. Vice President for Student Affairs:
   a. Admissions, Registration, and Financial Aid; b. Career Services; c. Counseling Center; d. Housing; e. Intramural Sports; f. Student Development; g. Student Health Services; h. Student Union.

OLD
1. Vice President for Administration and Secretary of the Board of Trustees:

NEW
1. Vice President for Administration and Secretary of the Board of Trustees:

Item #5. Change in duties of Honors committee

OLD
f. Honors Committee. This committee formulates and recommends policy and procedures for the University Honors Program, and assists the Director of the Honors Program in its administration. The members are the Director of Honors Programs (chair); a faculty representative from each college (preferably, the chair of the college Honors Program Committee); the Vice Provost for Admissions and Registration; two honors students representatives; and a Faculty Senator.

NEW
f. Honors Committee. This committee formulates and recommends policy and procedures for the University Honors Program, and assists the Director of the Honors Program in its administration. This committee reviews and recommends to the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee all proposals for new Honors courses. Proposed curricula changes affecting existing Honors courses (e.g., change of title, change of course number) require only the approval of the Honors Director. The members are the Director of Honors Programs (chair); a faculty representative from each college (preferably, the chair of the college Honors Program Committee); the Vice Provost for Admissions and Registration; two honors students representatives; and a Faculty Senator.
Item #6. Advising and Retention Committee - NEW
add as committee (c.) under Commission on Undergraduate Studies pp 42

c. Advising and Retention Committee. This committee recommends to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies policies and procedures concerning undergraduate academic advising and retention, and strategies for student retention. Membership consists of the Director of Undergraduate Academic Services (chair), a faculty representative from each academic college, two representatives from Student Development, two representatives from Admissions and Registration, and one representative from each of the following groups: Student Senate, Career Planning, Counseling Center, Honors College, Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee.

Item #7. New addition - Computer software infringement policy (p 73)

NEW - Under Part VII. Professional Practices, O. Computer Software Infringement Policy

O. Computer Software Copyright Infringement Policy.

Clemson University forbids the unauthorized reproduction of computer software or the use of illegally obtained software. Using University equipment to make illegal copies of software is prohibited. Software used at Clemson University may be used only in accordance with the manufacturer's license agreement. Faculty and students are responsible for being aware of the licensing restrictions for the software they use on any University computer or computer system or on any privately owned computer housed in University facilities. According to both South Carolina and Federal law, it is illegal to reproduce copyrighted software without permission.

Item #8. Grievance Procedures II process changes - addition of item c. and renumber

OLD (C.3.a. and C.3.b.) p 36

a. A faculty member with a grievance shall first meet with the department head for an informal discussion of the matter. This discussion must take place within ninety days of the matter's occurrence. Both shall meet in good faith and shall make every attempt to resolve the matter in an equitable and professional manner.

b. If the matter cannot be resolved at the level of the academic department, the faculty member shall meet with the dean for an informal discussion. The faculty member must request this interview within fifteen days of the discussion of the matter with the department head. The dean shall arrange for a meeting with the faculty member within fifteen days upon receiving the request. Again, the resolution of the matter in an equitable and professional manner shall be the primary goal of those involved.

c. If the matter cannot be resolved at the collegiate level, the faculty member has two options: a) he/she may petition the Provost to review the matter and render a decision regarding it; and b) if the faculty member so requests (or if the Provost, with the faculty member's consent, chooses to do so) the Provost shall refer the matter to the Grievance Board (composition given in the Constitution page 60) for its recommendation prior to making the decision. This petition must be in writing and must be received by the Provost within fifteen days of the faculty member's meeting with the dean regarding the matter.
\textbf{NEW}

a. A faculty member with a grievance shall first meet with the department head for an informal discussion of the matter. This discussion must take place within ninety days of the matter's occurrence. Both shall meet in good faith and shall make every attempt to resolve the matter in an equitable and professional manner.

b. If the matter cannot be resolved at the level of the academic department, the faculty member shall meet with the dean for an informal discussion. The faculty member must request this interview within fifteen days of the discussion of the matter with the department head. The dean shall arrange for a meeting with the faculty member within fifteen days upon receiving the request. Again, the resolution of the matter in an equitable and professional manner shall be the primary goal of those involved.

c. In the case of non-reappointment or of denial of tenure, the requirements to meet with the Department Head and the Dean are waived.

d. If the matter cannot be resolved at the collegiate level, the faculty member has two options: a) he/she may petition the Provost to review the matter and render a decision regarding it; and b) if the faculty member so requests (or if the Provost, with the faculty member's consent, chooses to do so) the Provost shall refer the matter to the Grievance Board (composition given in the Constitution page 60) for its recommendation prior to making the decision. This petition must be in writing and must be received by the Provost within fifteen days of the faculty member's meeting with the dean regarding the matter.

\textbf{OLD (C.6.) p 38}

6. Protection of the Faculty Members and Others Involved in Grievance Procedures.

All persons involved in grievance procedures shall be free of any or all restraint, interference, coercion, or reprisal on the part of associates or administrators in filing a grievance, in accompanying a faculty member filing a grievance, in appearing before the Hearing Panel or the Provost, or in seeking information in accordance with the procedures described herein. These principles apply with equal force after a grievance has been resolved. Should these principles be violated, the violations should be brought to the attention of the Provost, and subsequently (if necessary) to the President.

\textbf{NEW}

6. Protection of the Faculty Members and Others Involved in Grievance Procedures.

All persons involved in grievance procedures, \textbf{including the Grievance Board}, shall be free of any or all restraint, interference, coercion, or reprisal on the part of associates or administrators in filing a grievance, in accompanying a faculty member filing a grievance, in appearing before the Hearing Panel or the Provost, or in seeking information in accordance with the procedures described herein. These principles apply with equal force after a grievance has been resolved. Should these principles be violated, the violations should be brought to the attention of the Provost, and subsequently (if necessary) to the President.
Item #9a. Executive committee as a standing committee

NEW - Add to list of standing committees (Section 5. Committees)

The Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall consist of the Officers of the Faculty Senate and the chair-persons of the standing committees and the Finance Committee. The President of the Faculty Senate shall be chair-person of this committee.

Item #9b. Add new section to the Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University. Article II. Section 8 and Change in number on board, tenure requirement, allowing former Senators to serve, filling temporary vacancies on Grievance Board

OLD (Section 5. standing committees of the Faculty Senate) - Move to new section

The Grievance Board. The Grievance Board shall consist of seven members selected from the ranks of Full and Associate Professors who are members or alternates of the Faculty Senate at the time of their election. Board members shall all be from different colleges. The term of service on the Grievance Board shall be two years. The election shall be held each January in such a manner that no more than four (4) Board members are replaced at one time. This restriction in no way inhibits selection of additional members to replace those who are no longer able to serve. The Chair shall be selected by the Advisory Committee. The Board hears grievances brought to it in accordance with Faculty Grievance Procedure II.

NEW

Section 8. Boards

The Grievance Board. The Grievance Board shall consist of eight members elected by 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 and Associate Professors, and shall be members, alternates, or former members of the Faculty Senate. Board members shall each be from a different college and their term of service shall be for two years. The Senate shall hold an election each January to replace no more than four (4) Grievance Board members, and to permanently fill positions left vacant during the year and filled by temporary appointment by the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee shall appoint the chair of the Grievance Board. The Grievance Board hears grievances brought to it in accordance with Faculty Grievance Procedure II.

Item #10. Grievance Procedures II process changes - findings

OLD (C.3.f.) p 38

f. Upon receipt of the Hearing Panel's recommendation, the Provost shall review the matter, requesting any persons involved to provide additional information as needed. The Provost shall render a final decision no later than fifteen days after the receipt of the Panel's recommendation. The decision of the Provost shall be transmitted in writing to the faculty member, the Hearing Panel, and other parties directly concerned.
f. Upon receipt of the Hearing Panel’s recommendation, the Provost shall review the matter, requesting any persons involved to provide additional information as needed. The Provost shall render a decision no later than fifteen days after the receipt of the Panel’s recommendation. The decision and findings of the Provost, together with the report of the Hearing Panel, shall be transmitted in writing to the faculty member, the Hearing Panel, and all named parties.

OLD (pp 38)

iii. Within fifteen days of the final hearing, the Panel shall submit its findings and recommendations to the Provost along with appropriate documents, and records. Simultaneously, a copy of the Panel’s findings and recommendations shall be forwarded to the grievant.

NEW

iii. Within fifteen days of the final hearing, the Panel shall submit its findings and recommendations to the Provost along with appropriate documents, and records.

Item #11. Admissions and Continuing Enrollment (pp 41)

OLD

b. Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee. The Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee is responsible for establishing the predicted grade-point ratio for admission to each college within the University. This grade-point ratio will be established in consultation with the Dean of each college, the Provost, and the Vice Provost for Admissions and Registration. Students failing to meet this minimum will be admitted only upon approval of the Admissions Exceptions Committee. Members are the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies (chair); the chair of the Student Senate Committee on Academic Affairs; a Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee representative; a representative of the Student Minority Council; the Vice Provost for Admissions and Registration; and one faculty representative from each college. Non-voting members are the Director of Admissions, the Director of Housing, and the Registrar. There are two sub-committees of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee:

NEW

b. Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee. The Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee is responsible for establishing the predicted grade-point ratio for admission to each college within the University. This grade-point ratio will be established in consultation with the Dean of each college, the Provost, and the Vice Provost for Admissions and Registration. Students failing to meet this minimum will be admitted only upon approval of the Admissions Exceptions Committee. The only exceptions to this procedure may be student-athletes receiving athletic aid who meet NCAA freshman eligibility requirements. Members are the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies (chair); the chair of the Student Senate Committee on Academic Affairs; a Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee representative; a representative of the Student Minority Council; the Vice Provost for Admissions and Registration; and one faculty representative from each college. Non-voting members are the Director of Admissions, the Director of Housing, and the Registrar. There are two sub-committees of the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee:
Item #12. Confidentiality of Personnel Matters pp 25 -

OLD

D. Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Because the faculty of a department or equivalent academic unit is the primary judge of the qualifications of its members, peer evaluation is essential in recommendations for appointment, renewal of appointment, tenure, and promotion. All peer recommendations regarding any individual holding faculty rank in a department shall, therefore, originate with the faculty of that department. Individual departments at Clemson University establish written procedures and committee structures in order to facilitate peer evaluation.

The departmental committee(s) reviewing appointment, promotion, and tenure matters shall be composed of full-time faculty members excluding individuals who, as administrators, have input into personnel decisions such as appointment, tenure, and promotion. Department Heads may be invited to serve as resource persons but may not be present during committee deliberations and voting. Departmental procedures for peer evaluation shall be in writing and shall be available to the faculty, the department head, the dean, and the Provost. Each department's peer evaluation process shall receive formal approval by the faculty, the department head, the dean, and the Provost. To the maximum extent possible, the procedures followed and criteria used shall be explicit.

NEW

D. Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Because the faculty of a department or equivalent academic unit is the primary judge of the qualifications of its members, peer evaluation is essential in recommendations for appointment, renewal of appointment, tenure, and promotion. All peer recommendations regarding any individual holding faculty rank in a department shall, therefore, originate with the faculty of that department. Individual departments at Clemson University establish written procedures and committee structures in order to facilitate peer evaluation.

All personnel matters are confidential and matters of trust

The departmental committee(s) reviewing appointment, promotion, and tenure matters shall be composed of full-time faculty members excluding individuals who, as administrators, have input into personnel decisions such as appointment, tenure, and promotion. Department Heads may be invited to serve as resource persons but may not be present during committee deliberations and voting. Departmental procedures for peer evaluation shall be in writing and shall be available to the faculty, the department head, the dean, and the Provost. Each department's peer evaluation process shall receive formal approval by the faculty, the department head, the dean, and the Provost. To the maximum extent possible, the procedures followed and criteria used shall be explicit.

Item #13. Return some of the annual leave policies to Faculty Manual pp 72

OLD

As state employees, faculty are eligible for state leave and holiday benefits. For a full explanation refer to the Personnel Manual. A brief explanation of some of the leave benefits follow.
1. Annual leave (twelve month appointments only), often called vacation leave, accrues monthly and may be used for any purpose.
2. Sick leave accrues monthly and may be used when personal illness or injury prevents one from performing regular duties. May also be used for medical appointments and care of immediate family members (limited).
3. Funeral leave is available to attend the funeral of an immediate family member.
4. Court leave is granted for obedience to a subpoena or other legal direction by a proper authority to serve on a jury, testify, or serve as a witness. When a faculty member is a voluntary witness in litigation as an individual, and not in any official capacity, court leave is not granted.
5. Military leave is granted, up to the maximum accorded by state law, for active duty or training with the armed forces of the United States or the National Guard. The leave need not be consecutive and may involve more than one tour of duty.
6. Holiday leave is granted for official holidays; however, teaching schedules and other circumstances may require the faculty member's presence. Nine-month faculty receive the regular student holidays listed in the University catalog unless special circumstances require their presence.

NEW

As state employees, faculty are eligible for state leave and holiday benefits. For a full explanation refer to the Personnel Manual. A brief explanation of some of the leave benefits follow.

1. Annual leave (twelve month appointments only), often called vacation leave, accrues monthly and may be used for any purpose. The terms of annual leave for persons holding twelve-month faculty appointments, this includes administrators and librarians, are somewhat different from those of classified personnel. Annual leave for twelve-month faculty is accumulated at the rate of eighteen working days per year for the first nineteen years of service at Clemson, and thirty days per year thereafter.
2. Sick leave accrues monthly and may be used when personal illness or injury prevents one from performing regular duties. May also be used for medical appointments and care of immediate family members (limited).
3. Funeral leave is available to attend the funeral of an immediate family member.
4. Court leave is granted for obedience to a subpoena or other legal direction by a proper authority to serve on a jury, testify, or serve as a witness. When a faculty member is a voluntary witness in litigation as an individual, and not in any official capacity, court leave is not granted.
5. Military leave is granted, up to the maximum accorded by state law, for active duty or training with the armed forces of the United States or the National Guard. The leave need not be consecutive and may involve more than one tour of duty.
6. Holiday leave is granted for official holidays; however, teaching schedules and other circumstances may require the faculty member's presence. Nine-month faculty receive the regular student holidays listed in the University catalog unless special circumstances require their presence.
7. A faculty member who shifts from a nine-month to a twelve-month appointment shall have leave calculated on the basis of the total number of years service to the university.
8. A faculty member who shifts from a twelve-month to a nine-month appointment has the following options for handling accrued annual leave: 1) all accrued annual leave earned (up to a maximum of forty-five days) will be credited to the individual's account and frozen until retirement or termination, upon which the credited amount will be paid at the salary rate in effect upon retirement or termination; 2) all accrued annual leave (up to a maximum of forty-five days, regardless of any leave used in the current calendar year) will be computed at the rate of salary in effect immediately prior to the transfer to the new appointment and will be paid to the individual on the last payday prior to the transfer. It is the faculty member's responsibility to notify University Personnel if such a shift is being planned.
Item #14. Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships pp 20

OLD

F. Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships

Rank and Tenure Status. The rank and tenure status of those appointed to endowed chairs and titled professorships shall be determined by the applicable rules, regulations, policies, and practices governing all appointments to the Faculty of Clemson University.

Conditions of Award. The University community as a whole has a vested and vital interest in the academic contributions of holders of endowed chairs and titled professorships. Consequently, while appointments to such chairs and professorships shall be for an indefinite period, and while the performance of the holders of such appointments shall be subject to the normal reviews of performance to which all faculty members are subject, special or periodic review of the professional performance of these particular faculty members may be conducted, but only if conditions stated at the time of award so stipulate. Such a review may be initiated by the dean of the college if requested by both the departmental faculty Advisory Committee and the department head.

For any such review the Provost shall ensure that a committee (composed in the same manner as the search-and-screening committee that made the initial selection of the holder) evaluates the performance of the holder of the chair or titled professorship. Recommendations for removal by this Committee shall follow the same route as those of the initial search-and-screening committee. Should these recommendations result in a decision by the President to remove the incumbent from the chair or titled professorship, such a decision shall not affect the incumbent's tenure status and professorial rank.

NEW

F. Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships

Rank and Tenure Status. The rank and tenure status of those appointed to endowed chairs and titled professorships shall be determined by the applicable rules, regulations, policies, and practices governing all appointments to the Faculty of Clemson University. Inasmuch as endowed chairs and titled professorships are established in recognition of exceptional levels of achievement in teaching, research, and public service, individuals whose principal responsibilities are administrative are not normally eligible for these appointments. Under exceptional conditions a Department Head or prospective Department Head may receive an appointment to an endowed chair or titled professorship. Such an appointment must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of approval by the faculty of the affected department. This vote shall be by secret ballot and shall be administered by the departmental Tenure and Promotion or Personnel Committee.

Conditions of Award. The University community as a whole has a vested and vital interest in the academic contributions of holders of endowed chairs and titled professorships. Consequently, while appointments to such chairs and professorships shall be for an indefinite period, and while the performance of the holders of such appointments shall be subject to the normal reviews of performance to which all faculty members are subject, special or periodic review of the professional performance of these particular faculty members may be conducted, but only if conditions stated at the time of award so stipulate. Such a review may be initiated by the dean of the college if requested by both the departmental faculty Advisory Committee and the department head. If the holder of the chair or endowed professorship is the department head, the dean of a college shall initiate the review at the request of the departmental Tenure and Promotion or Personnel Committee.
For any such review the Provost shall ensure that a committee (composed in the same manner as the search-and-screening committee that made the initial selection of the holder) evaluates the performance of the holder of the chair or titled professorship. Recommendations for removal by this Committee shall follow the same route as those of the initial search-and-screening committee. Should these recommendations result in a decision by the President to remove the incumbent from the chair or titled professorship, such a decision shall not affect the incumbent's tenure status and professorial rank. If the holder of the chair or endowed professorship is a Department Head or prospective Department Head, the appointments shall be independent.
Summary Report of the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee to Review the Vice Presidents' Administrative Growth Reports

John Huffman, Chemistry, Chair of the ad hoc Committee

The ad hoc Committee reviewed the growth reports submitted by four of the six Vice-Presidents. The growth reports of the Vice Presidents for Business and Finance and Institutional Advancement were reviewed by the Faculty Senate Finance Committee. The ad hoc Committee analyzed the reports of the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, Administration, Student Affairs, and Research.

The Committee found that it was possible to provide an assessment of the growth in three of the four areas which we reviewed. We were, however, unable to assess the growth in Academic Affairs based on the data provided. It would appear that this Vice President's office doesn't really know how many administrative personnel are included under Academic Affairs, nor how many have been included in the recent past. Also, no data were provided concerning the offices of the academic deans or department heads.

The growth in the other three areas reviewed by the ad hoc Committee ranged from 110% in Research since 1986, 26% since 1985 in Student Affairs to very nominal growth in units under the Vice-President for Administration. There appears, however, to be no consistency whatsoever in the definition of administrative personnel across the offices of these four Vice-Presidents.

In the Business and Finance Division, growth in Facilities Planning and management grew 38% from 1986-87 to 1991-92, while Sponsored Programs grew 570%. This growth in Sponsored Programs was justified by a 51% increase in research funding. Since 1987 Institutional Advancement has experienced a 34% increase, but there has been a 300% increase in the number of positions which contain the term "Vice-President."

All of the Vice-Presidents' reports provide justification for administrative expansion in their areas. This Committee did not, however, feel that they could address the question of effectiveness of growth in any of the areas in question. Although each Vice-President's report made an attempt to outline possible increases in workload in their area, it was not possible for the Committee to reconcile these arguments with the increases in administrative growth. This is not to imply that the growth in any area is either justified or unjustified, but reflects the Committee's inability to evaluate the effectiveness of the growth in any given area.

Copies of the detailed analysis of the reports of the Vice-Presidents are attached plus a copy of a letter to President Lennon concerning the report of the Provost.
Attachment H (1 of 1)

PRESIDENT'S REPORT
MARCH, 1993

1. Response to question on voluntary retirement of two Clemson employees. Response will be oral.

2. Tenure and Promotion Guidelines - A statement from the Provost and Deans.

3. One member must be elected at the March Faculty Senate Meeting to the Grievance Board for a two-year term. Nominees must be Full or Associate Professors; members or alternates of the Faculty Senate at the time of election; and must be from different colleges. Colleges from which to elect are:
   - Agricultural Sciences
   - Architecture
   - Engineering

4. According to the Faculty Manual, a named professor is to be elected by the Faculty Senate to a three-year term of the Academic Council. Gordon Halfacre, Alumni Distinguished Professor from the Department of Horticulture, will complete his term in April, 1993. The Executive/Advisory Committee will present a slate to the Senate at the March meeting, at which time election will be held.

5. Plans are now being arranged for the Faculty Senate Annual Spring Reception to honor retiring senators, continuing senators, and to welcome newly-elected senators. Invitations will be mailed at a later date; however, please plan to attend this event which will follow the April 13th Senate meeting.

6. Statement on return of one (1%) percent monies.

7. College elections of representatives to the Faculty Senate are to be held during the month of March. Please remind your college to do so if elections have not already been held. Results should be sent to the Faculty Senate Office, Cooper Library, as soon as possible. Advisory Committee members should also be elected as soon as possible and results provided to Faculty Senate Office.
March 1, 1993

MEMORANDUM

TO: THE FACULTY SENATE

FROM: RICHARD R. MONTANUCCI
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

THROUGH: SYBLE OLDAKER, FACULTY SENATOR
COLLEGE OF NURSING

I respectfully request that the Faculty Senate place on its agenda for the next senate meeting the recent case involving two University officials from the Business and Finance Office. Although the Faculty Senate is not an investigative body, it represents the faculty, and must set the moral tone for the University. Since public funds were involved from the University, the faculty and the other citizens of this state have the right to know the particulars of this case. The 13th Circuit Solicitor serves the public and is accountable to the citizens of South Carolina.

There are several questions which the Faculty Senate should ask of Solicitor Joseph Watson:

1) Given that public funds were involved, why were these two individuals not prosecuted?
2) Why were they allowed to continue to collect pay until mid-April?
3) Were there other irregularities in this case that have not been reported?
4) Why hasn’t there been a full disclosure of all the facts?
5) Why has this case been treated differently than others in the past?

When people are placed in a position of higher trust, they should be held to higher standards, not lower standards. It is a fact that this case has been handled differently than those involving faculty or staff at this University. There are at least four similar instances in which faculty or staff were prosecuted for similar behavior. Therefore, we must ask:

1) Is there a double standard of justice?
2) Are high-ranking University officials treated differently than faculty or staff by our system of jurisprudence?
3) Is the action of the Solicitor in compliance with both the spirit and the letter of the recently enacted South Carolina State Ethics Act of 1991?

RRM
Dear Faculty Colleague:

In any modern organization, the opinions and feelings of the work force constitute an important factor in the excellence of its operations and in the accomplishment of its mission. Toward that end the Faculty Senate is conducting a survey similar to those used in other organizations. The results of the study will be made available to the Faculty Senate and the Provost.

For confidentiality, please do not give your name. We are interested only in what groups of faculty think about their work environment.

Please take a few minutes of your time to complete this questionnaire and return it to the Faculty Senate Office, Room __, Cooper Library. Use interoffice mail (or First Class mail).

If you have questions, call the Senate office: 656-2456.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Department Code: __ __ __ __

Please circle your response to items 1 to 21 using these responses:

- Strongly disagree (SD)
- Disagree (D)
- Don't know or No opinion (?)
- Agree (A)
- Strongly agree (SA)

Section I: Your department

1. If I do a good job, I will get credit for it. SD D ? A SA
2. In my department, the workload is distributed fairly among faculty. SD D ? A SA
3. I believe the measures used in my department to deal with employee problems are fairly applied. SD D ? A SA
4. My department head treats everyone fairly. SD D ? A SA

Section II: Your college

5. My academic dean adequately involves his/her faculty in the decision-making process. SD D ? A SA
6. My academic dean is quick to right significant wrongs overlooked by my department head. SD D ? A SA
7. My college administration does those things necessary for me to become successful professionally. SD D ? A SA
8. It would be preferable that the department head (chair) be elected by the faculty for a fixed term, rather than be appointed by the dean. SD D ? A SA

Section III: Administration (general)

9. The relationship between faculty and administration is good. SD D ? A SA
10. The administration is dedicated to excellence in teaching in higher education. SD D ? A SA
11. My institution is managed effectively. SD D ? A SA

(Over, please)
12. The administration adheres to the *Faculty Manual*.

**Section IV. Teaching and Undergraduate Education**

13. The "reading day" (i.e. the last Friday before exams, during which no lecture classes are held) should be continued.

14. There has been a widespread lowering of academic standards at Clemson.

15. The authority to decide which activities will be excused absences from class should be moved from the instructor to the office of Undergraduate Studies.

16. The Computer Center should continue to be responsible for providing and maintaining laboratories of personal computers for student use instead of turning this responsibility over to the colleges.

**Section IV. The Faculty**

17. A faculty member who teaches 9 or more credit hours per semester should have the option of crediting at least 60% of effort to teaching.

18. At my institution, publications used for tenure and promotion are just counted, not qualitatively measured.

19. The Faculty Senate is effective in representing the faculty to the administration.

20. A faculty member who integrates communication skills into the curriculum should receive credit in annual evaluations.

21. I would support a Faculty Club on this campus.

**Section IV: Ratings**

On a scale of 0 to 10, please rate the following on their performance by circling a value for each item. (If you do not have an opinion on an item, please leave that item blank or circle the "?"; a blank will not affect the score.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. your department head</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. your director (if applicable)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. your academic dean</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. the Provost</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. the President</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Division of Agriculture and NR only:

- 27. your research dean (if applicable) | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
- 28. your extension dean (if applicable) | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
- 29. Vice-Pres. Agriculture and Nat. Resources? | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |

**Comments:**

If you wish, you may enter comments here. Please indicate if you are using the back of this sheet or attaching another sheet. If your comment relates to a question above, please give the item number.

---------------------------------------------

(Please include additional comments on a separate sheet)
1. **Call to Order.** President William Baron called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated March 9, 1993 were approved as written.

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

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Dick Conover thanked all members who served on this Committee, and noted that several interesting issues were considered, such as the Proposed Attendance Policy and the issue of "Reading Day". Senator Conover then provided an update on the "Reading Day" issue. Senator Conover informed the Senate that as a means to save money, the possibility of changing the academic calendar to shorter semesters with longer class periods is being considered. Senator Conover thanked Alan Schaffer for his work with the attendance policy. Vice President-President-Elect Schaffer referred to a draft attendance policy and stated that when opportunities arose, he had objected to any change in the existing policy, and further stated that others want some changes.

   **Welfare Committee.** Senator Brenda Vander Mey submitted this Committee's Report (Attachment A). The Response to SACS Request for a Clear Written Policy on Faculty Workload Distributions was submitted to the Senate (Attachment B). President Baron made a motion to accept this Report on Productivity from the Welfare Committee. There was no discussion. Vote was taken, and acceptance of Report passed unanimously.

   **Finance Committee.** Senator James Davis stated that most efforts of this Committee were spent on the Division of Agriculture and their problems. Senator Davis thanked committee members, and Leo Gaddis, a committee participant who is not a senator. Items which may be considered by the incoming Finance Committee include: compensation paid out of the Foundation, and University Centers.

   **Policy Committee.** Senator Eleanor Hare thanked members of this Committee, and Janis Cheezem, a non-senator who provided assistance, and submitted the Policy Committee Reported dated April 13, 1993 (Attachment C). The 1992-93 Policy Committee Annual Report was submitted by Senator Hare (Attachment D), and recommendations to the incoming Faculty Senate were reiterated.

   **Research Committee.** Senator Bill Bridges stated that there was no report.
b. University Commissions and Committees

1) ad hoc Committee to Review Vice Presidents' Reports on Administrative Growth - Senator John Huffman informed the Senate that the vice presidential area of Academic Affairs was the only area which did not respond, but that this situation had been resolved. Senate Alternate Jo Anne Deeken stated that a Report from Academic Affairs had been received and will be studied. Results will be forthcoming.

2) Traffic and Parking - Senator Conover stated that he will share information on issues being considered by this Committee to the incoming Faculty Senate representative.

3) President's Cabinet and Provost's Council - President Baron informed the Senate that he presented a proposal regarding written evaluations of faculty, department heads, and deans (this proposal will be presented to the Senate under the President's Report).

4) Provost's Council - President Baron informed and explained to the Senate a proposal before this Council to offer a Buy-Out Program at Clemson University for those eligible for retirement. A decision will be made within the next 2-3 weeks.

4. President's Report. President Baron submitted the President's Report (Attachment E), and discussed each item. After presenting and discussing his personal proposal regarding written evaluations of faculty, department heads, and deans, President Baron strongly suggested that a reciprocal agreement of evaluation be made.

5. Old Business

a) Senator Vander Mey introduced, Resolution: Faculty Senate Disappointment, which was seconded. Following discussion, motion to table was received by Senator Hassan Behery. Vote to table failed, floor was opened to continue debate, and discussion resumed. Vote to accept resolution of disappointment passed (Attachment F) (FS93-4-1 P).

b) Senator Gary Wells submitted a motion to amend the Faculty Manual to include a Form for Appointment of Academic Administrators (Attachment G), and thanked Janis Cheezem for her guidance in preparing this document. Following discussion during which background information was provided, vote to accept change was taken and passed unanimously.

6. President Baron thanked the Faculty Senate, Standing Committee Chairs, Alan Schaffer, Lucy Rollin, Eleanor Hare, Cathy Sturkie, and Margaret Pridgen for their work and efforts on behalf of the Senate. Remarks from outgoing President Baron were then received before he introduced the new Senate President, Alan Schaffer. New officers were installed at 5:00 p.m.

Lucy Rollin, Secretary
7. **New Business**

   a. President Alan Schaffer introduced new senators of the Faculty Senate.

   b. President Schaffer urged Senators to respond to and return the Committee Preference Questionnaire to the Senate Office.

   c. Senate Alternate Jerry Waldvogel informed the Senate of a policy that reserves seats in certain required classes for entering freshmen and thus, effectively, prevents upperclassmen from enrolling in classes they need for graduation. He asked the Scholastic Policies Committee to investigate; President Schaffer said he would put it on their agenda.

   d. President Schaffer commented on budgetary problems facing the University and the impact this has on faculty morale. He mentioned three areas he would like the Senate to act on in the coming year: (1) better communication between Senators and their constituents, (2) the possibility of establishing a system of rotating department chairs to replace the head system now in place, and (3) the possibility of establishing term limits for Deans.

8. **Adjournment.** The Faculty Senate meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

   ![Signature]

   David Leigh, Secretary

   ![Signature]

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

THE WELFARE COMMITTEE

April, 1993

Meetings: Tuesday, March 23 & Tuesday, April 6

Based on the sense of the Senate regarding a faculty member's request that a letter of condemnation be sent to President Lennon for accepting his deferred package plan from the Clemson University Foundation, the Committee drafted a resolution. This resolution is to be discussed and voted on by the Faculty Senate at its April 13, 1993 meeting.

The Committee reviewed and responded to the proposed No Smoking Policy.

The Committee thinks that the current smoking policy is adequate.
The Committee thinks that the proposed policy is too restrictive and has some unrealistic restrictions.
The Proposed policy does not accommodate smokers outside University buildings.
The Proposed policy may set a bad precedent for future decisions on indoor air quality issues (e.g., perfumes, colognes, body odors, dry-cleaned clothing, etc.)
Ensuring operable windows in each office and in each classroom may circumvent many air quality issues.

The Committee finalized its report on Distribution of Faculty Effort (distributed at April 13 meeting).
Response to SACS Request for a Clear Written Policy on Faculty Workload Distributions
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
April, 1993

Background

In the Fall of 1992, the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee was asked to respond to the SACS request that there be a "clear written policy" on faculty workload distributions.

An initial response from the Committee was that the policy that appears in the Faculty Manual (pp. 62-3) seemed to allow for flexibility. It was assumed that some flexibility is necessary to ensure that instructional needs of students and research and service obligations of faculty be realized.

There were a number of concerns aired at this stage: 1.) Might a more specific policy stymy progress toward approximating CU's Goals and Benchmarks? 2.) Wouldn't a monolithic policy disserve the university as one unit and certain departments (disciplines) and individual faculty in particular? and, 3.) Given nationwide criticism of increasing emphasis on research over teaching in U.S. universities, and CU's research-heavy Mission Statement and Goals and Benchmarks, what kind of policy statement could be articulated that would allow the various units to best serve their students, their disciplines, and the people of South Carolina?

Finally, there was and remains a general sense that CU's Goals and Benchmarks need to be rearticulated based on recent criticisms of higher education in the U.S.

Two decisions were reached at this stage. First, the Committee decided that a systems approach to faculty distribution of effort was the most reasonable one to take. Clemson University was visualized as one large system comprised of various macrounsits (colleges) which are themselves divided into subunits (departments, disciplines). These subunits are comprised of microunsits (individual faculty). As a system, Clemson University has identifiable system goals (CU Goals and Benchmarks). These goals include serving the people of South Carolina, providing quality education for students, and conducting and disseminating research that promotes growth in the various disciplines represented at Clemson, as well as improving the quality of life for the people of South Carolina. The macrounsits and subunits also have goals. These goals must be synchronized with those of the system itself if the system and its components are to survive. That is, these goals are in relation to rather than separate from the goals of the system itself. The microunsits, therefore, can not be seen as independent entities with complete control over teaching, research, and service. Rather, within each subunit, distributions of effort of the microunsits must be orchestrated to approximate the goals of the subunit, which are linked to the goals of the macrounit, which in turn are linked to the goals of the system itself.

The second decision reached was that the Committee needed to find out how faculty workloads were currently distributed in the subunits. To that end, Form 2 was modified so that data on departmental workload distributions could be assessed. Via the Provost's office, the Committee requested that all academic department heads complete this modified Form 2. Results are discussed on the next page.

Throughout AY 1992-1993, the Committee collected materials related to public criticism of higher education. In addition, the Committee received information
about the First AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards and the five-year reassessment and revamping of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (funded by FIPSE) as per meeting the new challenges facing higher education in the U.S. The Committee also met with David Underwood, Ron Nowacyck, and Holly Ulbrich. They shared their impressions of national trends in revising higher education. Their impressions were based on a Focus Group conference that they attended in Florida. These materials and discussions helped guide the Committee in making its recommendation.

David Underwood et al. provided the Committee with a summary of the conclusions reached by the Focus Group on Faculty Workload Analysis. This group identified current university definitions of "research" as one critical problem area in the U.S. today. The group also thought that teaching and research should be viewed as complementary endeavors, rather than adversarial ones. It also recognized that placing the burden on each and every faculty member to contribute in all areas (research, teaching and service) is at least an archaic if not also counterproductive approach to meeting the goals of a university as one entity. Therefore, this group suggested that units be evaluated for their collective contributions in these areas. Thus, individual faculty members' distributions of effort would be arranged to make the most of everyone's abilities while ensuring smooth operating of the entire unit and university.

This group recognized that "service" frequently is poorly defined. Service also tends to be devalued. Hence, service is often avoided by faculty. There is a real need to adequately define, allocate, and reward service. Finally, the group concluded that mission statements must be examined and rewritten to facilitate a more holistic vision of the university and its components.

Findings of the Survey on Workload Distributions of CU Faculty

The survey results regarding faculty workload patterns for AY 1992-93 are indicated in Table 1. These patterns were reported and summarized by five classifications: teaching, research, extension, librarianship and other. The OTHER category was further subdivided into four classes in an attempt to clarify this category. The subdivisions were: administration and public service, administration only, public service and service, and other.

There are 1008 FTEs reported by the ten colleges. FTEs by the survey classifications were: teaching, 483.57; research, 316.17; extension, 72.91; librarianship, 26; and other 109.35. With the exception of the Colleges of Agriculture and Forestry, Parks & Recreation, over fifty percent of college FTEs are devoted to teaching (Table 2). These two colleges have the greatest percentage of their FTEs devoted to research.

The OTHER classification required further breakdown. Over ten percent of reported total faculty FTEs were classed in the OTHER category. Department heads were asked to clarify any reports in this category. Tables 3 and 4 show the further breakdown of the category OTHER. (It was apparent that not all department heads were familiar with the meaning of the five original categories.) With the OTHER category, public service/service was the largest class with 39.63 percent of the FTEs. The second largest class was administration.

The workload distribution data reveal that, on average, colleges at Clemson University devote about 50% of their FTEs to teaching and 25% to research. The remaining 25% is variously spread across categories within the OTHER category (10.7%), with less than 5% of FTEs devoted to extension activities and about 10.7% FTEs allocated to librarianship.

Tables 1 & 2 also indicate that there is some between-college variation in effort distribution. For instance, the Colleges of Nursing and Architecture have the
highest percentages of teaching FTEs, while the Colleges of Forestry, Parks & Recreation and Agriculture have the highest percentages of FTEs devoted to research. What the tables do not reveal, but was evident on the raw data sheets, was that the majority of colleges also evidence degrees of within-college variation of effort distributions. Further research is needed to discern whether within- and between-college variations are compatible with unit and system goals. These data also do not provide sufficient information about whether Clemson University as an entity is distributing FTEs in a manner that ensures relative immunity from current national criticism of higher education. It seems clear that a more specific policy on workload distributions, contextualized by the University's mission statement, and specific mission statements, goals and benchmarks of the units within the University, should be created.

These data are sufficient enough to conclude that the flexibility permitted by the current workload policy is being recognized by the colleges. Thus, the current policy should serve as a starting point for a more refined one. Therefore, there is no need to completely reinvent the proverbial wheel.

The Current Controversies Over Higher Education in the United States

In a nutshell, the hottest controversy surrounding higher education is the overemphasis on and rewarding of research over teaching. Running a close second is the public outcry that universities be held accountable to their publics for what they do and do not do. In addition, there is increasing furor from the public over perceived lack of outreach and service to the taxpayers who help fund many colleges and universities.

In a recent issue of Policy Perspectives (Sept., 1992), research sponsored by the Pew Charitable Trusts indicated that faculty in liberal arts colleges are similar to faculty in research universities in their orientation toward more research and discretionary time, and less time devoted to teaching. This orientation, it is argued, adds to the cost of undergraduate education. The implication is that this added cost is probably not counterbalanced by any additional enhancements of undergraduate education itself. In another article in this periodical, it is argued that faculty and universities have lost the public’s trust by violating the social contract between faculty and the public. It is felt that faculty and universities may never regain this trust, especially if faculty continue to take an individualistic approach to their disciplines and teaching responsibilities, refusing to honor the contract. However, it is also recognized that at some universities, people are willing to "hunker down" and ask the tough questions such that needed changes can be made.

In the July/August, 1992 edition of Change, Derek Bok ("Reclaiming the Public Trust") notes with irony that while higher education is under fire from the public in the U.S., American higher education is held in very high esteem in much of the rest of the world. While drugs and riots on campuses are no longer sources of discontent, news stories of research fraud, misuse of research monies, and the devaluation of teaching have fueled more negative regard of higher education by those external to it. Arguing that universities are "victims of a lot of exaggeration and distortion," Bok nonetheless contends that we must convince the public that we do have teaching as a top priority. In addition, in our disciplines we must join in on the national effort to address those issues and problems that worry the general population the most about the future of this country.

Within academe, there exists evidence that, if measured by salaries of the faculty, teaching is in fact devalued. In "How Devalued is Teaching?" (Teaching, Learning & Assessment Newsletter, Winter, 1993), it is reported that national data reveal that at both research universities and liberal arts colleges, there
is less compensation for teaching than for research. Furthermore, the more hours a professor spends in the classroom, the less is his/her pay.

While the data used for the current report cannot assess teaching versus research compensations, it is clear that some colleges devote more FTEs to teaching than to others. It also is clear that service has relatively low priority in most colleges at Clemson.

Mechanisms to revise the evaluation, value and rewarding of teaching have been fairly systematically addressed by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Defining and rewarding "service" is a task currently being undertaken by most colleges here at CU. What remains, for the main part, is changing the policy regarding distribution of effort.

**Recommendations**

That Clemson University’s Goals and Benchmarks be reevaluated. This reevaluation should be a critical assessment of the priorities given research, teaching and service. Whether or not the Goals and Benchmarks contain clearly stated goals and objectives also should be assessed. Finally, this reevaluation should assess the degree to which the Goals and Benchmarks give clear guidance to compatible and coherent goals and objectives for colleges and departments.

All colleges should have clear written policies on effort distribution. These guidelines must be compatible with the University’s larger goals and objectives.

All departments should have clear written policies on effort distribution. These guidelines must be compatible with the larger goals of the college and of the University.

That the current workload (effort) distribution policy as written be revised to indicate that all distributions of effort are to be contracted at the subunit (departmental) level.

These distributions should be contracted based on the goals of the subunit.

All subunits should have clearly written goals and benchmarks.

All departments should have clear written policies regarding the distribution of individual faculty efforts and reward systems for faculty included in their By-Laws.

These policies should be approved by each department’s respective Dean, and then by the Provost and the President of Clemson University.

All policies should include a rationale.

These policies should be approved by a majority of each department’s faculty before the policy is forwarded to the next level of administration. Voting should be confidential; actual counts should be taken.

In no case may a department head dictate the policies. Rather, the department head, once the policies have been approved, should ensure that the policies are fairly and efficiently put into effect.
Each individual faculty member should have the freedom to renegotiate his/her distribution of effort contract as subunit goals change, or as faculty potential to contribute in the various areas (service, research, teaching) change.

The Current Policy on Faculty Workload Distribution

From The Faculty Manual, pp. 62-3:

B. Workload

"The normal faculty workload entails teaching and research assignments; service to a department, a college, and the University; and other professional activities. The usual teaching assignment at Clemson University is 9-12 credit hours for each of the two regular semesters. The particular teaching assignment of an individual faculty member may, for a number of reasons, vary from department to department and even within departments. Departments with heavy faculty research obligations may in some instances reduce teaching loads and assign the hours so released to research. Released time may also be provided through funded research. Unusually heavy service assignments (e.g., committee work, administrative duties, advisory responsibilities, extramural service) may also lead to reduced teaching assignments, depending upon the staffing situation in a given department. In some instances graduate courses, off-campus courses, or unusually large classes may be considerations in workload distributions.

Off-campus courses are offered by some Colleges. The program at Furman University leading to the Master of Business Administration degree through the College of Commerce and Industry and the courses taught at the Greenville Higher Education Center (GHEC) are two examples. These courses are taught by Clemson faculty and carry University credit.

Faculty on non-teaching appointments and librarians have their work assignments made on the basis of particular tasks to be accomplished or periods to be covered. Faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching as well as non-teaching assignments have their workloads established on a percentage basis.

Courses are assigned to faculty by their department head on the basis of established procedures. Factors taken into consideration include: departmental needs, faculty expertise, faculty preferences for particular teaching assignments, faculty schedules, and the nature and extent of non-teaching workloads."

Proposed Policy on Distribution of Faculty Effort

"Faculty effort distributions are contracted between the individual faculty member and the department head based upon departmental needs and departmental goals and benchmarks. These contracts must be approved by the appropriate college dean, the Provost and the President. Guidelines for faculty effort distributions must be made explicit in each department's By-Laws. Factors to be considered in distributing faculty effort include: departmental teaching needs, internal and external departmental service obligations and needs, departmental research goals, departmental obligations to the larger goals and benchmarks of the University, and departmental commitment to off-campus teaching and community service activities.

Since each department contributes differently to the larger goals and benchmarks of the University, and to their respective disciplines, each department must clearly state its normal faculty teaching load in its
departmental By-Laws. Likewise, each department must specify its normal faculty service, research, extension and librarianship loads. Within each department, the effort distribution contracted with each individual faculty member must reflect an equitable distribution with other members of the same department. Funded research obligations of individual faculty members and departments should be considered when making these equitable distributions. In some instances, graduate courses, off-campus courses, or unusually large classes may be considerations in effort distribution decisions.

Departmental distributions of effort of individual faculty members are assigned by the department head on the basis of established procedures that have been approved by a majority of the faculty and are detailed in the department's By-Laws. A department head may not dictate the faculty effort distribution policy. Rather, the department head must ensure that the policy is fairly and efficiently applied. Factors to be considered include: departmental goals and benchmarks, departmental teaching obligations and needs, faculty expertise, faculty preferences for particular teaching, research, and service assignments, faculty schedules, and the nature and extent of non-teaching workloads. Faculty effort distribution contracts may be renegotiated as faculty expertise and interests change, and as departmental needs, goals and benchmarks change.

Faculty on non-teaching appointments have their effort distributions made on the basis of particular tasks to be accomplished or periods to be covered. Faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching as well as non-teaching assignments have their effort distributions established on a percentage basis."

Potential Repercussions of Accepting the Proposed Policy

If the proposed policy, or one similar to it, were to be accepted, it is possible that many departments would have to alter their approaches to the evaluation of faculty accomplishments. This would include the approach taken by department heads when conducting their annual evaluations of faculty accomplishments and the approach taken when evaluating faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure. Some departments may have to define or redefine the categories used when establishing faculty goals and evaluating faculty accomplishments. Some departments also may have to rewrite pertinent sections of their By-Laws. All departments would have to take a unit approach to effort distribution and faculty evaluations. It also is possible that the work schedule policy (Faculty Manual, p. 63) may have to be rewritten. Finally, in departments where mission statements and goals and benchmarks either have not been updated or have been written without reference to the mission statement and goals and benchmarks of the University, such documents will have to be revised and resubmitted for approval by the appropriate administrators.

Respectfully submitted by the Welfare Committee, AY 1992-93

Members: Michael Bridgwood, John Gilreath, Gerald Lovedahl, John Mumford, Jim Rathwell, Brenda Vander Mey (Chair), and Gerald Waddle
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: C.U. Workload Distributions by Colleges (FTE's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 AGRIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 NURS</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 FOR</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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### TABLE 3: C.U. OTHER CLASS WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTIONS BY COLLEGES (FTE'S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>ADM/PS1</th>
<th>ADM2</th>
<th>PS/SER3</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIB ARTS</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>30.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>19.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>21.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>36.10</td>
<td>36.10</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>109.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1ADM/PS = Administration/Public Service  
2ADM   = Administration  
3PS/SER = Public Service/Service

### TABLE 4: C.U. OTHER CLASS WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTIONS BY COLLEGES (PERCENT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>ADM/PS1</th>
<th>ADM2</th>
<th>PS/SER3</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIB ARTS</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>20.99%</td>
<td>54.44%</td>
<td>22.79%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRIC</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>67.78%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>32.22%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;I</td>
<td>7.59%</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
<td>55.89%</td>
<td>29.44%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>45.68%</td>
<td>54.32%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>10.08%</td>
<td>55.47%</td>
<td>12.37%</td>
<td>22.08%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>87.44%</td>
<td>12.56%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>10.03%</td>
<td>39.27%</td>
<td>23.23%</td>
<td>27.47%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
<td>34.04%</td>
<td>39.61%</td>
<td>13.40%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1ADM/PS = Administration/Public Service  
2ADM   = Administration  
3PS/SER = Public Service/Service
The Policy Committee met March 23.

At the request of faculty in the Microbiology Department, a mini-survey was conducted. Results were sent to the departmental faculty, Department Head, Dean and Provost. The department head received a mean evaluation of 8.6 on a scale of 0-10, where 10 is the best score possible.

A form for tracking the appointment of academic administrators has been developed and will be submitted for approval at the April Senate meeting. The form is intended to become a part of the Faculty Manual.

After considerable discussion, the committee decided that the selection of questions for a survey needed more study. From the discussion at the March Senate meeting it seemed to the committee that more input from Senate membership should be obtained. The committee recommends that a Faculty Survey be done on a periodic basis, as established by the Senate. We also recommend that the Senate consider establishing an ad hoc committee for the purpose of designing, organizing the distribution of, and compiling the results of the survey.

The committee further recommends that, as in standard merit system procedures, the Faculty Manual be revised to require at least an internal search for all positions.
1992-1993 Policy Committee Annual Report
April 13, 1993

The following includes a partial list of accomplishments of the Policy Committee during the 1992-1993 Senate session. Some of these originated in the Policy Committee. Others resulted from individual requests. One of the most time-consuming and productive efforts involved the compilation and publication of the Findings of the Faculty Survey. The committee was unable to complete the design of a faculty survey for the spring of 1993 before the end of the current Senate session. Rather than proceed with a questionnaire that had not been thoroughly discussed in the Senate, the committee, with a strong recommendation that the survey be continued, leaves the faculty survey to the next Senate. This report concludes with some recommendations from the committee to the next Faculty Senate.

Changes to the Faculty Manual:

Proposed that the Faculty Senate President be the representative of the Faculty Senate on the Athletic Council.

Endorsed an amendment to the Faculty Manual reorganizing for the Fine Arts Committee.

Proposed changes to the eligibility requirements for endowed chairs and titled professorships that specify conditions under which department heads may be selected.

Proposed amendments to the Grievance Policy to waive the requirement to meet with the Department Head and Dean in the case of non-reappointment and protect faculty members and other involved in grievance procedures.

Proposed an amendment to the Grievance Policy that the findings of the Provost, together with the report of the Hearing Panel, be transmitted to all named parties.

Proposed a form to track compliance with provisions of the Faculty Manual in the selection and appointment of all academic administrators.

Changes to the procedural bylaws of the Faculty Senate:

Initiated a change to the Faculty Senate procedural bylaws to require a 2/3 vote of the members present to bring a resolution to the floor if the resolution is not provided to the Senators in the packet sent before each meeting.

Initiated a change to the Faculty Senate procedural bylaws to provide a statement of relevant Faculty Senate and professional experience of nominees for Senate Officers, Grievance Board and Grievance Counselors. Whenever possible, this statement will be distributed to Senators prior to the election meeting.

Changes to the Constitution of Clemson University:

The Finance Committee was established as a permanent committee of the Faculty Senate.

The Executive Committee was established as a standing committee of the Faculty Senate.

The Grievance Board was enlarged from seven to eight members. The pool of nominees from which Grievance Board members may be selected was enlarged to include former members of the Faculty Senate.
Resolutions:

Resolved, that the administration be requested to affirm its support of the AAUP statement on discrimination.

Resolved, that the architectural integrity of the Sheep Barn be preserved as a reminder of the University's past.

Resolved, we encourage faculty not to sell complimentary copies marked with wording that they are not to be resold and petition the University Bookstore to stop buying such complimentary copies. (Last year's Faculty Senate also passed a similar resolution prohibiting the sale of complimentary copies of textbooks.)

The Policy Committee, in a joint resolution with the Athletic Council, proposed that the faculty representative to the NCAA should be a non-administrative faculty member; that the nominating committee for this position should be the Executive Committee of the Athletic Council; that the President of Clemson University be asked to select from a slate recommended by this nominating committee; and that this representative should be appointed for a 3-year renewable term.

Distributing the Faculty Survey:

Continued the work of the 1991-1992 Policy Committee in analyzing the data from the Faculty Survey and publishing the completed survey. Individual departmental surveys have also been conducted on request of faculty in those departments.

Recommendations to the next Senate concerning the Faculty Survey:

In response to an internal questionnaire, two-thirds of Senators responding indicated that they supported another Survey of Faculty Opinion during the spring of 1993. Most of the minority indicated that they supported another survey in the fall of 1993 or the spring of 1994. After considerable discussion, the committee decided that the selection of questions for a survey needed more study and more input from Senate membership than had been obtained. Rather than proceed with a questionnaire that had not been thoroughly discussed in the Senate, the committee, with a strong recommendation that the survey be continued, leaves the faculty survey to the next Senate.

We recommend that a Survey of Faculty Opinion be done on a periodic basis, as established by the Senate. We also recommend that the Senate consider establishing an ad hoc committee for the purpose of designing, organizing the distribution of, and compiling the results of the survey.

Recommendations to the next Senate concerning the Faculty Manual:

We recommend that, as in standard merit system procedures, the Faculty Manual be revised to require at least an internal search for all positions. Such procedures would allow Clemson University to fill positions with the best qualified person, while allowing all faculty access to the opportunity to be considered.
1. As per the instructions of the Faculty Senate, I sent a letter to the Solicitor requesting an explanation as to why he chose not to prosecute in a recent action relating to the University. His response is attached.

2. I have made the following proposal regarding written evaluations of faculty, department heads, and deans to the Academic Council and to the Provost’s Council. I will also make this proposal to the Association of Department Heads. I hereby make the proposal to the Faculty Senate.

   Proposal:

   a) Student evaluations of teaching faculty would have to be submitted to the faculty members’ Department Heads.

   b) Written evaluations of Deans and Department Heads would be done annually by Faculty. An evaluation questionnaire for Department Heads was prepared by the University Assessment Committee. A questionnaire for the evaluation of Deans should also be developed by the Assessment Committee.

   c) The evaluation results of the Department Heads and Deans must be made available to the Deans and the Provost and the Faculty who completed the evaluation.

   d) In cooperation with the faculty, Department Heads, and Deans, the Provost should develop more effective procedures for the evaluation of faculty.

RESOLUTION: FACULTY SENATE DISAPPOINTMENT

FS93-4-1 P

Whereas, economic and social conditions have reduced faculty morale to a low point; and,
Whereas, belt tightening and sacrificing have become commonplace at Clemson University;
and,
Whereas, some units have seen a reduction in force while other units have seen limited salary increases and reductions in operating monies; and,
Whereas, fund raising is a normal part of the job of the President of Clemson University;
and,
Whereas, the monies granted President Lennon in his extended deferred compensation package from the Clemson Foundation were unrestricted in nature and could have been used for some other purpose; and, although,

This extension is an extension of an agreement originally made public in 1988;

Resolved, that given the current climate at Clemson University, the Faculty Senate of Clemson University hereby expresses its disappointment in the Board of Trustees of Clemson University for permitting this extension, and its disappointment in Dr. Lennon’s leadership and judgment for accepting it.

This Resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on April 13, 1993
Form CUFM-1001
Appointment of Academic Administrator

Position: ________________________________
College (if applicable): ________________________________
Reporting to: ________________________________

I. Search Committee Members: ¹

(Elected Members) (Appointed Members)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

II. Search Committee list of Nominees was forwarded for review:

By: (Search Committee Chair) Date

III. Check one:

☐ I hereby appoint ________________________________ from the list of nominees submitted to me by
the Search Committee.

☐ An appointment cannot be made from the list of nominees submitted.

By: ________________________________
For Groups I, II & III - Dean
For Groups IV & V - Provost

IV. I hereby approve the appointment made in Section III hereof.

By: ________________________________ By: ________________________________
Provost (For Groups I, II & III) President (all groups)

¹ Group I: For academic department head or other departmental academic administrator within a department, the
department faculty chooses the majority. Dean appoints minority. Must have student member.

Group II: For assistant dean, associate dean, or director within college, faculty of the college or equivalent
administrative unit chooses majority; college dean (or comparable administrator) appoints minority. Must include one
student member. (For the Dean and Director of the Cooperative Extension Service, majority chosen by the Extension
Senate.)

Group III: For academic administrator of an off-campus program, majority and minority appointees shall represent
both off-campus program and associated on-campus academic area. Affected faculty appoints committee majority; dean
may appoint minority.

Group IV: For a college dean or library dean, affected faculty chooses majority, and Provost may appoint minority.
Committee must include at least one student, one department head from within college, and either a dean from another
college or an off-campus representative from an appropriate profession.

Group V: For Vice Provost, academic dean (other than college) or otherwise unspecified academic administrators
reporting directly or indirectly to the Provost, the Provost appoints search committee (after consulting with the Advisory
Committee of the Faculty Senate). One student must be included. (Include a county extension agent if the position is Vice
President and Vice Provost for Agriculture and Natural Resources.)
Faculty Manual Amendment

to Include Form for Appointment of Academic Administrators

Presented by the Policy Committee
April 13, 1993

The following addition is to be made to the Faculty Manual, PART II. The University's History and Administrative Structure. L. Selection of the President and Other Academic Administrators (page 11)

Append the underscored sentence to the sixth paragraph in Section L.

The selection and appointment of all academic administrators shall be in conformity with applicable University Affirmative Action policies and procedures. In particular, in the selection of each search and screening committee, black and female representatives shall be included whenever feasible. Form CUFM-1001 shall be used in all cases to track compliance with the following provisions of the Faculty Manual. Copies of this form shall be placed in the individual's personnel file and additional copies of the duly completed and executed form sent to Human Resources, the Provost, and the Faculty Senate President. The applicable college dean shall be responsible for administration of the form and associated appointment process for groups I, II, and III. The Provost shall be responsible for groups IV and V.

Comments:

Form CUFM-1001 is intended to expedite and simplify the procedures outlined in the Faculty Manual.
TO: The Board of Trustees of Clemson University
FROM: The Faculty Senate of Clemson University
RE: President Lennon's Deferred Compensation Package

After much discussion and debate, we write to inform you that the Faculty Senate of Clemson University perceives that some faculty are disappointed that the Clemson University Foundation's Board has extended President Lennon's deferred supplemental package. To be blunt, the Senate perceives that some faculty are more than disappointed. They are angry and feel this extension to be an affront. Given the sacrificing and belt tightening going on in academic units across the campus, some faculty feel that to add to President Lennon's compensation sends the message that the top administrator is important, but faculty and ensuring the ongoing operations of the University are not. These faculty members are demoralized. There are those who strongly believe that the discretionary funds used for this extension should have been offered to academic units in need of money.

This letter is directed to you because you were the party that permitted this package to be offered and accepted. We can appreciate Dr. Lennon's fruitful work on behalf of the Foundation. At the same time, we must represent our constituents. On behalf of our constituents, we would ask that you recognize and contend with the demoralizing effect this decision has had on some faculty.
* On May 25, 1988, the Clemson University Foundation Board of Directors responded to a Trustee request to create a deferred compensation mechanism for the President of Clemson University.

* The package is intended to accomplish three objectives:
  1. Create an incentive to keep the President at Clemson University for the longest possible period.
  2. Create a compensation package which is more competitive with peer institutions and with the corporate sector.
  3. Create a mechanism to compensate the President for fund-raising efforts above and beyond the normal call of the position.

* The package in place is funded exclusively from private gifts given specifically to the unrestricted endowment. No other restricted or any unrestricted gifts are used for this purpose.

* There is no correlation between the deferred compensation package and any level of gift support—either annually or related to the recently completed Campaign for Clemson.

* The package was structured with IRS guidance. It was designed to offer optimum benefit to the President and no compromise to the tax exempt status of the Clemson University Foundation.

* The original agreement called for a three-year period running from February 26, 1988, until February 25, 1991. It was for $155,000 plus income for the three-year period.

* The first addendum extended the package for two years, from February 26, 1991, to February 25, 1993. It was for $150,000 plus income.

* The second addendum goes into effect on February 26, 1993, and lasts through February 25, 1995. It is for $150,000 plus income.

* The total obligation, as of February 25, 1993, is approximately $425,000. This includes the dollar amounts designated in the original agreement and the first addendum, plus growth in the corpus based on the average annual return of the Clemson University Foundation Managed Pool and any income earned on that particular money.
The balance will continue to grow until the point in time when the existing President terminates his employment with the Clemson University Foundation. The President can collect this package by terminating his employment with the Foundation and therefore terminate any existing or future agreements with the Foundation. He does not have to terminate employment at Clemson University in order to collect his vested interest, although the intent is to sustain employment with the Foundation so long as he is employed by Clemson University. The agreement is automatically terminated if his employment with Clemson University is terminated for any reason.

The President was subject to payment of income tax effective on February 25, 1991. On this date he was considered fully vested in the original agreement. He was in complete control. The President had the option to terminate employment and retrieve the money at his discretion. The same principle applies on February 25, 1993, and February 25, 1995, for the accumulated amounts.

The Foundation covers related income tax preparation fees and expenses which this deferred compensation package may require.

Mr. David Merline of Greenville was the attorney of record. Dave is a member of the Clemson University Foundation Board of Directors and has been most helpful and generous with his time in this regard.

February, 1993
1. **Call to Order.** President Alan Schaffer called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated April 13, 1993 were approved as written.

3. **Election of Senate/Faculty Representatives to University Committees.** Motion was made by Senator Walt Owens to suspend normal voting rules and elect by plurality was seconded and passed. Elected representatives to committees were then announced by President Schaffer.

4. **Committee Reports**
   
a. **Committee Reports**

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Webb Smathers reported that this Committee had not officially met; however, business had been conducted by telephone. The Committee Report was submitted, and briefly discussed (Attachment A). Senator Smathers moved that the Faculty Senate go on record as opposing the implementation of mandatory mid-term grades, and motion was seconded. Discussion followed. Vote was taken and motion to oppose implementation passed unanimously.

   **Welfare Committee.** Senator Lois Lovelace Duke stated that the Committee had met twice, and is looking at the issue of reappointment of new faculty. A proposal will soon be brought to the Faculty Senate for consideration. The issues of administrative/faculty growth, salary surveys, and salary increases will continue to be researched.

   **Finance Committee.** Senator Jim Rathwell reported that this Committee had met with David Larson, Vice President for Business & Finance, to discuss the long-range containment program. Senator Rathwell also informed the Senate that a meeting (with Provost Jennett, David Larson, members of the Finance Committee, students and staff) had been held that morning; the subject of which was an explanation of the budget and potential cuts.

   **Policy Committee.** Senator JoAnne Deeken submitted the Policy Committee Report (Attachment B), and:

   1. introduced a resolution Accommodating the Special Academic Instructional Needs of Clemson University Students with Disabilities. Following discussion, vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment C) (FS93-6-1 P).

   2. tabled a proposal to amend the Faculty Manual to incorporate a statement and policy on discrimination, which was seconded and passed (Attachment D).

   3. reported that the Policy Committee is looking at the issue of department heads versus department chairs. A member of the Council of Deans and the Academic Organization of Department Heads will meet with this Committee soon.
Research Committee. Senator Gary Powell stated that this Committee enjoyed a retreat with the Vice President for Research, George J. Gogue. A Resolution on Faculty Representation on the Board of Directors of the Clemson University Research Foundation (CURF) was submitted by Senator Powell. Vote to accept resolution was taken, and passed unanimously (Attachment E) (FS93-6-2 P).

b. Executive/Advisory Committee

(1) Senator Rathwell submitted a Resolution Addressing Budget Cuts from the Executive/Advisory Committee for approval by the Faculty Senate. Following a friendly amendment from Senator Roger Rollin, vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment F) (FS93-6-3 P).

(2) Senator Walt Owens introduced a Resolution to Join Conference of South Carolina University Faculty Senate Presidents to the Senate from the Executive/Advisory Committee for acceptance. Following discussion, vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment G) (FS93-6-4 P).

c. University Commissions and Committees

(1) ad hoc Committee to Draft a Job Description for the Faculty Representative to the NCAA - Senate Alternate Jerry Waldvogel reported that this Committee had prepared a final version of a Draft Job Description which will be presented to the Athletic Council soon; and will be presented to the Faculty Senate in the Fall.

(2) Joint City/University Committee - Vice President/President-Elect Owens provided an update on the new Bookstore which should be completed by 1996.

5. Old Business

a. President Schaffer reported that the proposal regarding basic requirements to be completed during the first two and one-half years of college (75 Hour Credit Requirement) has been defeated by the Academic Council.

b. President Schaffer shared information regarding the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee, and the incorporation of a statement recommended by the Faculty Senate and approved by the Provost, that is now being revisited.

c. Senator Deeken referred to and briefly explained the Report from the Provost on Growth in Academic Affairs (Attachment H). Statistics are on file in the Faculty Senate Office for perusal.

6. New Business

a. Senator Frank Tainter presented a concern received from his colleagues which involves the evaluation of the air quality in particular buildings on campus. This issue was referred to the Welfare Committee to consider as soon as possible.
7. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

David Leigh, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

May 31, 1993

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE REPORT

We have not met but have conducted business relating to three items by phone.

1. The Scholastic Policies Committee was informed through President Schaffer's correspondence from Provost Jennett that he has rejected FS 92-3-2 P, which relates to early registration for student athletes, honors students and cooperative education students on work assignment. The Committee had no strong feelings concerning this rejection relative to the desirability of further action.

2. The Scholastic Policies Committee was polled concerning the approval by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies to reinstate midterm grades (see attachment to Provost Jennett from Senior Vice Provost Reel). Of the Scholastic Policies members available, four were opposed to midterm grades (one strongly opposed) and two were neutral. Sentiment was that there could be some merits for largely freshmen classes where there was some "carry over of the high school attitude." Most faculty felt the grades prior to drop-add were insufficient to determine final grade and in some cases may even give a false sense of security. It is certainly a costly system. It is our recommendation that the Faculty Senate oppose implementation of midterm grades.

3. As a project for 1993-1994 the Scholastic Policies Committee has agreed to attempt to influence upgrading of some teaching classrooms. There is a wide disparity of lighting, equipment, acoustics and general suitability for instruction existing among classrooms. There are questions as to where responsibility lies, between departments, colleges or university, regarding expenditure of funds for upgrading these classrooms. We hope to learn the process and hopefully help improve some classrooms.

Respectfully submitted,

Webb M. Smathers, Jr., Chair
Scholastic Policies Committee
MEMORANDUM

TO: J. Charles Jennett
    Provost

FROM: Jerome V. Reel, Jr.  
    Senior Vice Provost

RE: Proposal for Mid-term Grades.

The Commission on Undergraduate Studies approved the following proposal regarding mid-term grades to be effective Fall, 1994:

"Once near mid-term in every course the instructor shall make available for each student

   a) that student's ranking to-date in that course, or  
   b) that student's course grade to-date,

relative to grading system stated in the course syllabus.

This feedback should occur near mid-term, but it shall occur no later than the course meeting prior to the last day to withdraw without final grades. More frequent feedback is strongly encouraged.

Both student and instructor are to recognize that this feedback reflects the student's performance up to that point in time, and such, that student's final course grade may change based upon subsequent course work performance(s)."

The policy would include all undergraduate courses and does apply to summer school.

The motion was unanimously approved to be presented to the Academic Council for implementation for Fall, 1994.
Policy Committee Report  
June 8, 1993

The policy committee met three times: May 4, May 19, 1993, and June 2, 1993

The Committee has voted to refer the following three items back to the President of the Faculty Senate:

1. The previous Faculty Senate voted to recommend the appointment of an Ad-Hoc Senate Committee to examine the idea of a Faculty Survey. The present Policy Committee concurs with this recommendation. The Policy Committee will not officially consider the idea of a faculty survey but will await the recommendations of the Ad-Hoc Committee.

2. Senator Bodine asked about local radio coverage of the Faculty Senate meetings. The Committee asks Pres. Schaffer to contact both the campus radio station and WCCP to see about getting radio coverage.

3. The Policy Committee requests that Pres. Schaffer approach Provost Jennett and ask his opinion regarding Promotion and Tenure. The current Faculty Manual is clear in stating these are two separate procedures and are not tied together. Rumors abound that the Provost considers the two procedures linked. The Policy Committee would like to know if the Provost intends to officially request a change in the Faculty Manual in order to link these two procedures or to keep the two separate and distinct procedures as stated in the manual. The Committee felt that this correspondence should better come from the President of the Faculty Senate than from the Policy Comm.

The following two resolutions have been passed unanimously by the Policy Committee:

1. Resolution regarding the American with Disabilities Act and academic instruction. (See attached.)

2. Resolution regarding a Faculty Manual change to incorporate non-discrimination based on sexual or affectional preference. (See attached.)

The Policy Committee continues to work on the idea of changing the Faculty Manual in order to incorporate a proposed change from appointed Dept. Heads to elected Dept. Chairs with specified term limits. We are also looking at a concurrent change to limit the tenure of Deans. An announcement that the Committee was looking at this idea was made at all College meetings in May and input was requested from the faculty. Admittedly, this was not scientific sampling or surveying, but the Comm wanted to see if there was any overwhelming consensus on the issue. No consensus arose from the input we received. Feelings on the subject are very high (both pro and con) through out the faculty. There was a consensus that Deans and Dept. Heads need to be accountable to the Faculty. The only dispute was whether an elected
Chairmanship was the way to achieve that accountability. The Committee will ask one representative from the Council of Deans and one from the Academic Dept. Heads to come to a meeting on July 7 at 2:00 in the Library Conference Room in order for them to provide input into the deliberations of the Committee. The format of the meeting and invitations to those two groups were discussed on June 2.

Dean Waller has notified the Policy Committee of two possible changes to the Faculty Manual. The Committee will discuss these on July 21.

Respectfully submitted by JoAnne Deeken, Chair, Faculty Senate Policy Committee May 27, 1993
Faculty Senate Resolution
Accommodating the Special Academic Instructional Needs of
Clemson University Students with Disabilities
(5/20/93)

Whereas, there are at present approximately 180 students with physical and/or learning disabilities registered with the Office of Student Development at Clemson University, and

Whereas, the overall size and diversity of Clemson University's student population will undoubtedly continue to increase in the coming years, and

Whereas, it is Clemson University's legal responsibility under the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 to provide all disabled students officially registered with the Office of Student Development with an appropriate teaching environment in which they can demonstrate their mastery of the material of each course through minimization or elimination of the impact of the student's disability, and

Whereas, it is the Provost's responsibility to inform and educate the faculty regarding the specific accommodations which may be necessary to achieve this legal compliance (see attachment from Office of Student Development for specifics), and

Whereas, current staffing levels within the Office of Student Development are not adequate to handle all aspects of the workload involved with achieving compliance to ADA,

Be It Resolved that the Clemson University Administration shall:

1. conduct an evaluation of the University's compliance with the academic instruction provisions of ADA,

2. expand the present half-time staff position within the Office of Student Development which is devoted to ADA compliance to a full-time position, and provide the necessary resources and additional support staff to ensure that compliance is achieved,

3. take steps to formally notify all teaching faculty at the beginning of each academic year as to the exact requirements of compliance with ADA, the sorts of accommodations for the learning needs of disabled students which may be required of faculty in their courses, and the resources available through the Office of Student Development to help meet these requirements.
The Policy Committee proposes the following addition(s) to the Faculty Manual:

Under Part III of the Faculty Manual (The Faculty), Section B (Academic Freedom and Responsibility), add the following sentence to Paragraph 9 (p. 16): "They [faculty] shall not discriminate against any colleague, student, administrator or any other person associated with the University on the basis of age, sex, physical handicap, race, religion, national origin, marital status, or sexual or affectional preference."

In Part IV of the Faculty Manual (Personnel Practices), Section B (Affirmative Action Policies and Procedures for the Recruitment and Appointment of Faculty and Administrators), substitute the following sentence for the first sentence of Paragraph 2 (p. 23): "It is the policy of Clemson University that no person is to be accepted or rejected for employment solely on the basis of age, sex, physical handicap, race, religion, national origin, marital status, or sexual or affectional preference."

*On August 18, 1992, by a 19-1 vote, the Senate passed (and the Administration later approved) Resolution FS92-8-3 P, in support of the AAUP Statement on Discrimination. In order for such a policy to be effective, it must be incorporated in the Clemson University Faculty Manual, as well as relevant employee and student manuals.

AAUP Statement on Discrimination
adopted October, 1976

The Association is committed to use its procedures and to take measures, including censure, against colleges and universities practicing illegal or unconstitutional discrimination, or discrimination on a basis not demonstrably related to the job function involved, including but not limited to age, sex, physical handicap, race, religion, national origin, marital status, or sexual or affectional preference.
RESOLUTION ON FACULTY REPRESENTATION ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CLEMSON UNIVERSITY RESEARCH FOUNDATION (CURF)

FS93-6-2 P

Preamble: Following discussions with Dr. Jay Gogue, the Research Committee suggests that the representatives include the current Chairman of the Research Committee (one year term), and an additional faculty member with good research credentials to be appointed by the Research Committee, in consultation with the Vice President for Research, to a three-year term. If the individual so appointed cannot fulfill the three-year term, he/she will request in writing a replacement who will be appointed to the remainder of the term by the Research Committee. The faculty members will participate in the yearly Board meeting as regular members of the Board with full voting rights and responsibilities.

Whereas, Faculty representation on the Board of the Clemson University Research Foundation (CURF) is desirable to provide faculty input in the activities and oversight of the endeavors of CURF, and

Resolved, The Faculty Senate favors adding two faculty members to the Board of Directors. These members will be the current Chairman of the Research Committee and a second faculty member with good research credentials. This second member will be nominated by the Research Committee in consultation with the Vice President of Research and appointed to a three-year term by the Faculty Senate. If this second faculty member cannot serve the full three-year term, a replacement will be chosen by the above process to complete the remainder of the three-year term.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on June 8, 1993
RESOLUTION ADDRESSING BUDGET CUTS
FS93-6-3 P

Whereas, Clemson University is facing a budgetary crisis of unprecedented proportions,
and
Whereas, This crisis will impact upon the entire faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and public service, and
Whereas, As a result of this crisis, faculty positions may be deleted, and
Whereas, The faculty is aware of their responsibilities during this budgetary crisis, and
Whereas, All financial planning to date has been carried out by the University Administration with no formal faculty input, and
Whereas, The faculty of Clemson University have a vital interest in the resolution of the present financial crisis,

Resolved, That the President shall establish full and meaningful faculty participation in the financial planning process which identifies, prioritizes, and implements any and all budgetary reductions.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on June 8, 1993
RESOLUTION TO JOIN CONFERENCE OF SOUTH CAROLINA UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENTS

FS93-6-4 P

Whereas, a new association of Faculty Senates in South Carolina’s public institutions of higher learning is being formed;

Whereas, the purpose of the organization is to advance the cause of higher education in South Carolina by exchange of information on matters of mutual interest and by facilitating contact between faculty and governmental decision makers, such as the members of the General Assembly;

Whereas, the purpose and goals of the Conference are set forth in a Statement of Purpose and Goals; and

Whereas, a set of by-laws has been proposed for the organization;

Resolved, that the Clemson University Faculty Senate hereby joins the Conference of South Carolina University Faculty Senate Presidents.

This resolution passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on June 8, 1993.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Schaffer, President of the Faculty Senate

FROM: JoAnne Deeken

RE: Report from the Provost on Growth in Academic Affairs

DATE: May 19, 1993

I'd like to thank Jerry Whitmire and his office for his cooperation in preparing the statistical report which is the cornerstone of this report. Jerry and his office took the initiative in contacting both John Huffman and myself immediately after receiving a copy of my previous report. He made himself and his staff available to supply any information the Senate might need to study administrative growth. After discussion and much work, Dr. Whitmire's office prepared a clear and succinct printout detailing administrative growth in Academic Affairs. This report extended to the department level.

Before discussing the report itself, I'd like to give some background information. First, the report lists in full time equivalents (FTEs) the number of persons at least a portion of whose pay comes from administrative support lines of the budget. In using this procedure, there is no way to distinguish a professor who is receiving a salary supplement to act as assistant department head from a secretary from a full time director of a center on campus. Second, only filled positions were counted in the figures. Dr. Whitmire was able to obtain these figures through pay roll records which do not list unfilled positions. Also, in fairness to Administrative Units which may have purposely not filled positions in order to handle budget cuts in their units, but who have not yet officially "lost" the positions, considering filled positions was considered to be equitable.

Dr. Whitmire was also concerned that just showing FTEs could hide some administrative shifting. If a high level administrative position was not filled and instead two lower level (lower paid) support staff were hired, a description of administrative growth would be deceptive. Therefore, I asked for and received both a FTE breakdown and total salary breakdown. Dr. Whitmire asks that those using and reading this report realize that the salary figures may also be deceptive. Normal raises and reclassifications are included...
in the figures. Salaries should increase over a five year period.

Several offices were transferred to Academic Affairs for other units in 1991. Dr. Whitmire's report traces these offices from 1988/89 to the present. While each experienced growth over the five year period, little of that growth occurred while the offices reported to the Provost.

Finally, the balance of my report will often mention percentage increases. I'd like to remind everyone that percentages are often deceiving in and of themselves. An increase from 1 administrator to 2 is an increase of 100%. An increase from 88.75 to 112.1 is an increase of only 26%. However, the second increase has a much greater effect overall.

If all the units presently reporting to the Provost reported to him in 1988/89, he would have had 636.13 FTE administrative personnel in his area. He currently has 785.08. Total FTE growth was 23.42%. Total salaries for those persons in 1988/89 was $17,712,125.11. In 1992/93 it is $25,195,767.58. The percentage increase was 42.25%.

A breakdown of each of the colleges and Academic areas follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>%age increase</th>
<th>FTE %age increase</th>
<th>salary %age increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>38.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag Sciences</td>
<td>23.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>-10.22</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/Industry</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>61.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Ops.</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>149.70</td>
<td>157.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest/Recreation</td>
<td>28.65</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>40.84</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>-7.20</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attached to this report are the spreadsheets from Dr. Whitmire's office. I recommend a stronger look for anyone concerned about administrative growth in his/her particular department.

cc: John Huffman
1. **Call to Order.** Vice President/President-Elect Walt Owens called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The General Faculty Minutes dated May 6, 1993 were approved as written. The Faculty Senate Minutes dated June 8, 1993 were approved as written.

3. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Webb Smathers reported that this committee had not met during the summer, and that the Academic Council had unanimously approved the proposal for mid-term grades.

   **Welfare Committee.** No report.

   **Finance Committee.** No report.

   **Policy Committee.** Senator JoAnne Deeken submitted the Policy Committee Report (Attachment A).

   **Research Committee.** No report.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**

   1) **Traffic and Parking Committee** - Senator Harold Allen briefly explained significant changes contained in a proposal which is now under consideration (Attachment B). Questions and/or comments may be directed to Senator Jerry Christenbury.

4. **President's Report.** Vice President/President-Elect Owens reported that the budget situation is still uncertain at this time, but that the final outcome will soon be made public. During discussion of the budget situation, the Finance Committee was asked to address budget cuts within administrative budgets. Additional items reported were that Bill Amick was re-elected to a two-year term as Chairman of the Clemson University Board of Trustees, and that the Academic Council passed the proposal regarding mid-term grades.

5. **Old Business** None.

6. **New Business**
   a. Senate Alternate Jerry Waldvogel submitted for approval the Position Description for the Faculty Athletics Representative at Clemson University (Attachment C). Following an explanation of this position description and discussion, vote for acceptance and to endorse position description was taken and passed unanimously. Senator Rollin suggested that during individual college meetings senators announce that Cecil Huey will be the Faculty Athletics Representative.
Representative at Clemson University.

b. Vice President/President-Elect Owens announced that the Board of Trustees Breakfast hosted by the Faculty Senate will be held at 8:30 a.m. on Saturday, October 2, 1993 in the Virginia Shanklin Room of the Clemson House.

c. Senator Deeken submitted two Faculty Manual Changes for consideration by the Senate:

   (1) a membership addition of the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees and the Chairperson of the Institutional Advancement Committee of the Board of Trustees to the Selection Committee of the University Honorary Degrees Committee (Attachment D). Following discussion, vote to accept this change was taken, and passed unanimously.

   (2) a membership statement substitution regarding the University Scholarships and Awards Committee (Attachment E). Following discussion, vote to accept this change was taken and passed.

d. Senator Roger Rollin praised and thanked the ad hoc Committee to Draft the FAR Position Description for its efforts and diligent work to prepare a position description that is very important to the future of Clemson University.

7. Special Order of the Day - Majorie Campbell, DCIT Training Consultant, explained and discussed the electronic mail system with members of the Faculty Senate. Senators were urged to become familiar with and use this system of communication within the University. For further instruction, senators may contact Marjorie Campbell at 656-2415.

8. Announcement. Vice President/President-Elect Owens announced that three Alumni Distinguished Professors had been named: Eugene Bishop, Department of Mechanical Engineering; John Idol, Department of English; and Ray Turner, Department of Physics.

9. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

David Leigh, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Senators Absent: L. Blanton, W. Bridges, D. Hutton, J. Flanigan, A. Schaffer (H. Woodall attended), J. Gilreath (J. Waldvogel attended), R. Williams
Report of the Faculty Senate
Policy Committee
Prepared by JoAnne Deeken
August 10, 1993

Since the last Senate meeting the Policy Committee has met twice, on July 21 and August 4. We had scheduled a meeting with representatives of the Academic Dept. Heads group for July 7, but the meeting was canceled at the last minute because the representatives had quite legitimate last minute conflicts. Joe Dickerson of Plant Path and Rod Mabry of Finance have been rescheduled for an appearance with the Policy Committee on Sept. 1 at 3:00 in the Library Conference Room. Committee members, please note this is an hour later than our usual meeting time.

In addition, the Policy Committee would like to share with the Senate the following response form Provost Jennett. The Committee had heard concerns from the faculty that the Deans and/or the Provost were linking or trying to link Promotion and Tenure. We asked Dr. Schaffer to write to the Provost to clarify his position. We believe the following quote from his response is clear and urge all of you to share the sentiments with your faculty.

"...I do not consider promotion and tenure linked. I have considered that the standard for a lifetime position should be higher than the standard for promotion from assistant to associate professor or from an instructor to assistant professor. I would admit that the rules do not explicitly state that, but as you so often have pointed out, this is a 'mature university' and common sense would indicate we very often make appointments at the instructor level that are not considered permanent and very often we bring a person in at the associate professor level with no tenure. The implication is that tenure is a much higher standard." (Jennett, memo 6/7/93.)

The Committee has also passed two proposed Faculty Manual changes that need your approval now. Copies of the changes are enclosed with this report. Another proposed Faculty Manual change, regarding alternative ranks in the College of Nursing has been tabled until a representative from that College can appear before the committee.
August 16, 1993

MEMORANDUM

TO: Harold Allen

FR: Gerald Christenbury,
Faculty Representative

RE: Parking Committee Report

Significant Changes:

1. **Page 4, Draft #2 7/26/93, Section 27-3001.2 (D)**
   Vehicles owned or leased by University departments must display a valid parking permit when parked in employee or student parking zones overnight.

2. **Page 11, Draft #2 7/26/93, Section 27-3004.7 (A)(5)**
   Towing and Impounding after (3) parking violations
   - this has been in the code, but printed differently in Student handbook,
   - will be corrected next year, so that if (3) past due tickets (15 days given) vehicle may be towed or impounded.

3. **Page 7, Draft #2, 7/26/93, Section 27-3002.4 (A)**
   Re-defined Visitor area for more rapid turnover
   - no charge for casual visitor,
   - charge those for weekly seminars, etc.

4. **Other Concerns: Page 10, Draft #2, 7/26/93, Section 27-3004.3**
   Fees determined by Board of Trustees, or their designees
   - most probably originates in Traffic office to balance budget,
   - voted on by V. Pres. as other auxiliary services fees.

5. **Other Changes: Page 2, Draft #2, 7/26/93, Section 273000.3 (M)**
   Primarily definitions to accommodate various Laws & Codes. For example; define a Past Due Ticket - not paid or appealed within 15 days.

New regulations will be voted on at September Traffic and Parking Committee meeting.

bm
Position Description for Faculty Athletics Representative
at Clemson University

DRAFT

The position of Faculty Athletics Representative at Clemson University is crucial to the strength of Clemson's Athletics Program. Its most important function is to affirm the importance of academic integrity both internally and externally: within the University community itself, and in the public perception of the University. To help ensure the commitment to academic integrity at Clemson, the Faculty Senate has drafted this description of the position--its qualifications, selection process, and duties--to act as a guide toward the continuing empowerment and support of the Faculty Athletics Representative.

In so doing, the Senate endorses the "Statement of the Role of the Faculty Athletics Representative" ratified by the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association in October 1992, after review by the NCAA Presidents Commission, and submitted to the Commissioners of NCAA Member Conferences and Compliance Coordinators of NCAA Division 1 Member Institutions and Conferences on December 3, 1992. This document emphasizes the importance of the Faculty Athletics Representative in ensuring academic integrity, facilitating institutional control of intercollegiate athletics, and enhancing the student-athlete experience. It stresses that senior faculty members can provide significant leadership in issues concerning athletics programs IF they have adequate administrative and institutional support. The guidelines for Clemson's Faculty Athletics Representative, offered herein by Clemson's Faculty Senate, aim to provide that support and to affirm the necessity of the system of checks and balances which now ensures the academic integrity of Clemson's Athletics Program.

I. Qualifications for Clemson's Faculty Athletics Representative

Clemson's FAR should be a tenured Associate or Full Professor who has served on Clemson's faculty a minimum of three years. The FAR should be familiar with the policies and procedures of the Athletic Council and knowledgeable about Clemson's Athletics Program generally.
II. Term of Office for Clemson's Faculty Athletics Representative

Clemson's FAR should serve a term of four years, once renewable.

III. Selection Process for Clemson's Faculty Athletics Representative

According to the Policies and Procedures of Clemson's Athletic Council, the nominating committee to select the FAR consists of the Executive Committee of the Council plus the Faculty Senate's representative to the Council. This committee should encourage nominees from both inside and outside the Council. Each nominee should be interviewed by the nominating committee to ascertain his/her qualifications, familiarity with Clemson's Athletics Program, understanding of the duties and responsibilities of the FAR, and motives for seeking the position. The committee should ensure that, as stated in the FARA guidelines to the NCAA, "those who represent the faculty are most likely to be independent of the financial and other pressures that create enormous incentives for competitive success in the revenue-producing sports."

The nominating committee will submit to the President of the University a slate of no fewer than three nominees, from which the FAR will be chosen.

Upon completion of a four-year term, the nominating committee may recommend one additional term of office for the FAR.

IV. Duties and Responsibilities of Clemson's Faculty Athletics Representative

A. Ensuring Academic Integrity

The foremost duty of Clemson's FAR is to ensure academic integrity in the functioning of the Athletics Program. To that end, the FAR should periodically review appropriate records of student athletes, especially as they relate to eligibility requirements; he/she should participate fully in the current system of eligibility checks and balances. The FAR should perform all reviews necessary to ensure that recruitment, admissions, and academic advising, evaluation, and support are all carried out in a manner consistent with the primary academic mission of Clemson University. The FAR may request periodic reports from those who work with student athletes regarding the students' academic preparation and performance, such as progress toward the degree.
B. Ensuring Compliance

The FAR should play a supportive and advisory role with Clemson's Director of Institutional Compliance, and should play a major role in any institutional inquiry into suspected violations or infractions, and in any NCAA athletics certification program reviews. The FAR should receive the results of any periodic audits of the Athletics Department which may be conducted. As stated in the FARA document, even when the Director of Institutional Compliance reports directly to the President, the FAR should retain significant responsibilities for institutional control structures and activities.

At all times, the FAR, along with the Athletics Administration, should ensure that high standards of student-athlete conduct, both on and off campus and in the classroom and out, are clearly communicated and consistently enforced.

C. Promoting the Student-Athlete Experience

The FAR should work to promote a balance in the student-athlete's experience among athletics, academics, and a social life. Clemson University aims to provide a full range of activities for all its students, including athletes, but recognizes that student-athletes may need particular encouragement and aid in seeking out opportunities not associated with athletics. The FAR should offer such encouragement and aid, and should reinforce Clemson's commitment to giving its student-athletes, along with all its students, an education first and foremost. While Clemson's Athletic Council also assumes such responsibility, the FAR is uniquely positioned to represent the Faculty to the student-athlete, and should be given every opportunity to do so.

D. Communicating with Faculty and with Administration

The FAR serves on the Athletic Council, and provides regular reports to that body. The FAR also should submit a written report to the Faculty Senate annually, preferably at its September meeting, and should meet semiannually with the Faculty Senate's Executive/Advisory Committee. These reports should provide Faculty with information regarding academic integrity, rules violations, academic preparation and performance of student-athletes, and any other matters pertaining to intercollegiate athletics.
The FAR should have access to all budgetary information about the Athletics Program, and should act as voting institutional representative to the conference and to the NCAA.

The FAR must have access to the President and must be recognized as a key advisor on athletics-related matters by everyone involved with athletics administration. The FAR must have a working relationship with the Director of Athletics and his/her staff.

The FAR should have a major role in institutional searches for key athletics personnel.

V. Institutional Resources and Compensation for Clemson's Faculty Athletics Representative

The FAR document states: "No faculty member should accept appointment to the position of FAR without a commitment of institutional resources consistent with those responsibilities and a pledge of institutional recognition of the time and energies required for these duties to be effectively discharged." The President, Provost, Deans, and Department Heads, as well as all other administrative personnel, must acknowledge that the FAR's duties require significant time and energy and are essential to the healthy functioning of Clemson University's programs in both athletics and academics. To that end, it is absolutely essential that Clemson's FAR be given adequate release time from professional responsibilities, and adequate clerical services for the many duties he/she must perform. Moreover, the FAR's efforts should be rewarded appropriately in University evaluations.

Most importantly, the FAR should be recognized as an essential element in the system of checks and balances that ensures a respected and successful athletic program, and should be given as much autonomy as that system can accommodate. As representative of the best interests of the Faculty and of the academic element of the Clemson community, the FAR can ensure that preventive measures and the means of early intervention are in place, thus playing a fundamental role in the vitality of Clemson University's Athletics Program, and of the University as a whole.

Prepared by the Senate's ad hoc committee to draft the FAR position description:

Professor Ron Thomas, Food Sciences
Assistant Professor Jerry Waldvogel, Biology
Assistant Professor Lucy Rollin, English (Chair of ad hoc committee)
Proposed Faculty Manual Change regarding the Honorary Degrees policy.

The following suggested was unanimously passed by the Senate Policy Committee on August 4, 1993.

Replace sentence two, paragraph 3 of Section I, p. 78 of the Faculty Manual with the following:

“...A selection committee shall be established consisting of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall serve as Chairperson; the President of the Faculty Senate, who shall serve as Secretary; the most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; an Alumni Professor appointed by the President; the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees; and the Chairperson of the Institutional Advancement Committee of the Board of Trustees.”
To: The Faculty Senate
From: The Policy Committee
Subject: Proposal for a Change in the Faculty Manual

21 July 1993

At present the University Scholarships and Awards Committee counts among its members "a faculty representative from each college (normally, the chair of the College Scholarships Committee)" (Faculty Manual, p.43, para. h).

The Faculty Manual Committee has received a recommendation from a subcommittee in [Financial Aid Director Marvin Carmichael’s] office that the faculty representative from each of the nine colleges "be appointed by the college deans for an indefinite term." This recommendation is based upon a need for "on-the-job training" for the faculty involved and their "access to significant clerical and administrative services."

It is not clear to the Policy Committee how being appointed by their deans should entitle these faculty members to closer support than elected representatives. Moreover, the Committee: 1) perceives no compelling reason why faculty should surrender this decision to administrators; 2) does not believe that continuity requires unlimited terms.

Accordingly, the Policy Committee recommends the following change in the Faculty Manual:

Substitute for the quoted statement in para. 1 (above) from para.h, p.43 of the Faculty Manual the following:

"a faculty representative from each college elected by the collegiate faculty for staggered three-year terms, once renewable...."
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
SEPTEMBER 14, 1993

1. Call to Order. President Alan Schaffer called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The Faculty Senate Minutes dated August 17, 1993 were approved as written.

3. Committee Reports
   a. Committee Reports

   Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Webb Smathers submitted and briefly discussed this committee's report (Attachment A).

   Welfare Committee. Senator Lois Lovelace Duke reported that this committee is considering the issues of raises and growth in administration; employment practices for the rank of instructor; and letters of reappointment.

   Finance Committee. Senator Jim Rathwell stated that this committee had met, and encouraged the Senate to submit specific questions for President Max Lennon and Vice President David Larson which will be compiled and forwarded for responses.

   Policy Committee. Senator JoAnne Deeken reported that this committee had met with Rod Mabry and Joe Dickerson, representatives from the Organization of Academic Department Heads to discuss departmental governance across the Clemson University campus. Dean Bobby Wixson will represent the Council of Deans at the Policy Committee on September 22, 1993, to discuss this same issue. By November, a recommendation will be brought to the Faculty Senate on the issue of departmental governance.

   Research Committee. Senator Gary Powell stated that this committee will meet on September 15, 1993 to address teaching versus research.

   b. University Commissions and Committees - None

4. President's Report. In addition to items included in the September, 1993 President's Report (Attachment B) President Schaffer:

   *encouraged senators to attend and invite other faculty to the meeting on September 22, 1993 at 3:30 p.m. with President Lennon. This meeting will be held in Room 200, Hardin Hall Auditorium. The subject will be, "Where Do We Go Now with Strategic Planning?"

   *briefly discussed his understanding of the business association between the National Football League (NFL) and Clemson University. President Schaffer has stated to Nick Lomax, Vice President for Administration and Secretary to the Board of Trustees, that the distribution of funds received should go towards student services and academic programs.

   *reported that there were some administrative raises, and that some were high. The
reported that there were some administrative raises, and that some were high. The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee will look into this issue and will report back to the Senate.

reported that the issue of budget cuts within administrative departments will be pursued by the Faculty Senate Finance Committee.

stated that he attended the meeting of the Board of Trustees Educational Policy Sub-Committee. During that meeting, members of the Board criticized the implementation of the Mid-Year Check.

stated that he attended a meeting of the Clemson University Foundation. The Foundation By-laws must be amended so that one or two faculty senators may serve on the Foundation. President Schaffer and Gary Ransdell, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, will propose an amendment to the Foundation.

5. Old Business

a. Glenn Birrenkott, Chair of the 1992-93 Faculty Manual Committee, submitted the Final Report (Attachment C), and explained those proposed changes that were not approved by the Provost.

b. Senator Deeken made a motion to remove from the table the Proposal to Amend the Faculty Manual (Attachment D). Vote was taken to remove the proposal from the table, and motion passed. The floor was opened for discussion during which many senators submitted views in favor of or against this proposed Faculty Manual amendment. Call to Question was received, seconded, and vote passed. Vote was taken to forward these two Faculty Manual amendments to the Provost for inclusion in the Faculty Manual, and failed (14 yes; 11 no with one abstention and was, therefore, defeated because two-thirds majority vote was required).

6. New Business

a. Bill Baron was nominated by Roger Rollin to serve on the Grievance Board. Other nominations may be provided to the Faculty Senate Office by September 30, 1993. Election of one additional faculty member to the Grievance Board will be held on September 30, 1993 by the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate.

b. The Resolution on Surplus State Funds Returned to Clemson was submitted and explained by Senator Rathwell, Chair of the Finance Committee. Following discussion, vote was held and resolution passed unanimously (FS93-9-1 P) (Attachment E).

c. Senator Rathwell moved for a two-thirds vote to bring the Resolution on the Clemson University Budget Process to the floor of the Faculty Senate for consideration, which was seconded. Vote was taken and passed unanimously. Senator Rathwell then read aloud, submitted, and explained the resolution under consideration. Following discussion during which an amendment was suggested, seconded, voted on and failed; vote to accept resolution as written and submitted was taken, and passed unanimously (FS93-9-2 P) (Attachment F).

d. Alan Schaffer stepped down in his capacity as President of the Faculty Senate (Secretary David Leigh presided) to move that a two-thirds vote be taken to place the Proposed Faculty Manual Change regarding the Honorary Degrees Policy on the floor for consideration by the Senate (Attachment G). Vote was taken and passed. Alan Schaffer then explained the miscommunication that had occurred, and submitted the correct version of this Faculty Manual Change to the Senate. Vote was taken, and change to Faculty Manual passed unanimously (Attachment H).
e. President Schaffer encouraged all senators to attend the Board of Trustees/Faculty Senate Breakfast on October 2, 1993.

7. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

David Leigh, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Senators Absent: W. Stringer, S. Barbary, J. Flanigan, S. Stevenson (J. Waldvogel attended), R. Williams
Minutes

Scholastic Policies Committee - Faculty Senate

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on September 7, 1993, in 223 Barre Hall. Chairperson Webb Smathers presided. The following members were present: Shelley Barbary, Bill Hare, Leigh Moody, Bud Rice, and Harold Woodell.

The first item of business discussed involved the definition of acceptable space and equipment for classroom instruction. It is evident that classrooms across the campus exist in which the environment is detrimental to the learning process. Overcrowding, poor acoustics, faulty or inadequate audio-visual equipment, noisy air-conditioning, and rickety chairs and desks were mentioned as representative of the problems the committee needs to explore. Specifically, the committee seeks to find answers to the following questions:

1. Who is responsible for the cost of maintaining equipment and classrooms?
2. How can Dee Stone (Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs) help the committee with these matters? A sub-committee composed of Webb Smathers, Shelley Barbary, and Bill Hare will try to work with Stone to resolve these matters.
3. How can the committee secure information about the classroom problems? Suggestions involved a search of recent university self-studies and SACS reports, contacting the fire marshal, someone in Performing Arts, Stasson Thompson (Ag. Econ.), and Dee Cross (Animal Science). Leigh Moody has agreed to ask the Student Senate to poll students on these issues.

The second order of business was a discussion of the Honor Code developed by the College of Engineering. Since it is clear that the code as it is now written is in conflict with both the Faculty Manual and the Student Handbook, the committee sees the need for further study of this matter with the end to resolving the differences among these three documents. The committee recognizes the complexities surrounding the implementation of any honor code, but in general supports the efforts of the College of Engineering to do so and expects this issue eventually to stir campus-wide debate and sees the possibility of re-instating a university-wide honor code. This committee will send its conclusion to Cathy Sturkie, Secretary to the Faculty Senate, to report to the full Senate.

The committee next examined as an informational matter a document titled "Academic Council 1993 Freshman and Transfer Admissions Report."

The committee agreed to meet at 8:00 am on the third Tuesday of each month. Bud Rice consented to the role of Assistant Chair in the absence of Chairperson Smathers.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Harold Woodell.
REPORT FROM SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

Webb Smathers, Chair

The Scholastic Policies Committee has reviewed the Honor Code as developed by the College of Engineering and recommends that it be returned to the college for further study. Since the code as it is now written is in conflict with statements in both the Faculty Manual and the Student Handbook, the committee sees the need for re-examination of this matter with the end to resolving differences among these three documents. The committee recognizes the complexities surrounding the implementation of any honor code, but in general supports the efforts of the College of Engineering to do so and expects this issue eventually to stir a campus-wide debate on the need to re-instate a university-wide honor code.
1. The yearly report of the Clemson University Foundation is available to any member of the Faculty Senate who would like to look at it. A copy of this Report is housed in the Faculty Senate Office, Third Floor of the Cooper Library.

2. A copy of the proposed new parking regulations is also in the Faculty Senate Office for your perusal. These proposed regulations are also available in the Dean's Office of each college.

3. At the September 14th Faculty Senate meeting, nominations from the floor for an additional member of the Grievance Board will be received. The Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate will elect this additional member of the Grievance Board at its next meeting. Please consider nominating a person with the following information in mind:

   Service on the Grievance Board is for two years
   Nominee must be tenured
   Nominee must be a Full or Associate Professor
   Nominee can be a present member of the Faculty Senate, a present alternate senator, or a former member of the Faculty Senate
   Nominees must be from the Colleges of Architecture, Engineering, and the Library
MEMORANDUM

August 24, 1993

To: Faculty Senate

From: Glenn Birrenkott Jr., Chair
       1992-93 Faculty Manual Committee

Re: Changes to the Faculty Manual

In February and March of 1993 the Faculty Senate approved changes to the Faculty Manual put forward by the Faculty Manual Committee. The Provost has responded and approved all but the following:

1. Provost does not approve changing Associate Directors of Library to Associate Deans of Library

2. Provost has changes he, and Board of Trustees, would like to see in the Honorary Degrees Selection Committee. (I have referred this to Policy Committee).

3. Change to Admissions and Continuing Enrollment needs more discussion and is not approved.

4. While there is no confusion in the administration on which units report to which Vice President, our change to the Faculty Manual needs to be reworked for the following units: Admissions, Registration and Financial Aid, Magistrate's Office, Parking and Vehicle Registration, Public Affairs, and Public Safety. (This is an item for the 1993-94 Faculty Manual Committee).

Please note that the majority of changes have been approved and are currently being incorporated into the Faculty Manual. They will then be made available on DORIS and GOPHER.

This officially concludes the work of the 1992-93 Faculty Manual Committee. I would like to thank the members for their hard work and attention to detail.
PROPOSAL TO AMEND
THE FACULTY MANUAL

The Policy Committee proposes the following addition(s) to the Faculty Manual:

Under Part III of the Faculty Manual (The Faculty), Section B (Academic Freedom and Responsibility), add the following sentence to Paragraph 9 (p. 16): "They [faculty] shall not discriminate against any colleague, student, administrator or any other person associated with the University on the basis of age, sex, physical handicap, race, religion, national origin, marital status, or sexual or affectional preference."

In Part IV of the Faculty Manual (Personnel Practices), Section B (Affirmative Action Policies and Procedures for the Recruitment and Appointment of Faculty and Administrators), substitute the following sentence for the first sentence of Paragraph 2 (p. 23): "It is the policy of Clemson University that no person is to be accepted or rejected for employment solely on the basis of age, sex, physical handicap, race, religion, national origin, marital status, or sexual or affectional preference."

*On August 18, 1992, by a 19-1 vote, the Senate passed (and the Administration later approved) Resolution FS92-8-3 P, in support of the AAUP Statement on Discrimination. In order for such a policy to be effective, it must be incorporated in the Clemson University Faculty Manual, as well as relevant employee and student manuals.

AAUP Statement on Discrimination
adopted October, 1976

The Association is committed to use its procedures and to take measures, including censure, against colleges and universities practicing illegal or unconstitutional discrimination, or discrimination on a basis not demonstrably related to the job function involved, including but not limited to age, sex, physical handicap, race, religion, national origin, marital status, or sexual or affectional preference.
RESOLUTION ON SURPLUS STATE FUNDS RETURNED TO CLEMSON
FS93-9-1 P

Whereas, many classes have been canceled because the Colleges do not have funds to hire instructors;

Whereas, many tenure-track positions are unfilled because funds have been withdrawn from the Colleges;

Whereas, necessary laboratory and support equipment is not being replaced because funding is not available;

Whereas, some departments do not have sufficient funds to provide essential services;

Whereas, the quality of our Library has been negatively impacted by lack of funds for acquisitions; and

Whereas, the primary function of Clemson University is the instructional process,

Resolved, that all money that Clemson receives from the $100 million state budget surplus should be allocated to all nine colleges and the Library, exclusively.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on September 14, 1993.
RESOLUTION ON THE CLEMSON UNIVERSITY BUDGET PROCESS

FS93-9-2  P

Whereas, the Clemson University budget has been subjected to a series of severe cuts; and

Whereas, the process of instituting such cuts has been less than orderly and timely, and has lacked adequate input from the Faculty;

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate requests President Lennon to instruct the several Colleges, the academic departments, and the Library to establish Budget Review Committees. Such committees shall have access to all relevant budget information. Their purpose shall be to advise the appropriate administrators with regard to budget priorities for said units.

Be it further resolved, that said College/Library committees shall be constituted by the Faculty of each College and the Library, with at least one member being a Faculty Senator, and said departmental committees be constituted by the faculty of each department.

Be it further resolved, that said Budget Review Committees shall report at least once a semester to their respective academic units. Faculty Senators on the College and Library Committees shall report regularly to the Faculty Senate Finance Committee.

By Jim Rathwell, revised by Roger Rollin, further revised by Alan Schaffer, et. al.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on September 14, 1993.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change Regarding the Honorary Degrees Policy

At the August 17th meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Policy Committee proposed the following change to the Faculty Manual description of the Honorary Degree Committee:

“A selection committee shall be established consisting of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall serve as Chairperson; the President of the Faculty Senate, who shall serve as Secretary; the most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; an Alumni Professor appointed by the President; the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees; and the Chairperson of the Institutional Advancement Committee of the Board of Trustees.” (Changes recommended by the Policy Committee are in italics).

The Proposed Changed passed unanimously. Unfortunately, because of a breakdown in communication that was entirely my fault, we passed an incomplete resolution. What should have been proposed and what has been passed by the Board of Trustees is as follows. Notice that the additions are all aimed at increasing faculty representation:

“A selection committee shall be established consisting of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall serve as Chairperson; the President of the Faculty Senate, who shall serve as Secretary; the most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; two Alumni Distinguished Professors nominated by the Alumni Distinguished Professors themselves who shall serve three year terms; one Endowed Chair/Titled Professor to be nominated by their own group who shall serve a three year term; the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees; and the Chairperson of the Institutional Advancement Committee of the Board of Trustees.” (Changes that should have been included in the original are in italics).
Proposed Faculty Manual Change Regarding the Honorary Degrees Policy

“A selection committee shall be established consisting of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall serve as Chairperson; the President of the Faculty Senate, who shall serve as Secretary; the most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; two Alumni Distinguished Professors nominated by the Alumni Distinguished Professors themselves who shall serve three year terms; one Endowed Chair/Titled Professor to be nominated by their own group who shall serve a three year term; the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees; and the Chairperson of the Institutional Advancement Committee of the Board of Trustees.”

This proposed change to the Faculty Manual was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on September 14, 1993.
1. **Call to Order.** President Alan Schaffer called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The General Faculty Minutes dated August 18, 1993 were approved as written and distributed. The Faculty Senate Minutes dated September 14, 1993 were approved as corrected.

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

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Webb Smathers submitted and briefly discussed this committee's report (Attachment A).

   **Welfare Committee.** Senator Lois Lovelace Duke reported that this committee continues to address the issues of raises and growth in administration; employment practices for the rank of instructor; and letters of reappointment.

   **Finance Committee.** Senator Steve Lewis stated that there was no report.

   **Policy Committee.** Senator JoAnne Deeken submitted this committee's report (Attachment B). It was further stated that the committee report on University governance will be presented at the November Faculty Senate meeting. Following discussion of items contained in the draft report, Senator Deeken requested that input be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office. President Schaffer thanked this committee for its diligent efforts on this issue. President Schaffer requested that the Policy Committee begin to consider the issue of "consulting."

   **Research Committee.** Senator Steve Stevenson stated that there was no formal report, but reported that he was of the understanding that individual colleges can now obtain access to the "IRIS" database.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**

      1) **Computer Advisory Committee** - Senator Stevenson reported that local campus phone numbers for dial up are being removed; a committee will look at the telecommunications issue, in general; and that the Clemson University Research Foundation (CURF) will become a real entity. It was further stated that the administration wants to have a business administration computer system for CURF, and will ask that it be a distributed system, and that each college and business unit be part of this system. The request for proposal (RFP) is being developed, and will be available soon. An RFP has been released for the new mainframe.

      2) **Rape Awareness Week** - Senator Brenda Vander Mey announced that the week of October 25-29, 1993 has been designated as Rape Awareness Week, and encouraged the Senate's participation in a variety of activities.

      3) **Facilities Planning Committee** - Vice President/President-Elect Walt
Owens submitted an impact report on the July 93 Historic District Site and Carriageway Proposal, and provided a copy of a Petition that is being circulated (Attachment C).

4) Joint City/University Committee - Vice President/President-Elect
Owens stated that there was considerable criticism of the fact that the Committee had not had any input into the University's contract for use of its stadium for NFL games. A recently-adopted strategic plan specifying that the Committee was to advise both the city and the University on issues such as public safety and public events was greatly discussed. Dr. Owens mentioned the proposed establishment of a Parking Review Board to include faculty and staff where violations could be appealed.

5) Commission on Undergraduate Studies - Senator Lois Lovelace
Duke reported that the College of Engineering Honor Code was returned in favor of a University-wide Code; voted in favor of a motion to require scholarship awards recipients to have a 2.5 GPR or better; and voted to limit to 19 hours on-line pre-registration and 15 hours on-line pre-registration for probationary students.

6) Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee - Senator Bill Hare reported that the recruitment plan for transfer students to have completed Math and English requirements will be dropped due to the fact that only 475 students enrolled instead of the anticipated 800 students; the enrollment figure of 2,300 Freshman students will remain; and admissions requirements for each college remain the same as they were for this year which is for automatic admission a predicted GPR of 2.2 or better.

4. President's Report
President Schaffer mentioned items discussed during the Council of Deans meeting: (1) problem of summer consulting; (2) list of graduates in Graduation Program will now be a list of candidates due to printing difficulties and time constraints; (3) in response to the faculty parking proposal, the deans were unanimous that there should not be any parking structures in the center of campus.

President Schaffer also:

1) Encouraged senators to contact Representative Jim Clyburn about any ideas regarding higher education;

2) Described the meeting between the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and Senator William H. O'Dell. Senator O'Dell encouraged Senate to become more active with the Legislature;

3) Informed the Senate that members of the Executive/Advisory Committee and the Upstate Legislative Delegation will meet on November 4, 1993;

4) Reported on the meeting in which Bill Amick, Chairman of the Clemson University Board of Trustees, discussed plans to centralize higher education under one state agency;

5) Reported that the Provost could not agree with the Senate resolution on the distribution of non-recurring funds, but would be reasonable in the distribution;

6) Reported that the Provost does not want to reject the Senate resolution on the establishment of budget committees within colleges, but is concerned about how this process would affect some of the colleges. The Provost will meet with members of the Executive, Finance, and Policy Committees to discuss rewording the resolution; and
7) Reminded the Faculty Senate that nominations for the Class of '39 Award for Excellence are due to the Faculty Senate Office no later than October 26, 1993.

8) Senator John Huffman, Chair of the Grievance Board, reported that Senator Brenda Vander Mey wrote the Provost suggesting an ombudsman system to prevent a high number of Grievances. Senators Huffman, Vander Mey, and Schaffer met with the Provost to explain this possibility. The Provost was very interested in this idea, and it will be pursued.

5. **Old Business** (None)

6. **New Business** (None)

7. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

David Leigh, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Report of Scholastic Policies Committee
to Faculty Senate

October 12, 1993

Last meeting: September 21, 1993, 8:00am - 9:30am, Room 223 Barre Hall

1. Work is continuing on the issue of responsibility and standards for classrooms. A possibility exists that year end state money and NFL dollars (if forthcoming) will be substantially allocated to instruction.

2. Scholastic Policies Committee has been asked to consider the issue of "special problems" type classes being taught without Department and College Curriculum Committee review.

3. Scholastic Policies Committee has been asked to review the concept of a GPR step-up function criteria for the number of hours for which a student is permitted preregistration.

    e.g., ≥ 3.5 GPR no. max hours
    ≤
    ≤
    ≤
    < 2.0 max of 15 hours

4. We continue to be involved in the discussions about a University Honor Code. The College of Engineering has led this effort in attempting to establish a College Honor Code. We feel the University owes the College of Engineering a debt of gratitude for initiating this process.

Meetings scheduled: October 13, November 3, and December 8 from 1:30-3:00, Room 223 Barre Hall

Respectfully submitted,

Webb M. Smathers, Jr.
The Committee continues to deal with faculty governance. In September we met with representatives of both the Council of Deans and the Academic Dept. Heads. Both meetings were useful learning experiences. Drs. Mabry and Dickerson and Dean Wixson were the administrators who provided input. The Policy Committee met on Oct. 6 at 4 to come to a consensus on the recommendation we will be making to the Senate. A final report and recommendation will come to the Senate for the November meeting. The Committee feels that, while there is strong feeling across campus about Dept. Heads and Dept. Chairs, there is unanimity that there should be greater accountability to the faculty by each dept. leader. It might be interesting for the faculty senate to know that all three of our visitors felt there is a limit to the effectiveness of a person as a Dept. Head, and that they would support, at least in principle, the idea of term limits for them. I anticipate that whatever the report from the committee includes, there will be both a stronger role in evaluation and some type of term limitations for Dept. Heads.

Submitted by: JoAnne Deeken, Chair.
IMPACT OF THE JULY 93 HISTORIC DISTRICT SITE AND CARRIAGEWAY PROPOSAL

Regardless of the aesthetic benefits to the Campus and the Community of proposals like this, the function of the University would be compromised by the proposal as drafted. The proposal would eliminate a significant number of parking spaces around Brackett Hall, Hardin Hall, Olin Hall, Rhodes Engineering Research Center, Trustee House, Sirrine Hall and Riggs Hall.

We feel the planned loss of these spaces will significantly impact already overloaded parking facilities in the area, restrict access to buildings on the weekend and directly contravenes the first three of the ten principles of parking at Clemson University which are shown below. In addition, the carriage way, shown in Plate 3 of the proposal, would be too small to allow flat bed and 18 wheel truck deliveries to Olin Hall. Such deliveries are common and are essential to the operation of an engineering program. Furthermore, the budget constraints being experienced by the University should prohibit projects that directly conflict with the objective and function of the University. Rather than decreasing parking, ways to expand parking should be considered. One viable alternative would be to make Calhoun street one way and provide angled parking on each side of the street rather than parallel parking.

Ten Principles of Parking at Clemson

1. There should be reasonable, convenient, safe parking options for everyone in the campus community, regardless of income level.

2. Clemson should be guided by a "neighborhood" philosophy of parking instead of a perimeter philosophy.

3. Long-range master plans and plans for individual buildings and "academic neighborhoods" should include plans for parking.

Figure 1 Carriageway concept of Plate 3
PETITION AGAINST HISTORIC DISTRICT SITE AND CARRIAGEWAY PROPOSAL

We the undersigned petition the administration to reject the proposed Historic District Site as drafted in the July 1993 Master Planning Office proposal. We further petition that:

1. The present parking facilities around Olin Hall, Hardin hall, Trustee's House, Riggs and Rhodes Engineering Research Center be maintained.

2. The temporary barriers in front of Brackett Hall be removed.

3. The parking in front of Brackett be reinstated.

4. Plans that increase parking in the areas mentioned above be considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
NOVEMBER 9, 1993

1. Call to Order. President Alan Schaffer called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The Faculty Senate Minutes dated October 12, 1993 were approved as written.

3. Class of '39 Award for Excellence. President Schaffer appointed Hassan Behery to count ballots for this Award with the Provost. The election of the 1993 Class of '39 Award for Excellence was held by secret ballot, and ballots were collected.

4. Committee Reports

   a. Committee Reports

      Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Webb Smathers submitted and briefly discussed this committee's report (Attachment A). Suggestions and information were provided to Senator Smathers from members of the Senate regarding courses introduced under a "special topics" rubric. Student Government representatives will meet with this Committee to discuss a computerized student evaluation of instructors.

      Welfare Committee. Senator Lois Lovelace Duke reported that this committee continues to look at promotion data and the issue of faculty versus administration growth. A formal report and resolution will be presented in December. The issue of employment practices for the rank of instructor is also being studied by this Committee.

      Finance Committee. Senator Jim Rathwell stated that there was no report.

      Policy Committee. Senator JoAnne Deeken stated that there was no report.

      Research Committee. Senator Gary Powell reported that this Committee is looking at teaching research.

   b. University Commissions and Committees

      1) Joint City/University Committee - Vice President/President-Elect Walt Owens reported on criticism received from residents living near the site of the Golf Course (that the location had been changed from the original site); and that a firm had been retained to perform a market analysis for residential structures near the Golf Course.

      2) Statewide Conference of South Carolina Faculty Senate Presidents - Vice President Owens stated that this group had met several times, and that a press conference will be held on January 3, 1994. It was further stated that the Board of Regents issue has not been addressed by this group.
3) Facilities Planning Committee - President Schaffer reported that this committee continues to discuss the Historic District Site and Carriageway Proposal, and stated that copies of a Petition are being circulated.

4) Traffic and Parking Committee - Senate Alternate Jerry Christenbury reported that the Facilities, Maintenance and Operations Division (FMO) has requested parking spaces, and that there have been no discussions regarding "premium parking."

5. President's Report. President Schaffer:

(1) read a letter signed by him to President Lennon regarding the "premium parking" proposal. Senator Roger Rollin requested a two-thirds vote to bring a Resolution on "Premium Parking" to the floor of the Senate. Vote was taken and passed. Senator Rollin submitted this resolution for consideration, and it was seconded. Following a friendly amendment, vote to accept resolution was taken, and resolution passed (with one abstention) (Attachment B) (FS93-11-1 P).

(2) reported that the proposal to establish a Military Heritage Park on Bowman Field has had difficulties. Gerald Vander Mey, Campus Master Planner, will be asked to meet with the Executive/Advisory Committee at the next meeting to explain this proposal.

(3) reported on the successful meeting between members of the Upstate Delegation of the General Assembly and the Executive/Advisory Committee.

(4) stated that at the request of the Executive/Advisory Committee, he had written a letter to President Lennon regarding unsubstantiated rumors about the football coach and a possible buy-out of his contract.

6. Old Business (None)

7. New Business

a. Senator Deeken submitted and explained a Report and Recommendations of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee regarding Departmental Governance (Attachment C).

b. A Resolution of the Faculty Senate Regarding Departmental Governance was then submitted by Senator Deeken for consideration by the Senate. Following discussion during which it was reiterated that this Report is a concept document, vote to accept resolution was taken and resolution passed with three abstentions (Attachment D) (FS93-11-2 P).

c. Senator Smathers submitted a Resolution on University Honor Code for consideration by the Senate, stating that it was also a concept idea. Following discussion and after the acceptance of friendly amendments, vote to accept resolution was taken and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment E) (FS93-11-3 P).

d. Senator Harold Allen presented concerns regarding the purchase of shuttlebuses by the City of Clemson and the possibility that the University could be eventually responsible for paying for them. During discussion of this topic, Senator Rollin requested a special Faculty Senate meeting with the Campus Master Planner and the President of the University to provide input to this process.
e. Senator Budd Bodine requested that the Faculty Senate find out how extensive the problem of stolen equipment is on campus, and stated that money should be made available by the University for security - that security should not be the responsibility of University employees. This issue will be addressed by the Executive/Advisory Committee.

8. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

David Leigh, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Senators Absent: W. Bridges (J. Christenbury attended), S. Lewis, W. Stringer, F. Eubanks, S. Barbary, J. Lovedahl, M. Dixon (E. Skaar attended), R. Williams (J. Waldvogel attended)
Minutes

Scholastic Policies Committee - Faculty Senate

Chairperson Webb Smathers convened the Scholastic Policies Committee on October 13, 1993, at 1:30 pm in 203 Barre Hall. In attendance were Shelley Barbary, Roger Doost, Bill Hare, Leigh Moody, Bud Rice, and Harold Woodell. The committee discussed four items on its agenda.

The committee continues to follow its charge to determine standards for classroom usage and will proceed to obtain information on the responsibility for classroom maintenance from across the campus over the next several weeks. At present, the sub-committee on this matter reports that its attempt to ascertain the responsibility for repairs and upkeep on classroom facilities has been complicated by the uncertainties regarding both state funds and the possible infusion of money expected to come to the school from a proposed NFL franchise.

Next, the committee examined Ed Kaiser's memorandum to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies concerning the proposed honor code from the College of Engineering. (See attached.) The Scholastic Policies Committee concurs with the recommendation from Kaiser's sub-committee that the College of Engineering refrain from implementing its code of honor until the university at large has the opportunity to initiate a code of its own. In addition, the committee expressed concern about procedural matters and student confidentiality that need to be addressed (faculty manual changes would be required) before a universal honor code can be adopted by all nine colleges in the university. Above all, the committee hopes that any new code will guard against rigid strictures that would make a student who has knowledge of wrongdoing just as guilty as the cheater. No one wants an honor code that would create an atmosphere of suspicion and anxiety on the campus. The following resolution on this issue will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate:

The Scholastic Policies Committee urges the Faculty Senate to approve a resolution of general support of a university-wide honor code to be drafted by a university-wide committee, possibly the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. It is hoped that the code can be written and adopted by the Fall semester of 1994. The committee also recommends that the resulting honor code be reviewed by the senate in two years (Fall, 1996) and be open to review every five years thereafter until all unforeseen problems have been resolved. Further, the committee wishes to express its appreciation to the College of Engineering for its leadership in this important matter.

The third item discussed was a proposal to initiate a GPR Step-Function Registration. While the goal of this new procedure was deemed admirable—to prevent over-enrolling (based upon performance) by students during on-line pre-registration, the
committee did not see a justification for implementing a new procedure at this time due to the constraints it would impose on students with very high and very low GP Rs. Cost considerations associated with implementation were also discussed as negative factors.

The final issue the committee took up was in response to an inquiry about a course taught as an "applied activity" by Professor David Woodard (Political Science). This committee took little issue with the content of the course and attempted in no way to block the teaching of Professor Woodard's class titled "Renewing American Civilization." Course content, standards, and the need for any class rest with the faculty member charged with instruction, the department, and the college. The way in which this class and others like it are introduced into colleges' curricula, however, does need some attention. The committee would like for the senate to consider how often a university course that falls under one of several rubrics--"special activities," "selected topics," "special topics," "special institute," etc.--could be taught before it becomes subject to formal endorsement through the university's traditional curriculum committees. The committee concluded that all "special topics" courses should eventually be open to the same review process as any other new course in a given curriculum. Under no circumstances, though, should the committee's following recommendation be construed as an attempt to abrogate the faculty's right to academic freedom. If it is perceived as such by the senate, then the resolution will be withdrawn:

The Scholastic Policies Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate approve and send to the appropriate university committee a resolution that any course introduced into a college curriculum under a "special topics" rubric ("applied activity," "special institute," "selected topics," or other) may be offered only two times in three years before it must be submitted to the standing curriculum committees for formal approval.

The committee adjourned at 3:30 pm and will meet again on November 5, 1993.

Respectfully submitted,

Harold Woodell
RESOLUTION ON “PREMIUM PARKING”

FS93-11-1 P

Whereas, parking at Clemson University is currently and has traditionally been on a democratic, “first come-first served” basis; and

Whereas, the proposed “premium parking program” is founded upon an elitist, solely fiscal basis; and

Whereas the proposed “premium parking program” would disadvantage those whose average incomes are the lowest and/or those whose recent average wages have risen the least, i.e., classified staff and faculty;

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate is strongly opposed to the “premium parking” proposal and calls upon President Lennon to reject said proposal.

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on November 9, 1993.
I. Background and Charge

Clemson University formally opened in July 1893. From that time until the present, the departmental organization has included department heads who report directly to their dean. Even in the current Faculty Manual, the governance structure states that “Department heads serve at the pleasure of their respective deans, who formally evaluate the performance in office of heads reporting to them every five years. All heads of academic departments hold faculty rank and engage in the teaching, research, and public service functions of faculty to the extent feasible.” (Clemson University Faculty Manual, p. 9) At another section of the Manual (p. 12) the review process is described as occurring “before the end of the second and fifth year in office.” Currently, reviews are being done only every five years. The review process does include private interviews with every faculty member. However, the entire procedure is conducted by the Dean. The faculty affected have no knowledge of how their input was used (or whether it was used at all) or whether other faculty members agreed with their input. Also, individual interviews conducted by the dean can be seen as intimidating by new faculty members.

During the summer of 1992, the Faculty Senate Policy Committee collected data about the relationship between the administration and the faculty in a faculty senate survey. Prior to surveying the faculty, the Committee had heard that faculty were discontented with the department head system. They wanted to find out whether what they had heard was just grumbling from a few dissatisfied faculty or whether the sentiment was widely supported across campus. The results showed that ratings of department heads ranged (on a scale of 1-10) from a high of 9.27 to a low of 1.67. 16 out of the 48 reported departments (or 1/3) had a rating of 5 or lower. Across campus, at least 1/3 of all respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the following three statements: “In my department, the workload is distributed fairly among faculty;” “I am pleased with my department’s promotion and tenure process;” and “My department head treats everyone fairly.” Based on the results of this survey, there did appear to be a problem between some faculty and their department heads.

Alan Schaffer became President of the Faculty Senate in April, 1992. At his first Senate meeting he outlined ideas for his term. One item mentioned was the idea of recommending a change from appointed department heads to elected department chairs. After the meeting, he received positive feedback from faculty senators asking him to pursue this idea.

At the General Faculty Meeting in the Spring of 1992, President Lennon answered questions posed by a panel composed of the Chair of the Classified Staff Commission,
the President of the Faculty Senate, and the President-Elect of the Extension Senate. Faculty Senate President Alan Schaffer had requested that faculty submit to him questions to ask President Lennon during this panel discussion. One of the questions submitted asked if it was time that Clemson looked at its governance and examine the possibility that we move from appointed department heads to elected department chairs. President Lennon agreed that such an examination should take place.

Alan Schaffer referred that information to the Faculty Senate Policy Committee in the spring of 1993. The Committee has been studying the question from that point until now.

II. Methodology

The Policy Committee began working on the issue in April, 1993. The first actions involved discussions within the group on possibilities for change. Faculty Senators in each college were asked to announce to their faculties at Spring college-wide meetings that the Policy Committee was examining the issue and to request input from all faculty members.

In addition, Alan Schaffer wrote to presidents of faculty senates at approximately 50 colleges and universities. He explained that Clemson was examining its departmental structure and asked the Presidents to describe the governance system at their institutions. To date, 19 colleges and universities have replied.

The Policy Committee decided it needed input from more than faculty. Accordingly, it interviewed representatives of both the department heads and the deans on campus. Discussions were held with Dr. Dickerson, Department Head of Plant Pathology, Dr. Mabry, Department Head of Management, and Dr. Wixson, Dean of the Colleges of Sciences.

Based on the data collected from all these sources and supported by the data collected in a recent AAUP survey, the Faculty Senate Policy Committee is prepared to make recommendations for amending the departmental governance structure at Clemson.

III. Data

The responses to the call for information from college faculty surprised many of the committee members. As with any unscientific request for input, those who had the strongest feelings on the matter replied. In almost all of the colleges there was strong support for keeping the present system, or for moving to elected department chairs, or for many alternatives to these two structures. Many faculty had experienced good and bad situations under the structure they were either supporting or opposing. We could discern no overwhelming support for any of the various possibilities.
Information from other colleges and universities also showed no clear pattern. Governance structures ranged from no faculty input to situations where faculty in each college of a university voted for both the structure and the way the structure was implemented. Overall, those replies received from universities with elected departmental chairs showed more faculty satisfaction with the system than those with little or no faculty input into governance. However, the structures that existed varied quite widely.

The discussion with Drs. Mabry and Dickerson proved interesting.

1. They both stressed that, although they felt that department heads should whenever possible act as faculty advocates, heads also have a responsibility to serve their deans as effectively as possible, and that sometimes it is very difficult to "wear both hats." As to whether a department chair system could do this job better, neither seemed to feel strongly that this was the case.

2. Both felt that switching to a department-chair system would put too much power in the hands of deans, thereby reducing faculty influence in matters both at the college and university levels.

3. On the topic of accountability, several points were made:
   a. Improvement could come from periodic faculty reviews of department heads and deans.
   b. A review system could be similar to current Form 1 policy for faculty.
   c. The best timing would likely be a biannual review, rather than annually.
   d. Such review would probably require writing formal job descriptions for department heads to use as a basis for evaluation.

4. The idea of term limits on department heads was met with cautious support. It was emphasized that the "learning curve" for a new department heads is long and steep, so that terms of less than four years are not conducive to high levels of success. However, after 8-10 years, both guests indicated that the creativity of department heads can diminish significantly.

5. When asked to summarize the opinion of the Association of Department Heads as a whole, Mabry and Dickerson suggested that most department heads would advocate retention of the current department heads system, possibly with an 8-10 year term limit.

The input from Dean Wixson in many ways mirrored the input from the department heads.

1. A department head is better because that person is somewhat protected when s/he has to make hard decisions. Examples included forced downsizing due to budget cuts or trying to change the direction of a
department. The department head is better able to make decisions in the best interest of the university because s/he has a broader view and is not subject to election.

2. The Dean emphasized that there should be an annual evaluation of department heads, which was not the formal review currently described in the Faculty Manual.

In October, 1993, the Clemson chapter of the AAUP surveyed the faculty regarding this same issue. While the survey was not commissioned by the Policy Committee and while the data were released after most of the deliberations of the committee were completed, data from their survey does support some of our recommendations. The complete data from their report is available as the appendix to this document; however, a summary of some of the more important findings follows.

More than 50% of the respondents believe that the current system needs changing; that the department head should be appointed with faculty approval; that faculty disapproval of a department head should be grounds for removal from office; that the correct term limit for a department head should be 4-5 years; and the terms should be renewable two or fewer times. There was not general agreement on whether colleges or departments should decide individually about their individual governance structures.

IV. Recommendations

The job of the department head is one of the most difficult on campus. The person holding this job must, in effect, be responsible to two very different constituencies: the faculty and the administration. The faculty works in a collegial environment with group consensus and individual freedoms paramount. The administration is concerned with a much more rigid structure and is responsible for the overall direction of the university. For the administration, individual freedoms must be subordinated to a declared direction or goal. Under the current structure of governance, the department head is asked to represent both constituencies, but is responsible to only one of them, the administration. The policy committee feels that the most equitable situation is one in which both constituencies have a share in the evaluation, appointment and continuation of department heads.

The Policy Committee discussed whether it should recommend different governance structures based on the colleges. While this option had appeal for some members, the complexity in administering such a policy was considered too great to recommend at this time.
The Committee does not recommend a move towards elected department chairs at this point. We feel that the department head system will work best for Clemson as long as accountability to the faculty is built into the system. The system as it currently exists does not need radical change. Rather, it needs gradual change and modification to reflect the current needs of the university.

The Policy Committee does recommend the following:

1. That Clemson University retain the title of department head and that the department head continue to serve at the discretion of the Dean of the college, but with the concurrence of the faculty.

Rationale:

Faculty involvement in institutional governance is a long-standing tradition in the most prestigious colleges and universities. Clemson University accepts the idea of faculty participation in governance and has formalized its acceptance by including it in The Faculty Manual (p.1). The present departmental governance structure does not adhere to this principle. We recommend correction of this omission.

2. That terms of appointment for department heads shall be four years, once renewable.

Rationale:

There is learning curve associated with this job. Time periods ranging from 18 months to 2 years have been mentioned as the best estimates for this learning period. Four-year terms allow for a two-year learning curve followed by a two-year period of effectiveness. If the department head is effective, her/his term can be renewed for one additional term. This would allow an effective department head to continue in the position for a total of eight years. However, it would not encourage him/her to become stagnant or lose interest in the job. Both the department heads we interviewed and the dean believed very strongly that there was a limit to the effectiveness of a person in the position of department head. The recommended eight-year term is within that limit. When the term of a department head expires, s/he will continue as a tenured faculty member with the same duties as other tenured faculty members and with pay equivalent to other faculty members in the department with similar rank and experience.

3. That an elected committee of the faculty shall conduct an evaluation of the department head at the conclusion of the head’s second year in office. It will send a short evaluation form to each faculty member in the department. The summarized results of that evaluation shall be sent to the dean and the department head and shall be retained so that they can be used during the fourth year review.
Rationale:

This recommendation and the following one are the heart of the Policy Committee’s attempt to address the accountability of the department head to the faculty. We tried as closely as possible to follow the same process as that of reviewing faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. At the same time, we recognize the time-consuming nature of a review and have tried to streamline the process as much as possible. Please note, the review committee may be the same committee as the Faculty Advisory Committee, or may be a different committee. The department has the choice. The purpose of the two-year review is to give both the Dean and the department head indication as to the performance of the department head so that she/he will have some ideas about areas for improvement before the fourth year review.

4. That during the head’s fourth year in office, a committee shall be elected by the faculty of the department. The committee shall have at least three members (two of whom are senior faculty in the department, plus a faculty senator from outside the department). The committee shall conduct individual interviews with all tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the department, shall review the input from the second year review, shall evaluate progress based on that review and shall conduct a confidential yes/no vote on reappointment. Summarized statements of the results shall be sent to the dean, the department head, and the departmental advisory committee.

That both the second and the fourth-year committees shall be bound by the same privacy constraints as the faculty personnel committee.

Rationale:

Faculty must have direct input on whether or not their department head is renewed for a second term. The secret vote will force faculty members to give their final judgment, will not allow interviewing techniques to influence a statement (especially by newer faculty), and can not be influenced by peer pressure in an open meeting. The outside faculty member will also help reduce intimidation, give a different perspective on the department, and help diagnose departmental splits that may influence a vote or a decision. Individual interviews will give better input into the reasons for the votes and give the department head guidance on areas in which to improve if s/he is to be granted a second term.

5. That department heads currently in office one year or less at the time this policy is adopted shall be considered to be in the first year of their first term as department head.

That department heads in office more than one year and less than four years at the time this policy is adopted shall be reviewed at the end of that current school year as if
they were in the second year of their first four-year term.

That department heads in office four years or more at the time this policy is adopted shall be considered to be at the end of their first four-year term and shall be reviewed for renewal at the end of that school year.

Rationale:

The Policy Committee understands that we are proposing a major change in the system of governance at Clemson University. All department heads were hired with the expectation they would serve until the Dean was unhappy with their performance. They may have changed their research habits, removed themselves from teaching, or otherwise isolated themselves from their professional colleagues. We also understand that many department heads have remained professionally active, but we wish to give adequate time for all department heads to adjust to the new system. Department heads with one year or less in office are deemed to have adequate time to adjust to the system and respond to the normal second year review. Department heads in office for more than one and less than four years should have adequate time to adjust to the procedure based on the input gathered as the result of a second-year review. Department heads in the fourth or more year have had adequate time to prove themselves to their faculty.
Executive Summary of
The Report and Recommendations
Of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee
Regarding Departmental Governance
November 1, 1993

The Policy Committee recommends the following:

1. That Clemson University retain the title of department head and that the department head continue to serve at the discretion of the Dean of the college, but with the concurrence of the faculty.

2. That terms of appointment for department heads shall be four years, once renewable.

3. That an elected committee of the faculty shall conduct an evaluation of the department head at the conclusion of the head's second year in office. It will send a short evaluation form to each faculty member in the department. The summarized results of that evaluation shall be sent to the dean and the department head and shall be retained so that they can be used during the fourth year review.

4. That during the head's fourth year in office, a committee shall be elected by the faculty of the department. The committee shall have at least three members (two of whom are senior faculty in the department, plus a faculty senator from outside the department). The committee shall conduct individual interviews with all tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the department, shall review the input from the second year review, shall evaluate progress based on that review and shall conduct a confidential yes/no vote on reappointment. Summarized statements of the results shall be sent to the dean, the department head, and the departmental advisory committee.

That both the second and the fourth-year committees will be bound by the same privacy constraints as the faculty personnel committee.

5. That department heads currently in office one year or less at the time this policy is adopted shall be considered to be in the first year of their first term as department head.

That department heads in office more than one year and less than four years at the time this policy is adopted shall be reviewed at the end of that current school year as if they were in the second year of their first four-year term.

That department heads in office four years or more at the time this policy is adopted shall be considered to be at the end of their first four-year term and shall be reviewed for renewal at the end of that school year.
AAUP Questionnaire on Departmental & Collegiate Leadership

Please take a few minutes to read, complete, and return the enclosed questionnaire. This questionnaire is distributed by the Clemson Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) as a service to Clemson University. Completed questionnaires should be returned by Wednesday, October 6.

At present the Faculty Senate is engaged in an extensive examination of the current system of department heads and collegiate deans. The Senate is considering whether the present system, which has been in place since the early days of Clemson College, needs to be changed in response to a changed academic environment. This questionnaire seeks to determine faculty opinion on these matters. Its results will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate.

Please indicate your responses to the following statements by filling in the appropriate bubble on the enclosed scantron sheet with a #2 pencil. Please do not indicate your name or the name of your department on the enclosed scantron sheet, and do not fold the scantron sheet.

(1) In the present system, department heads are responsible to their deans and serve at the pleasure of their deans. This system does not need changing.

Strongly Agree a b c d e Strongly Disagree

(2) The current system should be changed such that the chief executive of a department (either a head or chairperson) must receive faculty approval to be appointed.

Strongly Agree a b c d e Strongly Disagree

(3) The current system should be changed such that the chief executive of a department would be removed if he or she loses faculty approval.

Strongly Agree a b c d e Strongly Disagree

(4) There should be limits on the number of terms a departmental chief executive can serve.

Strongly Agree a b c d e Strongly Disagree

(5) If term limits should be applied to departmental chief executives, how long should these terms be?

(a) annual (b) 2-3 years (c) 4-5 years (d) 6-8 years (e) 9-10 years

(6) If term limits should be applied to departmental chief executives, how often should terms be renewable?

(a) none (b) once (c) twice (d) three or more times

(7) There should be limits on the number of terms an academic dean can serve.

Strongly Agree a b c d e Strongly Disagree

(8) If term limits should be applied to academic deans, how long should these terms be?

(a) annual (b) 2-3 years (c) 4-5 years (d) 6-8 years (e) 9-10 years

(9) If term limits should be applied to academic deans, how often should terms be renewable?

(a) none (b) once (c) twice (d) three or more times

(10) Individual colleges should collectively determine whether they will retain the current headship system in all departments in the college or change all departments in the college to an alternative system.

Strongly Agree a b c d e Strongly Disagree

(11) Individual departments should be allowed to determine whether they will retain the current headship system or change to an alternative system.

Strongly Agree a b c d e Strongly Disagree

Please Return the completed scantron sheet (do not fold) By Wednesday, October 6 to the AAUP Secretary, Prof. William Hare, Math Science, 019 Martin Thank You!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Intervals</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative Frequency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Intervals</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY SENATE
REGARDING DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE
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Whereas, Clemson University's headship system of departmental governance has been unchanged for many years; and

Whereas, President Lennon asked the Provost and the Faculty Senate to study and make recommendations about departmental governance; and

Whereas, the President of the Faculty Senate referred this question to the Faculty Senate Policy Committee; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate Policy Committee has been studying the issue for seven months; and

Whereas, the recommendations of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee are a reasoned approach to changing the system of departmental governance at Clemson University;

Resolved, the Faculty Senate endorses the Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee regarding departmental governance; and

Further resolved, that the Report and Recommendations of the Policy Committee be forwarded to the Provost and the President as a Report and Recommendations of the Faculty Senate; and

Further resolved, that the faculty members appointed by the president of the Faculty Senate to the Provost's Committee on departmental governance use the Report and Recommendations of the Policy Committee as the basis of their recommendations to that committee.

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on November 9, 1993.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY HONOR CODE
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Whereas, the College of Engineering’s discussions of a College Honor Code has resulted in positive discussion university wide of the merits of a revised honor policy;

Whereas a University-wide Honor Code would result in benefits accruing to all Colleges campus-wide with one code and one standardized set of enforcement mechanisms;

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate supports the development of a University-wide Honor Code drafted by a committee composed of members of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, Commission on Graduate Studies, the Scholastic Policies Committees of the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate, and the Graduate Student Association;

Resolved, that the code be written and adopted expeditiously;

Resolved, the Honor Code be reviewed by a committee of the Faculty Senate two (2) years after becoming effective and every five (5) years thereafter.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on November 9, 1993.
1. Call to Order. President Alan Schaffer called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The Faculty Senate Minutes dated November 9, 1993 were approved as written.

3. Committee Reports

   a. Committee Reports

      Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Webb Smathers reported that this committee had met on December 8 and that there was nothing new to report. The Committee Report was submitted and briefly discussed (Attachment A).

      Welfare Committee. Senator Jerry Lovedahl stated that there was no report.

      Finance Committee. President Schaffer announced that Jim Rathwell had tendered his resignation as chair of this committee, and that Senator Jack Flanigan accepted his request to chair the Finance Committee for the remainder of the year. Senator Flanigan stated that there was no report.

      Policy Committee. Senator JoAnne Deeken submitted the Policy Committee Report (Attachment B). This committee is considering the issue of consulting and has received a ruling from the State Ethics Commission and the Clemson University Legal Counsel's Office that it is not a violation of the State Ethics Law for a professor to do consulting work during the summer unless that professor is teaching summer school.

      Research Committee. Senator Gary Powell reported that this Committee had met on November 10, and will meet again on January 12 to continue looking at research.

   b. University Commissions and Committees

      1) Fine Arts Committee - Senator Deeken reported that this committee had met to consider proposed attractions for the Brooks Performing Arts Center. Senator Deeken asked the Senate if they believe people would pay up to $40 a ticket to bring a quality program to the Brooks Center. Only a few of those present responded positively.

      2) Facilities Planning Committee - Senator Walt Owens submitted a diagram (Attachment C) to the Senate from the Historic District subcommittee of the Facilities Planning Committee and asked that members share it with their constituents. Senator Owens informed the Senate that this proposal would change the traffic pattern of Calhoun Drive.
3)  *ad hoc* Committee to Study the Kellogg Proposal - Senate Alternate Waldvogel reported that this committee had met, information had been distributed to members and that their investigation will begin in January. The Senate was encouraged to attend the General Faculty Meeting on December 15, 1993 and a forum on January 17, 1994 during which discussions regarding the Kellogg Proposal will be held.

4. **President's Report.** President Schaffer informed the Senate that he had met with President Lennon twice regarding the issue of 42 cents per mile gas reimbursement for some administrators. President Lennon has issued a memorandum directing that this practice cease. Discussion on this topic and others (perks received by administrators, raises, performance based pay) followed.

President Schaffer congratulated Ashby (Budd) B. Bodine, II, a senator and professor from Agricultural Sciences, as the 1993 Recipient of the Class of '39 Award for Excellence.

5. **Old Business**  (None)

6. **New Business**
   a. Senator Roger Rollin withdrew the Resolution on Administrative Growth (Attachment D).
   b. Senator Lovedahl submitted the Resolution on the Historic District/Carriageway Proposal (Attachment E). Following discussion, Senator James Rathwell moved to table this resolution, which was seconded. Vote to table resolution was taken, and passed unanimously.
   c. President Schaffer introduced Cecil Huey, Faculty Representative to the NCAA, who was invited to respond to questions from the Faculty Senate. Senator Deeken, Chair of the Policy Committee, deferred business of the Resolution Regarding the Pay Off of Coach Hatfield to Senator John Huffman. The resolution was submitted to Senate for consideration. Much discussion followed. Vote for call to question failed, and discussion continued. Following a friendly amendment, a vote for another call to question was held and passed. Vote on resolution was taken and passed (FS93-12-1 P) (Attachment F).
   d. A Resolution Concerning the Clemson Football Controversy was submitted by Senator Rollin, which was seconded. Discussion followed. Vote to accept resolution was taken and passed (FS93-12-2 P) (Attachment G).
   e. President Schaffer presented a Resolution Asking Governor Campbell to Reconsider and To Declare December 24 a Holiday for consideration by the Senate. Vote to bring to floor was taken and passed. The resolution was then explained by President Schaffer. Vote to accept resolution was taken and passed (FS93-12-3 P) (Attachment H).
   f. Senate Alternate Waldvogel requested that President Schaffer notify Bill Amick, Chair of the Board of Trustees, of inaccuracies in his letter to the Editor of the *Greenville News*; and that a letter be written to Vice President Almeda Jacks objecting to the tone of her letter to University employees regarding the parking situation.
7. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

David Leigh, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Senators Absent: P. Skewes, W. Bridges, S. Lewis, F. Eubanks, D. Hutton, L. Duke, J. Gilreath (Waldvogel attended), R. Williams
Minutes - Scholastic Policies Committee

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on December 8, 1993, at 1:30 pm in 203 Barre Hall. Professor Webb Smathers presided; Shelley Barbary, Bill Hare, Bud Rice, and Harold Woodell were present.

First, the chair noted that the committee will prepare a resolution on the "Special Topics" rubric for the January meeting of the full Faculty Senate.

The chair next informed the committee of his and Bill Hare's meeting with DeWitt Stone on the environment of the university's classrooms. Stone was optimistic about funds for this project coming from the new NFL team, the Carolina Panthers.

The committee then discussed the problem of the number of students per class. The most obvious difficulty is overcrowding, but complaints have arisen about the opposite situation—classes with too few students scheduled in large lecture halls. The committee will work with the fire marshall and the university scheduler to create guidelines on the ratio of classroom size to the number of students in a given room.

The committee would like for the Faculty Senate to know that it will address the following areas in the classroom environment:
1. climate control
2. cleanliness
3. replacing "junior high school" desks with ones of adult size
4. classroom furniture (podiums, chairs, blackboards, bulletin boards)
5. lighting and window shades
6. acoustics
7. audio-visual aids equipment (screens, tv's, overhead projectors)

The committee welcomes all suggestions from faculty who wish to add to this list.

The next item on the agenda was a faculty query about courses in which decisions about admitting and dropping students are made, in part, by the students in the same course. Since the committee did not have adequate information to issue a ruling on this matter, it decided to seek the advice of the university provost before proceeding further. After the provost responds, the committee will in turn report to the Faculty Senate on this matter.

In conclusion, the committee discussed and re-affirmed its position on two subjects discussed at length in earlier meetings:
1. The committee supports student attempts to evaluate faculty if the students work with the committee to develop the necessary forms and procedures.
2. The committee reiterated its support of one university-wide Honor Code to be in place by the Fall of 1994, thereby obviating the need for an additional code from the College of Engineering.

Noting that the committee had absorbed its monthly allowance of tar fumes from re-roofing, Chairperson Webb adjourned the meeting at 3:10 pm.

Respectfully,

Harold Woodell
The Policy Committee has been working hard on various items of importance. This report will list them in no particular order.

1. The Committee debated and passed a resolution regarding the buy-out of Coach Hatfield's contract. That resolution should be included in this packet and will be introduced during the "New Business" section of this meeting.

2. At the request of another faculty senator, we have been investigating consulting. We have been told that some department heads have been requesting that faculty members complete consulting forms and get permission from the university for consulting during the summer months. The given reason for this is because of the new Ethics Law. We contacted Ben Anderson's office, and at their recommendation, Gary Baker with the State Ethics Board. The opinion of these two offices agree. Nine month faculty do NOT need to complete the consulting forms for work during the summer, unless they are teaching summer school. There is nothing in the Ethics Law that prohibits anyone from working and being paid by another state agency or business during their "off" times.

There is a basic prohibition in the Ethics Law which prevents one state agency from paying an employee of another state agency for work that is part of job duties of his or her "home" agency. Therefore, the issue of consulting during the time a faculty member is teaching (whether regular or summer semesters) remains a problem. If the consulting activities are part of the job duties of the faculty member, then they can not be paid by another state agency. If the consulting activities are not part of the faculty member's regular job duties, then they can be paid. The problem obviously rests in trying to discover what the regular job duties of a faculty member are. This determination is hard enough for regular faculty members, but is extremely complex with others, such as Extension Faculty. Gary Baker feels that work done outside the regular working hours should be allowed, but he specifically said that no one has determined what the normal working hours for faculty are. Thus, guidelines regarding weekend and evening consulting work are still unclear. Ben Anderson's office seemed to feel that weekend consulting work for any entity other than a state agency should be allowed to proceed without hindrance, but was not totally confident about this interpretation. They will get back in touch with us.

The Committee has written Provost Jennett to inform him of these findings and asked that he relay this information to the various Deans. In that same letter, we asked him to send to the Committee the written guidelines each college should have developed that explain how criteria regarding consulting will be applied throughout the college. We have heard that some colleges have specified the number of days per week that a faculty member can consult. I heard someone from Provost Jennett's office say he believes that the correct definition of a work week is seven days and not five days. His
office has contacted Ben Anderson’s office for a clarification. Since the Committee’s request overlaps somewhat with the Provost’s request, Ben Anderson’s office may be waiting to make one interpretation for both groups.

The Policy Committee will continue to work with this thorny problem and make some recommendations later. We will keep you informed.

3. Dr. Larson in Sociology contacted us about second year review procedures. We were able to satisfy his confusion by referring to the recommendation made by the Welfare Committee regarding wording on renewal contracts.

4. We were asked to review the College of Engineering Honor Code to determine if there was a direct conflict with The Faculty Manual. We determined there was a conflict: The Faculty Manual states that a faculty member mentions a transgression only to the individual and the Department Head. The Honor Code states that violations be reported to the Honor Council. We referred Dr. Haque to the Scholastic Policy Committee to work towards a reconciliation of the two documents.

5. Lastly, the Committee received the attached Fax listing some of the “perks” given to the President, Vice-Presidents, and Deans through their discretionary funds. A copy of this Fax is enclosed with this packet. The Policy Committee has reluctantly decided there is nothing any of us can do about those perks. HOWEVER, WE DO URGE EACH OF YOU TO READ THE LIST AND PASS IT AROUND TO OTHER FACULTY AND STAFF. Some of the items are quite interesting. Remember, discretionary funds that come from Foundation money are not subject to state restrictions so that some perks regarding items such as entertainment and spousal travel are very interesting. One that particularly struck the Policy Committee members is the reimbursement for local and long distance use of a personal car AT THE RATE OF $0.42 PER MILE.
MEMORANDUM

TO: President Lennon
    Provost Jennett
    Vice Presidents

FROM: Wanda B. Hill
      Senior Associate Vice President for Business and Finance

DATE: June 24, 1992

RE: Clemson University Foundation Gift Funds Expenditure Policy

Attached is a copy of the policy governing the President's, Vice Presidents' and Deans' expenditure of discretionary funds allocated from the Loyalty Fund in the Clemson University Foundation.

The attached copy incorporates the latest revision for local and business mileage reimbursement effective July 1, 1992.

If you have any questions about the policy, please call Cheryl Dean, Director of Accounting for Related Organizations, at 656-3630.

cc with attachment:

- Deans
  - Cheryl Dean
  - Jonee Daniels
  - Dot Burchfield
  - Mack Howard
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
FOUNDATION GIFT FUNDS
EXPENDITURE POLICY
REVISED - JULY 1, 1992

I. GENERAL POLICY

Sections of the General Appropriation Act require that all University funds, regardless of their source, be deposited with the State Treasurer.

These sections of the Act have been interpreted to mean, as cited in the disbursement regulations of the Office of the Comptroller General, that all monies deposited in the State Treasurer's Office are "state" monies regardless of their source of origination. This means that all State rules, regulations and laws applying to the disbursement of appropriated funds apply to other funds deposited in the State Treasurer's Office.

Reference should be made to the Clemson University Fiscal Policies and Procedures Manual for information regarding State rules and regulations. There are two exceptions to the general rule cited above.

Section 129.3 of the Act gives the University's Board of Trustees the authority to establish policies relating to the expenditure of funds derived wholly from athletic or other student contests, from the activities of student organizations, and from the operation of canteens and bookstores and exempts them from provisions of the Act concerning unclassified personnel compensation, travel, equipment purchases and other purchasing regulations.

The other exception relates to gifts and other contributions when it is explicit in the gift restrictions that the funds may be spent for specific purposes that may not comply with State rules, regulations and laws.
II. GIFT DISCRETIONARY FUNDS

The University receives two basic types of gifts (i.e., those received directly from individual, corporate and other donors and those received through the Clemson University Foundation).

When the University receives gifts and other contributions directly from a donor or receives an allocation from the Clemson University Foundation, if the donor or the Foundation specifies particular types of expenditures for which the funds may be used, even though these types of expenditures may not be allowed by State rules and regulations, then these funds can be used for those specific expenditures.

These funds provide a means of paying those reasonable and necessary expenditures that must be made in the normal course of official University business, but which are not allowed by State rules and regulations. Expenditures of a personal nature should not be made with these funds.

Efforts should be made to charge all expenditures to state funds when appropriate and to conserve these funds. They are not intended to supplement regular operating budgets, but are to be used as a mechanism for paying special types of necessary expenditures.

Unexpended funds at year-end may be carried forward and spent in subsequent fiscal years.

III. FOUNDATION EXPENDITURES

The President, Vice Presidents and Deans have discretionary accounts maintained by the Treasurer of the Clemson University Foundation. These funds are made available to allow a means of paying those reasonable and necessary expenditures that must be made in the normal course of official University business, but which are not allowed by State rules and regulations. Expenditures of a personal nature should not be made with these funds.
The types of expenditures that can be paid through the Foundation are:

- Any excess over the State meal allowance when an employee is in travel status or local meals. Examples of local meals include participation in the interview of a prospective employee, entertainment of official University visitors, official University functions, training programs, retreats, working meetings, and similar official events. (Note: Meals for official University visitors can be charged to state funds up to the meal allowances provided by State regulations.)

- Overnight accommodations within 50 miles of an employee's residence and/or headquarters when considered reasonable and necessary in the normal course of official University business.

- Business mileage, including local mileage, incurred over and above normal work week commuting may be reimbursed if such mileage was incurred as a result of University related business. The rate will be $.42 per mile. However, if an automobile is provided through any type of arrangement that involves CU (gifts, etc.), only gas will be reimbursed at the rate of $.05 per mile.

- Memberships, dues and related expenses for civic, University, professional, or other organizations are allowed for employees if such expenses are deemed beneficial to the University. Any personal use of such clubs, even though the dues are paid by the University, should be paid from personal funds.

- Expenses related to home entertainment, including the use of ARA, if the activity relates to official guests of the University or the enhancement of morale within an administrative unit. Strictly social entertainment among peers should be paid from personal funds.

- Expenses related to drop-ins, open house, receptions, etc., held solely for business purposes of introducing new employees, guest speakers, new programs or facilities to the University or community. (Note: Receptions for students at graduation, Honors and Awards Day or other official events can be paid from state funds when the sole purpose is to benefit the students being honored.)

- Personal expenses incurred such as forfeited deposits, penalties applied, or fines in certain unusual limited circumstances when the employees' presence is required to perform official duties.
- Alcoholic beverages. (Note: Alcoholic beverages may be purchased with State funds only when the source of those funds are generated for that purpose, such as Professional Development registration fees.)

- Spousal travel, entertainment, and other spousal reimbursements when accompanying the President or Vice President in accordance with the following criteria:

1. Spouse related travel expense reimbursement for the President is clearly within normal practice found throughout higher education.

2. Spouse related travel expense reimbursement for Vice Presidents or their designees when an official party has been designated for a particular athletic function or event or the Vice President has been asked to represent the President.

3. Spouse related entertainment expense reimbursement for official on-campus activities where attendance is desirable.

- Expenses related to official activities of the University where attendance is desirable. Examples include cap and gown rentals at graduation, tickets to Clemson University entertainment events, and tuxedo rentals for special events.

- Gifts, flowers, and parties including Christmas parties or other personal benefits to employees and others. Any such expenditure must be approved by the appropriate Vice President as being reasonable and necessary and made in the normal course of official University business. Examples include flowers or gifts upon the death or illness of an employee. Gifts at retirement or upon termination of service, and Christmas gifts or cards are also permissible for University business or public relations purposes if amounts per individual do not exceed $50 per gift, excluding athletic tickets and funeral gifts.

- Expenses related to the institution's legislative activity on a one-to-one basis, such as entertainment. Group functions would utilize the official functions category of the Clemson University Foundation budget.

- Plaques, awards, retirement dinners.

These examples are not intended to be all inclusive. Discretion and good judgment should be used to determine expenditures appropriate for payment from Foundation funds.
V. DISBURSEMENT DOCUMENTATION

Disbursements from the Foundation should be requested using standard Foundation forms and meet the same documentation standards required by the University.

Disbursements from the University must follow standard University procedures and use standard University forms. Any exceptions, such as exemptions from procurement procedures, etc., must be approved consistent with the board delegations approved by the Board of Trustees on September 20, 1991. Approval for exceptions involving "important contracts and documents" as defined in the delegations must be approved by the appropriate vice president, the Vice President for Business and Finance, and the President. Exceptions not meeting the definition of "important contracts and documents" must be approved by the appropriate vice president.

Expenditures in excess of $100 per person per event for entertainment and $50 per recipient for gifts, excluding athletic tickets and funeral gifts, require prior approval from the President or his designee. Such approvals should be requested in memo form and a copy of the approval must be attached to the vouchers when submitted for reimbursement.

Documentation of expenditures should be explicit. All vouchers for entertainment should list the non-university employees entertained and the general nature of the meeting. If the function involves both state funds and 128.3 funds, the names of employees attending will be required. Vouchers for gifts should include a description of the gift, the name(s) of the recipient(s) and the reason for the gift.

Vouchers submitted for the expenditure of discretionary gift funds should include the statement "specific purpose" on the face of the voucher. A copy of the donor's restrictions should be attached to the voucher to support the expenditure. If it is impractical to attach the complete document, then appropriate excerpts will be acceptable.
VI. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

All funds disbursed through the University including Section 129.3 funds and gifts and other contributions are subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

Funds disbursed by the Clemson University Foundation are not currently subject to these disclosures.
TO: Max Lennon  
DATE: June 15, 1992  

For Your Information  
Please Read & Return  
For Your Approval  
Please Handle  
For Your Opinion

Re: Automobile Reimbursement

Current Clemson University Foundation VP Discretionary Fund Policy dated 30-Sept-91 states:

Business mileage, including local mileage, incurred over and above normal work week commuting may be reimbursed if such mileage was incurred as a result of University related business. **The rate will be consistent with IRS regulations. ($0.28 for the last half of Fiscal Year 1991-92 and the first half of Fiscal Year 1992-93). However, if an automobile is provided through any type of arrangement that involves CU (gifts etc.), only gas will be reimbursed at the rate of $0.05 per mile.**

Based on various national cost analysis and the heavy expected use by your staff, you have approved an amendment to the policy raising the reimbursement rate to $0.42 per mile effective July 1, 1992. To amend the policy the only change would be to replace the second sentence with the words "**The rate will be $0.42 per mile.**" If I have accurately summarized the desired change, please indicate your approval below. Once approved, my staff will distribute the amended policy to your staff.

Signed

Approved

Max Lennon

cc: Wanda Hill
The Historic District Subcommittee met Friday, December 10, 1993, at 2:00 in Conference Room 324 at University Square. Gerald Vander Mey presided and distributed the agenda.

The previous minutes were approved with no objections.

Gerald presented three alternatives to the Fort Hill/Calhoun alignment. One of the alternatives had two variations.

The first alternative called for one way traffic heading South in front of Bracken Hall with parallel parking on one side. Barricades would block off the remaining width of the street. Fort Hill Street would be reopened in its original state with two way traffic.

The variation on the first alternative called for one way traffic heading South in front of Bracken Hall with angled parking on one side. Fort Hill Street would be reopened in its original state with two way traffic.

The second alternative called for two way traffic in front of Bracken Hall with parallel parking on one side. Fort Hill Street would be reopened in its original state with two way traffic.

The third alternative called for two way traffic in front of Bracken Hall with parallel parking on one side. This area would be blocked off from regular traffic from 8:00am to 5:00pm Monday through Friday by the use of barricades at the Fort Hill Intersection.

After much discussion, the group pursued a fourth alternative in which Calhoun Drive would become two way with parallel parking one side in front of Bracken Hall. Fort Hill Street would be closed off to through traffic. This alternative would lend itself to Fort Hill eventually being shortened to a cul de sac to create a larger green space from Tillman to Riggs. The group decided to take this alternative back to their respective constituents for feedback and come back to make a final decision at the January meeting.

Several issues that would need to be addressed with the fourth alternative were the safety of students at the Fort Hill/Calhoun crossing and the disruption of the future transit system.

Gerald said that he would set up a meeting in January. The meeting was adjourned.
RESOLUTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE GROWTH

Whereas, the primary functions of Clemson University are instruction, research and service; and

Whereas, Clemson University is seriously underfunded by the State of South Carolina; and

Whereas, a series of budget cuts mandated by the State of South Carolina have led to the reduction of faculty positions and of support for instruction, research, and faculty service, resulting in the impairment of the University's mission; and

Whereas, while Clemson University faculty have been repeatedly required to do more with less, according to the latest available data fully 32% of the University's Educational and General Budget has been spent to administer an expenditure of only 41% on instruction;

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate calls upon President Lennon to take immediate steps: (1) to freeze the growth of the University Administration; (2) over the next five years, beginning with the fiscal year 1994-95, to reduce the size of the University Administration by at least 1% per fiscal year (without shifting costs to the colleges and academic departments); and (3) for each of the next five fiscal years to increase the amount of the Educational and General Budget apportioned to instruction by at least 1% per fiscal year.

Introduced by Roger Rollin
College of Liberal Arts

This resolution was withdrawn from consideration by Senator Rollin, December 14, 1993.
RESOLUTION ON HISTORIC DISTRICT/CARRIAGEWAY PROPOSAL

Whereas, there should be reasonable, convenient, and safe parking options for faculty and staff in the Clemson community, regardless of income level; and

Whereas, Clemson University should be guided by a "neighborhood" philosophy for faculty and staff parking instead of a perimeter philosophy; and

Whereas, long-range master plans and plans for individual buildings and "academic neighborhoods" should include plans for parking;

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate calls upon President Lennon to take immediate steps to: (1) retain the present parking facilities around Olin Hall, Hardin Hall, Trustee's House, Riggs and Rhodes Engineering Research Center; (2) remove the temporary barriers in front of Brackett Hall; (3) reinstate the parking in front of Brackett Hall; and (4) consider other means of increasing the parking for faculty and staff in the areas mentioned above.

This resolution was tabled by the Faculty Senate on December 14, 1993.
RESOLUTION REGARDING THE PAY OFF OF COACH HATFIELD

FS93-12-1 P

Whereas, the administration of Clemson University has elected to expend $600,000 from athletic revenues to pay off Coach Hatfield, and

Whereas, funding for academic programs at Clemson University are currently at an unacceptably low level, the expenditure of $600,000 in an apparent contract buyout projects a false public image of fiscal normalcy, and

Whereas, the expenditure of $600,000 for this purpose during a period of serious financial crisis for the academic programs of the University indicates that the University administration places an unacceptably high priority on the athletic programs, and

Whereas, the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate, through the President of the Senate, has already expressed to President Lennon their misgivings concerning the expenditure of any University funds to pay off Coach Hatfield, and

Whereas, there has been no adequate public explanation by President Lennon of the necessity for expending $600,000 to pay off Coach Hatfield,

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate of Clemson University expresses its deep concern and alarm at the action of President Lennon and the University administration in expending $600,000 to facilitate the departure of Coach Hatfield during a period when the academic and public service programs of the University are in a state of serious financial crisis.

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on December 14, 1993.
RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE
CLEMSON FOOTBALL CONTROVERSY

FS93-12-2 P

Whereas, the circumstances that led to the severance of Coach Hatfield’s relationship with the University have resulted in regional and nationwide publicity for Clemson, much of it unfavorable; and

Whereas, it is the perception of many faculty and staff as well as many among the general public that the University succumbed to heavy pressures exerted by individuals and groups whose priorities regarding the University are seriously askew, who are more concerned with the football team’s performance than with the performance of Clemson as an educational institution, who perceive the University as an entertainment center rather than a center of higher learning; and

Whereas, some faculty and staff and many among the general public may still believe that the funds to buy out Coach Hatfield’s contract come from tax revenues during a period in which the University has had to cut the costs of its educational program to the bone; and

Whereas, as yet there has not been any thoroughgoing official public clarification of these issues by the University administration;

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate urges President Lennon without delay to explain publically and widely: (1) the University’s perception of the specific circumstances that led to Coach Hatfield’s departure; (2) the University’s rationale for buying out Coach Hatfield’s contract (3) the specific source of the $600,000 for the buyout; and (4) his (the President’s) response to the athletics vs. academics at Clemson issue that this controversy has generated.

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on December 14, 1993.
RESOLUTION ASKING GOVERNOR CAMPBELL TO RECONSIDER AND TO DECLARE DECEMBER 24TH AS A HOLIDAY

FS93-12-3 P

Whereas, staff at Clemson University and other state employees, have suffered over the last three years without raises in pay or in some cases with insignificant raises that have not kept up with inflation, and

Whereas, in the past the state has given such employees a very small "reward" by declaring a special holiday during the December holiday season, and

Whereas, Governor Campbell has indicated that he does not have the authority to declare such a holiday this year despite having done so in previous years,

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate of Clemson University asks Governor Campbell to reconsider and to declare December 24th as a holiday for staff at Clemson University and for all other eligible state employees as a small gift from the state to those who do an excellent job of keeping the wheels of this institution and of state government turning.

Passed by the Clemson University Faculty Senate on December 14, 1993