MINUTES
of the
FACULTY SENATE
of
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

JANUARY, 1992 to DECEMBER, 1992
1. **Class of '39 Award for Excellence.** John L. Idol, Jr., Professor of English and this year's recipient, was honored at a ceremony during which congratulatory remarks were given by President A. Max Lennon, and Dr. T. L. Senn, Class of '39.

2. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order by President Luedeman at 3:54 p.m.

3. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated December 10, 1991 were approved as written.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Senate Committees**

   **Research Committee.** Senator Marion stated that there was no report.

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Louderback submitted a draft copy of the Scholastic Policies Committee Goals for Clemson University (Attachment A). Any comments should be directed to Joseph Louderback, Chair. A final version will be submitted after consideration. Senator Louderback reported that the Commission on Undergraduate Studies approved the requirement of 75 hours to complete the core curriculum.

   **Welfare Committee.** Senator Harris reported that a salary analysis will be completed due to the fact that some raises were given during the past year.

   **Policy Committee.** Senator Wells stated that the Committee will meet next week to discuss numerous items.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**

   1) **ad hoc Committee to Promote the Clemson Experience.** Senator Waldvogel reported that some items recommended by this Committee had been incorporated into the Strategic Plan as benchmarks; and that the final report should be ready by next month.
5. Senate President's Report. President Luedeman discussed the President's Report (Attachment B).

6. Old Business
   a. Due to many generous payroll deductions during the month of December, the Centennial Professorship total has risen to $90,311.
   b. The following senators were elected to serve on the Grievance Board for two years: Bhuvenesh Goswami (Commerce & Industry), Gerald Lovedahl (Education), and Syble Oldaker (Nursing).

7. New Business
   a. Senator Louderback stated that he had written the Greenville News regarding the statement of "relatively few eminent scholars at Clemson." After discussion, it was decided that individuals, department heads, and deans could respond on their own.
   b. Senator Schaffer requested that the Scholastic Policies Committee address the matter of the sale of course Syllabi.
   c. The Faculty Senate gave President Luedeman permission to request the Office of Institutional Advancement to set up an account so that donations may be made to the Faculty Senate.
   d. Senator Lovedahl expressed concern and asked for information regarding a bill in the Legislature which mandates university faculty at state supported schools to put in a 37.5 hour week, 50% of which is to be in the classroom. President Luedeman will pursue this matter.
   e. Senator Waldvogel questioned the possible move to consider doing away with the Master Teacher Program, and suggested that senators let him know if they have strong opinions about this possibility.

8. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Gerald L. Waddle, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Senators Absent: M. Bridgwood, G. Christenbury (D. Decoteau attended), K. Dieter, F. Eubanks, E. Hare (J. Waldvogel attended), J. Liburdy, E. Ruppert, A. Steiner, T. Tisue
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
GOALS FOR CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
January 14, 1992

Clemson University's goal is educating students. Achieving this goal requires that incoming students be academically prepared.

The most important criterion for admission should be academic promise.

The student body should continue to include significant numbers of out-of-state students, both graduate and undergraduate.

The student body should continue to include significant numbers of foreign students, both graduate and undergraduate.

Clemson University should create opportunities for students to obtain international experience.

Clemson University should inform all prospective students about admissions appeals and different admissions standards for each college.

Faculty and staff should be accountable for the quality of graduate and undergraduate education.

The University should consider giving College status to the Honors Program.

Each College should work toward having common freshman curricula among its departments.

The faculty will support joint efforts with the administration to improve the quality of graduate and undergraduate education.

All academic decisions should conform to the faculty manual.
1. The winner of the Class of '39 Award of Excellence is John Idol, Professor of English. The award was presented at the Bell Tower before the January Faculty Senate meeting. President Lennon assisted with the presentation of the award.

2. The NCAA Convention is completed and has adopted several new rules. First, 800 numbers for athletes to contact an institution are discontinued immediately. Secondly, new admission requirements have been adopted which require a 700 SAT score with a 2.00 in thirteen core courses. The scale slides allow a lower GPR if coupled with a higher SAT. This rule was proposed by the Presidents' Council and will become effective in 1995.

3. Spring enrollment data shows an increase in both the number of undergraduates and the number of graduate students over 1991.

4. The administration is working with the Legislature to raise the current cap on fee waivers from 2% to 4%. With this action, the Clemson Scholars Program can be saved. Without this cap raise, the Clemson Scholars Program will experience a shortfall of $659,500 in the 1992-93 academic year.

5. A new council is being formed at the University to deal with outreach services from the University such as Extension, professional development, telecampus, etc.

6. This morning, I spoke to the Classified Staff Commission concerning the Senate's definition of Public Service.

7. This Friday Greg Horton, Student Body President, and I will make a presentation on growth and class size at the meeting of the Board of Trustees.
1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order by President Luedeman at 3:34 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes of January 14, 1992 were approved as written.

3. **Special Order of the Day.** President Luedeman introduced Francis M. Canavan, Associate Vice President for Public Affairs, who clarified aspects and language of the new State Ethics Bill. Mr. Canavan stated that areas of major impact at Clemson were in the sections regarding lobbyists and speaking engagements. A question and answer period followed the presentation, and Mr. Canavan was kind enough to remain after the Faculty Senate meeting to answer additional questions.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Senate Committees**

   **Research Committee.** Senator Marion referred to the proposed Research Committee goals for Clemson University.

   He then made a motion to adopt the Resolution to Recommend CURFAC as a University Committee (FS92-2-1)(Attachment A). After discussion, Senator Baron moved that this resolution be tabled until the Vice President for Research advises the Senate of the purpose and composition of this committee. Motion to table was seconded by Senator Schaffer, and passed unanimously.

   Senator Marion moved for adoption of the Resolution regarding University-Wide Strategic Planning and the Creation of a Clemson University Administrative Computing Advisory Committee which was seconded by Senator Schaffer. Vote was taken, and resolution passed unanimously (FS92-2-2 P) (Attachment B).

   **Scholastic Policies.** Senator Louderback made a motion to adopt the Resolution on Report of the Admissions & Scholarship Committee of the Clemson University Athletic Council. Discussion followed. Vote was taken and resolution passed
unanimously (FS92-2-3 P) (Attachment C).
In response to the sale of Syllabi issue, this Committee has appointed a subcommittee to look into this matter. A report will be presented at the next Senate meeting.

Welfare Committee. Senator Vander Mey referred to the Committee's Vision Statement. After discussion, Senator Vander Mey asked that any comments or modifications be sent to John Harris, Chair of the Welfare Committee.

Policy Committee. Senator Hare submitted the Policy Committee Goals for Clemson University.

b. University Commissions and Committees
1) Fine Arts. Senator Rollin reported that this committee had met and is in the process of reconstituting itself.

2) Traffic and Parking. Senator Christenbury reported that this committee is considering the possibility of a parking fee increase to $25.

3) Facilities Planning. Senator Schaffer reported that a proposal to re-route Old Stadium Road at a cost in excess of $250,000 was passed by this committee and will have a second reading at the next meeting.

4) Computer Advisory. Senator Schaffer presented a list of DCIT consultants assigned for each college; stated that the use of E-Mail by administrators and faculty will be strongly encouraged; that two computer labs in Jordan Hall will be closed until Fall and will be replaced with a new lab in Brackett Hall; computer registration is ready to be implemented; and asked the Senate the result of the Software Policy Proposal that came from the Computer Advisory Committee (Faculty Senate Policy Committee is awaiting an opinion from Ben Anderson).

5) Honors. Senator Schaffer reported that this committee was informed that it has been illegally ruling on Honors curriculum (the Faculty Manual does not empower it to do so). The Honors Committee has asked the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate to empower it to approve or disapprove curriculum matters for the Honors College. A proposal to establish a core curriculum from the Director of the Honors College was unanimously voted down.

6) Campus Safety. Senator Vander Mey announced that Rape Awareness Week will be held during March 2-6, 1992, and
asked senators for their support by providing this information to their students.

7) Accident Review Board. Senator Thompson reported that if a professor is determined guilty in a motor vehicle accident, his or her department will be assessed $200; and that this fine can be passed down to the individual professor. It was also noted by Senator Thompson that an appeal of a decision may always be submitted to the Accident Review Board.


6. Old Business
   a. The Centennial Professorship total is now $90,511.

7. New Business
   a. The slate of officers from the Advisory Committee was presented to the Faculty Senate: Vice President/President Elect: Jim Davis, Alan Schaffer, and Brenda Vander Mey; and for Secretary: Mary Lynn Moon and Lucy Rollin. (Mary Lynn Moon declined the nomination). Elections will be held at the March Faculty Senate Meeting.
   b. President Luedeman announced that plans for the Faculty Senate Annual Spring Reception are underway.
   c. Senator Waldvogel submitted the Final Report from the ad hoc Committee to Promote the Clemson Experience (Attachment E). Senator Schaffer moved that the Faculty Senate support this Report. Motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.
   d. President Luedeman announced an Executive Session so that personnel items could be discussed.

8. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 5:46 p.m.

Gerald W. Waddle, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary
Senators Absent: W. Bridges (D. Decoteau attended), J. Brittain, W. Stringer, J. Harris, K. Dieter, E. Ruppert, A. Steiner (J. Waldvogel attended), T. Tisue
1. **Call to Order.** President Luedeman called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The General Faculty Minutes of December 18, 1991 and the Faculty Senate Minutes of February 11, 1992 were approved as written.

3. **Election of Officers.** The Advisory Committee brought forth 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. Alan Schaffer was elected Vice President/President Elect and Lucy Rollin was elected Secretary.

4. **Committee Reports**
   
a. **Senate Committees**

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Louderback informed the Senate that the Commission on Undergraduate Studies will provide information on the Sale of Syllabi in the future.

   Senator Louderback introduced the resolution, Disapproval of the Policy on Excused Absences from the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. After discussion, this resolution was tabled (Attachment A) (FS92-3-1).

   The resolution, Rescission of Early Registration for Student-Athletes, was introduced by Senator Louderback, and discussion followed. Motion was made to table this resolution, which passed (Attachment B) (FS92-3-2).

   Senator Schaffer noted that the Class Attendance Policy will be discussed at the Commission on Undergraduate Studies this week and asked for the sense of the Senate. After discussion and a straw vote, the sense of the Faculty Senate was that the current policy should be kept; and that "any problems of inflexibility in class attendance policy should be addressed by dealing with the individual faculty member through his/her department head, not by revising the current University policy."

   Senator Schaffer informed the Senate that the issue of "Dead Days" will be presented at the next meeting of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, and asked for guidelines.
from the Senate. A straw vote showed that the majority of the Senate thought "Dead Days" was a good concept and would support this concept.

Policy Committee. Senator Hare introduced Senator Walt Owens who presented a Draft of the Social Audit on behalf of the Policy Committee, and asked for the support of the Senate. Motion was made to sponsor this survey of faculty, which passed unanimously.

Research Committee. Senator Marion presented the Policy on Research Ethics which included changes made since its presentation to the Executive/Advisory Committee. Senator Marion stated that this document will be brought forward for support at the April Faculty Senate meeting in order for the Senate to have ample time to provide input before it comes before the Board of Trustees.

Welfare Committee. Senator Harris asked the sense of the Faculty Senate to co-sponsor any activities with the AIDS Task Force. After discussion, support was given to co-sponsor specific AIDS projects.

Senator Harris mentioned that the Welfare Committee will meet with the AIDS Peer Educators, and will decide if this presentation should be brought to the entire Senate.

Senator Harris presented the following resolutions for consideration by the Faculty Senate:

- Resolution to Pursue Policy to Obtain Annual Cost of Living Raises. Vote was taken, and resolution passed (Attachment C) (FS92-3-3-P).
- Resolution to Pursue Restoration of Medical Benefits to Previous Levels. Vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment D) (FS92-3-4 P).
- Resolution for President Lennon to Decline Consulting Opportunities Offered by Chairman Amick and Others. After discussion, vote was taken and resolution passed (16 for/9 against/no abstentions) (Attachment E) (FS92-3-5 P).
- Resolution to Provide the Same Retirement Plan Options. Vote was taken, and resolution passed (Attachment F) (FS92-3-6 P).
- Resolution to Pursue the Provision of a Faculty Club. Vote was taken, and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment G) (FS92-3-7 P).

b. University Commissions and Committees

1) Administrative Growth - Kenneth Murr submitted an update of the University Growth Report (Attachment
2) **English Fluency Act** - Senator Vander Mey referred to the Draft Policy Statement and encouraged all to read it carefully, and submit any comments.

3) **Campus Safety** - Senator Vander Mey reported that Rape Awareness Week was very successful.

4) **Commission on Undergraduate Studies** - Senator Vander Mey informed the Senate that the Commission will meet and take under consideration the subject of "Plus Grading".

5. **Senate President's Report.** Senator Luedeman briefly discussed the President's Report (Attachment I).

6. **Old Business**
   a. The Centennial Professorship is now $90,711.

7. **New Business**
   a. A "Statement of Compliance" form to be included with the Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide, was introduced to the Senate from Student Government. Comments were shared with Student Government from the Senate (Attachment J).
   
   b. Vice President/President Elect Baron submitted from the Executive/Advisory Committee a Joint Resolution on the Fee and Fine Structure of the Department of Parking Services, Version I for the Senate's consideration. Dr. Baron also presented Version II which was passed by the Student Government and the Commission of Classified Staff Affairs. Senator Louderback offered a friendly amendment to substitute Version II for Version I. However, he withdrew this amendment following discussion. Dr. Baron offered a friendly amendment to express that it is not a joint resolution, but a Faculty Senate resolution. Vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously. (Attachment K) (FS92-3-8 P).
   
   c. Senator Hare introduced a proposed amendment to the Faculty Manual regarding a Computer Software Copyright Infringement Policy. After discussion, vote was taken and proposal to amend passed unanimously (Attachment L).
   
   d. Senator Harris presented a Resolution to Express Appreciation to Student Senators for Efforts to Develop an Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide. Motion was seconded,
vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment M) (FS92-3-9 P).

e. Senator Wells submitted the AAUP Statement on Intercollegiate Athletics which will be presented at the next Faculty Senate meeting (Attachment N).

8. Adjournment. President Luedeman adjourned the meeting at 6:22 p.m.

Gerald L. Waddle, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

DISAPPROVAL OF THE POLICY ON EXCUSED ABSENCES FROM THE
COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

FS92-3-1

Whereas, the Commission on Undergraduate Studies has
promulgated a policy regarding excused absences from class; and

Whereas, there do not appear to be significant difficulties
with the existing policy; and

Whereas, the proposed policy greatly reduces the flexibility
that faculty can now exercise,

Resolved, that the Provost should not approve the policy.

This resolution was tabled.
3-10-92
RECSSION OF EARLY REGISTRATION FOR STUDENT-ATHLETES

FS92-3-2

Whereas, the Provost has approved early registration for student-athletes, even before on-line registration begins; and

Whereas, early registration is extremely valuable in hard financial times when classes are filling up quickly; and

Whereas, allowing student-athletes to register before any other students suggests that student-athletes are more important than other students; and

Whereas, there are costs associated with this early registration; and

Whereas, student-athletes will register even before important information regarding their degree progress is available, therefore ineluctably reinforcing the impression that a degree is not important to most student-athletes,

Resolved, that the Provost should rescind his decision.

This resolution was tabled.
3-10-92
RESOLUTION TO PURSUE POLICY TO OBTAIN ANNUAL COST OF LIVING RAISES

FS92-3-3 P

Whereas, the crisis in state finances has resulted in salary freezes for most members of the University community, and

Whereas, governments have continued to fund their commitment to provide cost of living raises to retirees regardless of income, and

Whereas, the cost of living continues to rise and reduce the standard of living of employees faced with a salary freeze,

Resolved, Clemson University should pursue a policy of obtaining annual cost of living raises for its employees and seek to recover for its employees wages lost to the effects of inflation.
RESOLUTION TO PURSUE RESTORATION OF MEDICAL BENEFITS TO PREVIOUS LEVELS

Whereas, the cost of medical care have continued to escalate beyond the reach of many families, and

Whereas, medical care is a necessity rather than luxury, and

Whereas, the state financial crisis has forced state employees' families to bear an increasing share of the cost of medical care, and

Whereas, the burden of poorer medical benefits falls proportionately heavier on the less well-paid state employees.

Resolved, Clemson University should pursue a restoration of medical benefits to levels provided a few years ago and continue to convey the importance of this issue to leaders in state government.

This resolution passed unanimously.
RESOLUTION FOR PRESIDENT LENNON TO DECLINE CONSULTING OPPORTUNITIES OFFERED BY CHAIRMAN AMICK AND OTHERS

FS92-3-5 P

Whereas, the State Ethics Commission has recently ruled that President Lennon may receive a $25,000 consulting fee for services to be provided to a business owned by Clemson Trustees Chairman Amick,

Whereas, the President's actions may serve to set the standard of conduct for faculty seeking outside employment and income,

Whereas, the decision to freeze the salaries of a large majority of Clemson Faculty increases the temptation for them to sacrifice their full-time commitment to teaching, research, and university service in order to pursue outside income opportunities,

Whereas, Clemson University currently prohibits faculty members who work in extension from paid consulting for in-state firms,

Whereas, as the Faculty Senate feels that the job of President of Clemson University is a full-time job requiring the undivided attention and 100% of the time of even the most talented individual,

Whereas, public perceptions of President Lennon's pursuit of outside income may be unfairly influenced by the recent felony conviction of the previous president of the state's other leading university for pursuing outside income,

Whereas, the effect of the salary freeze on faculty morale is lessened, if they perceive that they are sharing a common burden,

Resolved, President Lennon should decline this and any other consulting opportunity that is so graciously and generously offered by Chairman Amick or anyone else. The Faculty Senate believes that the President of Clemson University should be paid a publicly disclosed salary sufficient to assure his or her full and undivided commitment to the duties of the Presidency of Clemson University.
RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE THE SAME RETIREMENT PLAN OPTIONS

FS92-3-6 P

Whereas, Clemson University continues to provide new faculty members with an optional retirement plan, and

Whereas, this optional retirement plan permits a departing faculty member to receive funds that have been contributed by the state for that employee's retirement, and

Whereas, older faculty members have been denied this option, and

Whereas, Clemson University administrators have publicly argued in court that long term employees should seek employment at other universities, if they want to keep their salaries up to the levels paid to new inexperienced faculty, and

Whereas, recent salary freezes imposed on the majority of the faculty make it unlikely that many will recover a market level salary in the near future unless they change employers,

Resolved, Clemson University should seek to provide its older faculty with the same retirement plan options offered to new faculty.
RESOLUTION TO PURSUE THE PROVISION OF A FACULTY CLUB

Whereas, it is the policy of Clemson University to promote the interdisciplinary interaction of faculty, and

Whereas, there is currently no plan to provide a faculty club such as those which serve to promote faculty and administrative interaction at other universities, and

Whereas, the University of South Carolina has had one of the southeast's finest faculty clubs for many years,

Resolved, Clemson University should actively pursue the provision of a faculty club similar in quality to the one already provided to the faculty at the University of South Carolina.

This resolution passed unanimously.
University Growth
Report to the Faculty Senate

Submitted by Kenneth Murr and Robert Kosinski

This is an update to the Report submitted last October on University Growth. The figures are based on the 1991-2 Telephone Directory under the same rules as in the previous reports. The definitions are:

**Faculty**—all on-campus (656 telephone numbers) entries having title of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, research associate with faculty rank, military science instructor, or librarian are counted as faculty if the title does not also include the term head, dean, or director. Visiting faculty, adjunct faculty and lecturers are not counted in any category.

**Administrators**—all on-campus (656 telephone numbers) entries having title of head (except for librarians—only two librarians are administrators), dean (associate or assistant), director (associate or assistant), vice-provost (associate or assistant) or vice-president (associate or assistant), plus specific administrators who could be identified by title (e.g. registrar, president, and general counsel.) Directors of institutes also listed with faculty rank were equally divided between administration and faculty.

**Staff**—all on-campus (656 telephone numbers) entries not covered in other categories and intended to be classified personnel. The range of titles is extensive. Some directors were classified as staff (e.g., Lab Dir USDA and Dir of Spec Events).

**Omissions**—all athletic people (in Jervey), all off-site (non 656 telephone numbers) personnel, visiting faculty, adjunct faculty and lecturers were not counted in any category. Part-time faculty and staff are not listed in the telephone directory and so are not included.

### Table 1. Size of Study Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>304.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>967.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>2258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>12781</td>
<td>14251</td>
<td>15193</td>
<td>17295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The associated growth rates are:

### Table 2. Growth Rate of Study Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1987-91</th>
<th>1990-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The Faculty Manual has some discrepancies. The latest concerns the evaluation of department heads. On one page it requires evaluation every five years. On another page it requires an evaluation after year two, year five, and every five years thereafter. Provost Jennett has stated his desire to rule that the evaluation takes place every five years. We need to reassert that the evaluation begins in year two, and continues in year five and every five years thereafter.

2. Graduate and undergraduate applications are up over last year. The quality of the applicants is high. The University may accept more than 2300 freshmen.

3. A new attendance policy has been approved by the Undergraduate Commission. Loosely paraphrased, it states that a student may miss class equal to twice the number of weekly class meetings. Thereafter, the professor may drop the student from class for excessive absences.

4. The new registration policy states that athletes may register for courses but not sections or instructors before any other students. Whereas, Honors Students may register with the same priority as seniors. Is this a statement about the relative regard with which these two groups of students are held at Clemson?

5. Former Faculty Senate Presidents have met with President Lennon and Provost Jennett separately. Topics of discussion were faculty morale and the role of the provost vis-a-vis the other vice-presidents.

6. The colleges of Architecture, Commerce and Industry, Engineering, and Nursing have had their proposals for continuous improvement approved. The purpose of such a competition is to eliminate redundancy on campus.

7. At a recent meeting of the Business Advisory Council of the Council of Presidents, the business community expressed their concern that since business has undergone much restructuring to remain competitive, universities must undergo restructuring before business will "go to bat" for higher education. President Lennon addressed their concerns by explaining Clemson's strategic planning process.
8. The Commission on Higher Education appears to be pushing a plan which would require a raising of the tuition for graduate out-of-state students. Clemson is opposing this attempt.

9. The reorganization of the Council of Deans into a Council of Deans and a Provost's Council has been abandoned. The reorganization would have denied the President of the Faculty Senate a seat on the Dean's Council.

10. The establishment of a Faculty Senate Operating Account has become a reality. Individual gifts will now be accepted to provide monies for miscellaneous expenses which arise each year. Please make your check payable to: Clemson University Foundation and be sure to note that it is for: the Faculty Senate.
To: All Instructors  

From: Greg L. Powell, Director of Research and Development  
L. Gregory C. Horton, Student Body President '91-'92

Date: February 26, 1992

Subject: Release Request for Instructor and Course Evaluation Summary

We would appreciate your help in developing an Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide for the students of Clemson. We feel that teaching should be our University's top priority and hope that this evaluation will provide accurate and meaningful information to our students. It is also our hope that this project will increase awareness about the importance of teaching.

For the last three years, the students of Clemson, through their Student Government, have expressed their desire for an Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide to be made available to the student body. Last year, Student Government attempted to independently compile an evaluation, but the questionnaires were not handed out in the classrooms and little student input was received.

This year, Student Government has researched successful course evaluations at institutions like Georgia Tech, Duke, Temple, Colorado at Boulder and Harvard, and has spent much of this year attempting to pursue the project through the proper University channels. After much work, Student Government has gained the necessary support from the faculty and administration. We have worked with members of the Faculty Senate, the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, and the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee to develop an evaluation that will serve the needs of the students. The form was created by a subcommittee of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, reviewed by the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee, and finally approved by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies on February 14th, 1992. This process began back in September of 1991 with the Faculty Senate's unanimous support for Student Government's efforts to develop an evaluation and course guide.

Please help us in this project by reading the "Statement of Compliance", by completing the information at the bottom, and by distributing Student Government's Questionnaire along with Clemson University's Questionnaire. USE OF STUDENT GOVERNMENT'S QUESTIONNAIRE PRECLUDES ANY OTHER USE OF PART III ON CLEMSON UNIVERSITY'S QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS. THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT QUESTIONNAIRE CANNOT BE USED IF QUESTIONS OTHER THAN STUDENT GOVERNMENT'S ARE TO BE ASKED IN PART III.

"Statement of Compliance"

As an instructor at Clemson University, I may choose to have one copy of the University's Report Form released to Student Government for use in the publication of an Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide. I understand the Report Form will be used by the students as an informal aid in course selection. I am aware that the concept of publishing the summaries of instructor evaluations, on a voluntary basis, has been endorsed by both the Faculty Senate and the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. Further, I understand the summaries of these evaluations are not intended to be used as a basis for evaluating an instructor's performance for the purposes of tenure and promotion.

I authorize the release to Student Government one copy of the summary report form from Part III of the Clemson University Questionnaire for Student Evaluation of Instructors. I also understand Part III of the University Questionnaire must only contain the responses to Student Governments Questionnaire (Items 27-32).

Signature

Date

Current 5 Digit Instructor Identification Number

Please Print your name as it appears above.

This form must be returned with your evaluations. Thank you.
RESOLUTION ON THE FEE AND FINE STRUCTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKING SERVICES

Whereas, the University administration has instructed the Department of Parking Services to act as an auxiliary service department, and

Whereas, the Department of Parking Services is charged with providing a shuttle service as an integral part of a campus wide transportation network which includes improved and unimproved parking facilities, and

Whereas, the costs of providing shuttle service and maintaining improved parking facilities have continued to increase beyond the revenues generated by the current fee and fine structure levied by the Department of Parking Services, and

Whereas, the students, staff, faculty and food service employees are to date the sole, consistent providers of revenues from fees and fines to the Department of Parking Services, and

Whereas, other auxiliary service departments operating on campus encourage and profit from the use of designated parking facilities by persons other than Clemson University students, staff, faculty and food service employees,

Resolved, that while we encourage the development of a comprehensive transportation network on campus, and have demonstrated our support through decal purchases, we are unable to support any increase in the existing parking fees levied upon our constituents until the President of Clemson University authorizes the Department of Parking Services to extend parking fees and fines to include the other auxiliary service departments (i.e. Athletics, Conference and Guest Services, Recreational Services, etc.) which generate additional traffic and aggravate the routine parking situation on campus.

This resolution was passed unanimously.
PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE FACULTY MANUAL
MARCH 10, 1992

The Policy Committee proposes the following addition to the Faculty Manual:

Part VII. Professional Practices
  0. 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.

Proposal to Amend Faculty Manual passed unanimously.
RESOLUTION TO EXPRESS APPRECIATION TO STUDENT SENATORS FOR EFFORTS TO DEVELOP AN INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION AND COURSE GUIDE

FS92-3-9 P

Whereas, it is a goal of the Faculty Senate to improve student/faculty relations, and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution encouraging the leaders of the Student Senate to develop an Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide, and

Whereas, the elected leaders of the Student Senate have worked very hard in cooperation with representatives of the Faculty Senate to improve the access of students to information about course content and instructor performance,

Resolved, the Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation to the following Student Senators:

Jill L. Hennessy
Lewis G. Horton
Gregory L. Powell

for their efforts to develop an Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide.

This resolution passed unanimously.
AAUP STATEMENT ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Adopted by the AAUP National Council, June 13, 1991

PREFACE

Concern about pervasive abuses in intercollegiate athletics is widespread both in higher education and in the community at large.

We solicit comments both on the substance of this statement of the problem, and on the format that would make it appropriate for adoption by faculty senates and similar bodies as an expression of desired policy for their institutions.

INTRODUCTION

On many campuses the conduct of intercollegiate athletic programs poses serious and direct conflicts with desired academic standards and goals. The pressure to field winning teams has led to widely publicized scandals concerning the recruitment, exploitation, and academic failures of many athletes.

Expenditures on athletics may distort institutional budgets and can reduce resources available for academic functions. Within some academic programs faculty members have been pressured to give preferential treatment to athletes. Coaches and athletic directors are themselves often trapped in the relentless competitive and financial pressures of the current system, and many would welcome reform.

Not all institutions have problems with athletics of the same type or to the same degree. Nevertheless, we believe that all colleges and universities would benefit from
the adoption of a national set of standards that would protect athletes from exploitation and get expenditures on and administration of athletic programs under the regular governance procedures of the institution.

We urge faculty participation in the cause of reform. We urge our administrators to enter into national efforts to establish new standards through the NCAA or other regulatory agencies. We specifically endorse the following proposed reforms and ask faculty colleagues, administrators, and athletic department staff throughout the country to join with us in working to implement them on their campuses, in their athletic conferences, through the NCAA, and nationally:

**ADMISSION AND ACADEMIC PROGRESS**

1. Institutions should not use admission standards for athletes that are not comparable to those for other students.

2. A committee elected by the faculty should monitor the compliance with policy relating to admission, the progress toward graduation, and the integrity of the course of study of students who engage in intercollegiate athletics. This committee should report annually to the faculty on admissions, on progress toward graduation, and on graduation rates of athletes by sport. Further, the committee should be charged with seeking appropriate review of cases in which it appears that faculty members or administrators have abused academic integrity in order to promote athletic programs.

**AVOIDANCE OF EXPLOITATION**

3. Students who are athletes need time for their academic work. Participation in
intercollegiate athletics in the first year of college is ill-advised. Athletes should have at least one day a week without athletic obligations. Overnight absences on weekday evenings should be kept to a maximum of one per week, with rare exceptions. The number of events per season should be periodically reviewed by the faculty. Student athletes should be integrated with other students in housing, food service, tutoring, and other areas of campus life.

FINANCIAL AID

4. Financial aid standards for athletes should be comparable to those for other students. The aid should be administered by the financial aid office of the institution. The assessment of financial need may take account of time demands on athletes which may preclude or limit employment during the academic year. Continuation of aid to students who drop out of athletic competition or complete their athletic eligibility should be conditioned only on their remaining academically and financially qualified.

FINANCING ATHLETICS: GOVERNANCE

5. Financial operations of the department of athletics, including all revenues received from outside groups, should be under the full and direct control of the central administration of the campus. Complete budgets of the athletic department for the coming year and actual expenditures and revenues for the past year should be published in full detail. Annual budgets, as well as long-term plans should be approved under the regular governance procedures of the campus, with input from elected faculty representatives.
6. Particular scrutiny should be given to use of the institution's general operating funds to support the athletic department. Institutions should establish regulations governing the use of and fees for university facilities by private businesses, such as summer athletic camps. Fees charged to coaches should be assessed on the same basis as those charged to faculty and other staff engaged in private businesses on campus. Published budgets should include an accounting of maintenance expenses for sports facilities, activities of booster groups, payments by outsiders for appearances by coaches and other athletic staff, payments by sports apparel companies, and sources of scholarship funds.

7. Elected faculty representatives should comprise a majority of the campus committee which formulates campus athletic policy, and such a committee should be chaired by an elected faculty member.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

8. Paid-for trips to games, and other special benefits for faculty, administrators, or members of governing boards involved in the oversight of athletics, whether offered by the university or by outside groups, create conflicts of interest and should be eliminated.

IMPLEMENTATION

9. In order to avoid the obstacles to unilateral reform efforts, the faculty believes its chief administrative officer should join with counterparts in other institutions to pursue these reforms and report annually to the academic community on the progress of such efforts.
10. Beginning five years from adoption of these principles at an institution, athletic events should be scheduled only with institutions, and within conferences and associations, that commit themselves to the implementation of these principles.

***

Institutions should redouble their efforts to enroll and support academically able students from disadvantaged backgrounds regardless of their athletic ability. Athletic programs never should have been considered as a major way of supporting students from disadvantaged backgrounds in institutions of higher education. If these recommendations are adopted, athletes who lack academic skills or interests will no longer be enrolled, and some of those excluded will be from such backgrounds. In the interest of such athletes, institutions and the NCAA should avoid regulations that interfere with the formation of other channels of entry for these athletes into professional athletics.

6/27/91
1. **Call to Order.** President Luedeman called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The General Faculty Minutes of December 18, 1991 and the Faculty Senate Minutes of February 11, 1992 were approved as written.

3. **Election of Officers.** The Advisory Committee brought forth 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. Alan Schaffer was elected Vice President/President Elect and Lucy Rollin was elected Secretary.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Senate Committees**

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Louderback informed the Senate that the Commission on Undergraduate Studies will provide information on the Sale of Syllabi in the future.

   Senator Louderback introduced the resolution, Disapproval of the Policy on Excused Absences from the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. After discussion, this resolution was tabled (Attachment A) (FS92-3-1).

   The resolution, Rescission of Early Registration for Student-Athletes, was introduced by Senator Louderback, and discussion followed. Motion was made to table this resolution, which passed (Attachment B) (FS92-3-2).

   Senator Schaffer noted that the Class Attendance Policy will be discussed at the Commission on Undergraduate Studies this week and asked for the sense of the Senate. After discussion and a straw vote, the sense of the Faculty Senate was that the current policy should be kept; and that "any problems of inflexibility in class attendance policy should be addressed by dealing with the individual faculty member through his/her department head, not by revising the current University policy."

   Senator Schaffer informed the Senate that the issue of "Dead Days" will be presented at the next meeting of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, and asked for guidelines.
from the Senate. A straw vote showed that the majority of the Senate thought "Dead Days" was a good concept and would support this concept.

**Policy Committee.** Senator Hare introduced Senator Walt Owens who presented a Draft of the Social Audit on behalf of the Policy Committee, and asked for the support of the Senate. Motion was made to sponsor this survey of faculty, which passed unanimously.

**Research Committee.** Senator Marion presented the Policy on Research Ethics which included changes made since its presentation to the Executive/Advisory Committee. Senator Marion stated that this document will be brought forward for support at the April Faculty Senate meeting in order for the Senate to have ample time to provide input before it comes before the Board of Trustees.

**Welfare Committee.** Senator Harris asked the sense of the Faculty Senate to co-sponsor any activities with the AIDS Task Force. After discussion, support was given to co-sponsor specific AIDS projects.

Senator Harris mentioned that the Welfare Committee will meet with the AIDS Peer Educators, and will decide if this presentation should be brought to the entire Senate.

Senator Harris presented the following resolutions for consideration by the Faculty Senate:

- Resolution to Pursue Policy to Obtain Annual Cost of Living Raises. Vote was taken, and resolution passed (Attachment C) (FS92-3-3-P).
- Resolution to Pursue Restoration of Medical Benefits to Previous Levels. Vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment D) (FS92-3-4 P).
- Resolution for President Lennon to Decline Consulting Opportunities Offered by Chairman Amick and Others. After discussion, vote was taken and resolution passed (16 for/9 against/no abstentions) (Attachment E) (FS92-3-5 P).
- Resolution to Provide the Same Retirement Plan Options. Vote was taken, and resolution passed (Attachment F) (FS92-3-6 P).
- Resolution to Pursue the Provision of a Faculty Club. Vote was taken, and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment G) (FS92-3-7 P).

b. **University Commissions and Committees**

1) **Administrative Growth** - Kenneth Murr submitted an update of the University Growth Report (Attachment...
2) **English Fluency Act** - Senator Vander Mey referred to the Draft Policy Statement and encouraged all to read it carefully, and submit any comments.

3) **Campus Safety** - Senator Vander Mey reported that Rape Awareness Week was very successful.

4) **Commission on Undergraduate Studies** - Senator Vander Mey informed the Senate that the Commission will meet and take under consideration the subject of "Plus Grading".

5. **Senate President's Report**. Senator Luedeman briefly discussed the President's Report (Attachment I).

6. **Old Business**
   a. The Centennial Professorship is now $90,711.

7. **New Business**
   a. A "Statement of Compliance" form to be included with the *Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide*, was introduced to the Senate from Student Government. Comments were shared with Student Government from the Senate (Attachment J).

   b. Vice President/President Elect Baron submitted from the Executive/Advisory Committee a Joint Resolution on the Fee and Fine Structure of the Department of Parking Services, Version I for the Senate's consideration. Dr. Baron also presented Version II which was passed by the Student Government and the Commission of Classified Staff Affairs. Senator Louderback offered a friendly amendment to substitute Version II for Version I. However, he withdrew this amendment following discussion. Dr. Baron offered a friendly amendment to express that it is not a joint resolution, but a Faculty Senate resolution. Vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously. (Attachment K) (FS92-3-8 P).

   c. Senator Hare introduced a proposed amendment to the *Faculty Manual* regarding a Computer Software Copyright Infringement Policy. After discussion, vote was taken and proposal to amend passed unanimously (Attachment L).

   d. Senator Harris presented a Resolution to Express Appreciation to Student Senators for Efforts to Develop an Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide. Motion was seconded,
vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment M) (FS92-3-9 P).

e. Senator Wells submitted the AAUP Statement on Intercollegiate Athletics which will be presented at the next Faculty Senate meeting (Attachment N).

8. Adjournment. President Luedeman adjourned the meeting at 6:22 p.m.

Gerald L. Haddle, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

DISAPPROVAL OF THE POLICY ON EXCUSED ABSENCES FROM THE COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

FS92-3-1

Whereas, the Commission on Undergraduate Studies has promulgated a policy regarding excused absences from class; and

Whereas, there do not appear to be significant difficulties with the existing policy; and

Whereas, the proposed policy greatly reduces the flexibility that faculty can now exercise,

Resolved, that the Provost should not approve the policy.

This resolution was tabled.
3-10-92
RECISSION OF EARLY REGISTRATION FOR STUDENT-ATHLETES

FS92-3-2

Whereas, the Provost has approved early registration for student-athletes, even before on-line registration begins; and

Whereas, early registration is extremely valuable in hard financial times when classes are filling up quickly; and

Whereas, allowing student-athletes to register before any other students suggests that student-athletes are more important than other students; and

Whereas, there are costs associated with this early registration; and

Whereas, student-athletes will register even before important information regarding their degree progress is available, therefore ineluctably reinforcing the impression that a degree is not important to most student-athletes,

Resolved, that the Provost should rescind his decision.

This resolution was tabled.
3-10-92
RESOLUTION TO PURSUE POLICY TO OBTAIN ANNUAL COST OF LIVING RAISES

FS92-3-3 P

Whereas, the crisis in state finances has resulted in salary freezes for most members of the University community, and

Whereas, governments have continued to fund their commitment to provide cost of living raises to retirees regardless of income, and

Whereas, the cost of living continues to rise and reduce the standard of living of employees faced with a salary freeze,

Resolved, Clemson University should pursue a policy of obtaining annual cost of living raises for its employees and seek to recover for its employees wages lost to the effects of inflation.
RESOLUTION TO PURSUE RESTORATION OF MEDICAL BENEFITS TO PREVIOUS LEVELS

FS92-3-4  P

Whereas, the cost of medical care have continued to escalate beyond the reach of many families, and

Whereas, medical care is a necessity rather than luxury, and

Whereas, the state financial crisis has forced state employees' families to bear an increasing share of the cost of medical care, and

Whereas, the burden of poorer medical benefits falls proportionately heavier on the less well-paid state employees.

Resolved, Clemson University should pursue a restoration of medical benefits to levels provided a few years ago and continue to convey the importance of this issue to leaders in state government.

This resolution passed unanimously.
RESOLUTION FOR PRESIDENT LENNON TO DECLINE CONSULTING OPPORTUNITIES OFFERED BY CHAIRMAN AMICK AND OTHERS

FS92-3-5 P

Whereas, the State Ethics Commission has recently ruled that President Lennon may receive a $25,000 consulting fee for services to be provided to a business owned by Clemson Trustees Chairman Amick,

Whereas, the President's actions may serve to set the standard of conduct for faculty seeking outside employment and income,

Whereas, the decision to freeze the salaries of a large majority of Clemson Faculty increases the temptation for them to sacrifice their full-time commitment to teaching, research, and university service in order to pursue outside income opportunities,

Whereas, Clemson University currently prohibits faculty members who work in extension from paid consulting for in-state firms,

Whereas, as the Faculty Senate feels that the job of President of Clemson University is a full-time job requiring the undivided attention and 100% of the time of even the most talented individual,

Whereas, public perceptions of President Lennon's pursuit of outside income may be unfairly influenced by the recent felony conviction of the previous president of the state's other leading university for pursuing outside income,

Whereas, the effect of the salary freeze on faculty morale is lessened, if they perceive that they are sharing a common burden,

Resolved, President Lennon should decline this and any other consulting opportunity that is so graciously and generously offered by Chairman Amick or anyone else. The Faculty Senate believes that the President of Clemson University should be paid a publicly disclosed salary sufficient to assure his or her full and undivided commitment to the duties of the Presidency of Clemson University.
RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE THE SAME RETIREMENT PLAN OPTIONS

FS92-3-6  P

Whereas, Clemson University continues to provide new faculty members with an optional retirement plan, and

Whereas, this optional retirement plan permits a departing faculty member to receive funds that have been contributed by the state for that employee's retirement, and

Whereas, older faculty members have been denied this option, and

Whereas, Clemson University administrators have publicly argued in court that long term employees should seek employment at other universities, if they want to keep their salaries up to the levels paid to new inexperienced faculty, and

Whereas, recent salary freezes imposed on the majority of the faculty make it unlikely that many will recover a market level salary in the near future unless they change employers,

Resolved, Clemson University should seek to provide its older faculty with the same retirement plan options offered to new faculty.
RESOLUTION TO PURSUE THE PROVISION OF A FACULTY CLUB

FS92-3-7 P

Whereas, it is the policy of Clemson University to promote the interdisciplinary interaction of faculty, and

Whereas, there is currently no plan to provide a faculty club such as those which serve to promote faculty and administrative interaction at other universities, and

Whereas, the University of South Carolina has had one of the southeast’s finest faculty clubs for many years,

Resolved, Clemson University should actively pursue the provision of a faculty club similar in quality to the one already provided to the faculty at the University of South Carolina.

This resolution passed unanimously.
University Growth
Report to the Faculty Senate
Submitted by Kenneth Murr and Robert Kosinski

This is an update to the Report submitted last October on University Growth. The figures are based on the 1991-2 Telephone Directory under the same rules as in the previous reports. The definitions are:

**Faculty**— all on-campus (656 telephone numbers) entries having title of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, research associate with faculty rank, military science instructor, or librarian are counted as faculty if the title does not also include the term head, dean, or director. Visiting faculty, adjunct faculty and lecturers are not counted in any category.

**Administrators**— all on-campus (656 telephone numbers) entries having title of head (except for librarians—only two librarians are administrators), dean (associate or assistant), director (associate or assistant), vice-provost (associate or assistant) or vice-president (associate or assistant), plus specific administrators who could be identified by title (e.g. registrar, president, and general counsel.) Directors of institutes also listed with faculty rank were equally divided between administration and faculty.

**Staff**— all on-campus (656 telephone numbers) entries not covered in other categories and intended to be classified personnel. The range of titles is extensive. Some directors were classified as staff (e.g., Lab Dir USDA and Dir of Spec Events).

**Omissions**— all athletic people (in Jervey), all off-site (non 656 telephone numbers) personnel, visiting faculty, adjunct faculty and lecturers were not counted in any category. Part-time faculty and staff are not listed in the telephone directory and so are not included.

Table 1. Size of Study Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>304.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>967.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>2258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>12781</td>
<td>14251</td>
<td>15193</td>
<td>17295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The associated growth rates are:

Table 2. Growth Rate of Study Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1987-91</th>
<th>1990-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESIDENT'S REPORT
MARCH, 1992

1. The Faculty Manual has some discrepancies. The latest concerns the evaluation of department heads. On one page it requires evaluation every five years. On another page it requires an evaluation after year two, year five, and every five years thereafter. Provost Jennett has stated his desire to rule that the evaluation takes place every five years. We need to reassert that the evaluation begins in year two, and continues in year five and every five years thereafter.

2. Graduate and undergraduate applications are up over last year. The quality of the applicants is high. The University may accept more than 2300 freshmen.

3. A new attendance policy has been approved by the Undergraduate Commission. Loosely paraphrased, it states that a student may miss class equal to twice the number of weekly class meetings. Thereafter, the professor may drop the student from class for excessive absences.

4. The new registration policy states that athletes may register for courses but not sections or instructors before any other students. Whereas, Honors Students may register with the same priority as seniors. Is this a statement about the relative regard with which these two groups of students are held at Clemson?

5. Former Faculty Senate Presidents have met with President Lennon and Provost Jennett separately. Topics of discussion were faculty morale and the role of the provost vis-a-vis the other vice-presidents.

6. The colleges of Architecture, Commerce and Industry, Engineering, and Nursing have had their proposals for continuous improvement approved. The purpose of such a competition is to eliminate redundancy on campus.

7. At a recent meeting of the Business Advisory Council of the Council of Presidents, the business community expressed their concern that since business has undergone much restructuring to remain competitive, universities must undergo restructuring before business will "go to bat" for higher education. President Lennon addressed their concerns by explaining Clemson's strategic planning process.
8. The Commission on Higher Education appears to be pushing a plan which would require a raising of the tuition for graduate out-of-state students. Clemson is opposing this attempt.

9. The reorganization of the Council of Deans into a Council of Deans and a Provost's Council has been abandoned. The reorganization would have denied the President of the Faculty Senate a seat on the Dean's Council.

10. The establishment of a Faculty Senate Operating Account has become a reality. Individual gifts will now be accepted to provide monies for miscellaneous expenses which arise each year. Please make your check payable to: Clemson University Foundation and be sure to note that it is for: the Faculty Senate.
To: All Instructors

From: Greg L. Powell, Director of Research and Development
L. Gregory C. Horton, Student Body President '91-'92

Date: February 26, 1992

Subject: Release Request for Instructor and Course Evaluation Summary

We would appreciate your help in developing an Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide for the students of Clemson. We feel that teaching should be our University's top priority and hope that this evaluation will provide accurate and meaningful information to our students. It is also our hope that this project will increase awareness about the importance of teaching.

For the last three years, the students of Clemson, through their Student Government, have expressed their desire for an Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide to be made available to the student body. Last year, Student Government attempted to independently compile an evaluation, but the questionnaires were not handed out in the classrooms and little student input was received.

This year, Student Government has researched successful course evaluations at institutions like Georgia Tech, Duke, Temple, Colorado at Boulder and Harvard, and has spent much of this year attempting to pursue the project through the proper University channels. After much work, Student Government has gained the necessary support from the faculty and administration. We have worked with members of the Faculty Senate, the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, and the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee to develop an evaluation that will serve the needs of the students. The form was created by a subcommittee of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, reviewed by the Teaching Resources and Effectiveness Committee, and finally approved by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies on February 14th, 1992. This process began back in September of 1991 with the Faculty Senate's unanimous support for Student Government's efforts to develop an evaluation and course guide.

Please help us in this project by reading the "Statement of Compliance", by completing the information at the bottom, and by distributing Student Government's Questionnaire along with Clemson University's Questionnaire. USE OF STUDENT GOVERNMENT'S QUESTIONNAIRE PRECLUDES ANY OTHER USE OF PART II ON CLEMSON UNIVERSITY'S QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS. THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT QUESTIONNAIRE CANNOT BE USED IF QUESTIONS OTHER THAN STUDENT GOVERNMENT'S ARE TO BE ASKED IN PART III.

"Statement of Compliance"

As an instructor at Clemson University, I may choose to have one copy of the University's Report Form released to Student Government for use in the publication of an Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide. I understand the Report Form will be used by the students as an informal aid in course selection. I am aware that the concept of publishing the summaries of instructor evaluations, on a voluntary basis, has been endorsed by both the Faculty Senate and the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. Further, I understand the summaries of these evaluations are not intended to be used as a basis for evaluating an instructor's performance for the purposes of tenure and promotion.

I authorize the release to Student Government one copy of the summary report form from Part III of the Clemson University Questionnaire for Student Evaluation of Instructors. I also understand Part III of the University Questionnaire must only contain the responses to Student Governments Questionnaire (Items 27-32).

Table: Please Print your name as it appears above.

This form must be returned with your evaluations. Thank you.
RESOLUTION ON THE FEE AND FINE STRUCTURE OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF PARKING SERVICES

FS92-3-8  P

Whereas, the University administration has instructed the
Department of Parking Services to act as an auxiliary service
department, and

Whereas, the Department of Parking Services is charged with
providing a shuttle service as an integral part of a campus wide
transportation network which includes improved and unimproved
parking facilities, and

Whereas, the costs of providing shuttle service and
maintaining improved parking facilities have continued to
increase beyond the revenues generated by the current fee and
fine structure levied by the Department of Parking Services, and

Whereas, the students, staff, faculty and food service
employees are to date the sole, consistent providers of revenues
from fees and fines to the Department of Parking Services, and

Whereas, other auxiliary service departments operating on
campus encourage and profit from the use of designated parking
facilities by persons other than Clemson University students,
staff, faculty and food service employees,

Resolved, that while we encourage the development of a
comprehensive transportation network on campus, and have
demonstrated our support through decal purchases, we are unable
to support any increase in the existing parking fees levied upon
our constituents until the President of Clemson University
authorizes the Department of Parking Services to extend parking
fees and fines to include the other auxiliary service departments
(i.e. Athletics, Conference and Guest Services, Recreational
Services, etc.) which generate additional traffic and aggravate
the routine parking situation on campus.

This resolution was passed unanimously.
PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE FACULTY MANUAL

MARCH 10, 1992

The Policy Committee proposes the following addition to the Faculty Manual:

Part VII. Professional Practices
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.

Proposal to Amend Faculty Manual passed unanimously.
RESOLUTION TO EXPRESS APPRECIATION TO STUDENT SENATORS
FOR EFFORTS TO DEVELOP AN INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION
AND COURSE GUIDE

FS92-3-9 P

Whereas, it is a goal of the Faculty Senate to improve student/faculty relations, and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution encouraging the leaders of the Student Senate to develop an Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide, and

Whereas, the elected leaders of the Student Senate have worked very hard in cooperation with representatives of the Faculty Senate to improve the access of students to information about course content and instructor performance,

Resolved, the Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation to the following Student Senators:

Jill L. Kennessy
Lewis G. Horton
Gregory L. Powell

for their efforts to develop an Instructor Evaluation and Course Guide.

This resolution passed unanimously.
AAUP STATEMENT ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Adopted by the AAUP National Council, June 13, 1991

PREFACE

Concern about pervasive abuses in intercollegiate athletics is widespread both in higher education and in the community at large.

We solicit comments both on the substance of this statement of the problem, and on the format that would make it appropriate for adoption by faculty senates and similar bodies as an expression of desired policy for their institutions.

INTRODUCTION

On many campuses the conduct of intercollegiate athletic programs poses serious and direct conflicts with desired academic standards and goals. The pressure to field winning teams has led to widely publicized scandals concerning the recruitment, exploitation, and academic failures of many athletes.

Expenditures on athletics may distort institutional budgets and can reduce resources available for academic functions. Within some academic programs faculty members have been pressured to give preferential treatment to athletes. Coaches and athletic directors are themselves often trapped in the relentless competitive and financial pressures of the current system, and many would welcome reform.

Not all institutions have problems with athletics of the same type or to the same degree. Nevertheless, we believe that all colleges and universities would benefit from
the adoption of a national set of standards that would protect athletes from exploitation and get expenditures on and administration of athletic programs under the regular governance procedures of the institution.

We urge faculty participation in the cause of reform. We urge our administrators to enter into national efforts to establish new standards through the NCAA or other regulatory agencies. We specifically endorse the following proposed reforms and ask faculty colleagues, administrators, and athletic department staff throughout the country to join with us in working to implement them on their campuses, in their athletic conferences, through the NCAA, and nationally:

**ADMISSION AND ACADEMIC PROGRESS**

1. Institutions should not use admission standards for athletes that are not comparable to those for other students.

2. A committee elected by the faculty should monitor the compliance with policy relating to admission, the progress toward graduation, and the integrity of the course of study of students who engage in intercollegiate athletics. This committee should report annually to the faculty on admissions, on progress toward graduation, and on graduation rates of athletes by sport. Further, the committee should be charged with seeking appropriate review of cases in which it appears that faculty members or administrators have abused academic integrity in order to promote athletic programs.

**AVOIDANCE OF EXPLOITATION**

3. Students who are athletes need time for their academic work. Participation in
intercollegiate athletics in the first year of college is ill-advised. Athletes should have at least one day a week without athletic obligations. Overnight absences on weekday evenings should be kept to a maximum of one per week, with rare exceptions. The number of events per season should be periodically reviewed by the faculty. Student athletes should be integrated with other students in housing, food service, tutoring, and other areas of campus life.

FINANCIAL AID

4. Financial aid standards for athletes should be comparable to those for other students. The aid should be administered by the financial aid office of the institution. The assessment of financial need may take account of time demands on athletes which may preclude or limit employment during the academic year. Continuation of aid to students who drop out of athletic competition or complete their athletic eligibility should be conditioned only on their remaining academically and financially qualified.

FINANCING ATHLETICS: GOVERNANCE

5. Financial operations of the department of athletics, including all revenues received from outside groups, should be under the full and direct control of the central administration of the campus. Complete budgets of the athletic department for the coming year and actual expenditures and revenues for the past year should be published in full detail. Annual budgets, as well as long-term plans should be approved under the regular governance procedures of the campus, with input from elected faculty representatives.
6. Particular scrutiny should be given to use of the institution's general operating funds to support the athletic department. Institutions should establish regulations governing the use of and fees for university facilities by private businesses, such as summer athletic camps. Fees charged to coaches should be assessed on the same basis as those charged to faculty and other staff engaged in private businesses on campus. Published budgets should include an accounting of maintenance expenses for sports facilities, activities of booster groups, payments by outsiders for appearances by coaches and other athletic staff, payments by sports apparel companies, and sources of scholarship funds.

7. Elected faculty representatives should comprise a majority of the campus committee which formulates campus athletic policy, and such a committee should be chaired by an elected faculty member.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

8. Paid-for trips to games, and other special benefits for faculty, administrators, or members of governing boards involved in the oversight of athletics, whether offered by the university or by outside groups, create conflicts of interest and should be eliminated.

IMPLEMENTATION

9. In order to avoid the obstacles to unilateral reform efforts, the faculty believes its chief administrative officer should join with counterparts in other institutions to pursue these reforms and report annually to the academic community on the progress of such efforts.
10. Beginning five years from adoption of these principles at an institution, athletic events should be scheduled only with institutions, and within conferences and associations, that commit themselves to the implementation of these principles.

***

Institutions should redouble their efforts to enroll and support academically able students from disadvantaged backgrounds regardless of their athletic ability. Athletic programs never should have been considered as a major way of supporting students from disadvantaged backgrounds in institutions of higher education. If these recommendations are adopted, athletes who lack academic skills or interests will no longer be enrolled, and some of those excluded will be from such backgrounds. In the interest of such athletes, institutions and the NCAA should avoid regulations that interfere with the formation of other channels of entry for these athletes into professional athletics.

6/27/91
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
APRIL 14, 1992

1. Call to Order. President Luedeman called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The Faculty Senate Minutes dated March 10, 1992 were approved as written.

3. Special Order of the Day. President Max Lennon, Provost Charles Jennett, Vice President for Research Jay Gogue, and Stassen Thompson of the Strategic Planning Committee responded to the Faculty Senate Standing Committee Goals. The chairperson of each committee (Policy, Research, Scholastic Policies, and Welfare) read the goals, suggested one goal to discuss and discussion followed.

4. Committee Reports
   a. Senate Committees

      Research Committee. Senator Marion submitted the Policy on Research Ethics for Faculty Senate approval. After an explanation of changes to the policy, vote for adoption was taken, and passed unanimously.

      Senator Marion thanked the Research Committee members for their work this year.

      Scholastic Policies Committee. After a brief historical presentation of this issue by Senator Louderback, Senator Baron moved to remove from the table the Resolution on Disapproval of the Policy on Excused Absences from the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, which was seconded. Following discussion, vote was taken and resolution passed (FS92-3-1 P) (Attachment A).

      Senator Louderback moved to remove from the table the Resolution on Rescission of Early Registration for Student-Athletes, which was seconded. Vote was taken, and resolution passed unanimously (FS92-3-2 P) (Attachment B).

      Senator Louderback submitted from this Committee the proposed amendment to the Faculty Manual regarding the Honors Committee review and recommendation of proposals for new Honors courses (Attachment C), and requested approval from the Senate. Vote was taken, and proposal passed unanimously.

      Senator Louderback submitted from this Committee a proposed change to the Faculty Manual regarding admission of student athletes failing to meet minimum requirements (Attachment D), and requested approval from the Senate. Vote was taken, and proposed change passed unanimously.

      Senator Louderback thanked the Scholastic Policies Committee for its devotion and work during the past year.
Welfare Committee. Senator Harris submitted from this Committee proposed changes to the Grievance Procedures (Attachment E). Discussion followed an explanation of these proposed changes. Senator Vander Mey moved to table in order for senators to have ample time to consider these changes. Move to table was seconded, and passed.

Policy Committee. Senator Hare presented the Policy Committee Recommendation regarding the evaluation of department heads (Attachment F). Senator Owens offered a friendly amendment to clarify language, which was accepted. Vote was taken to approve recommendation and passed unanimously. Senator Hare then submitted and briefly discussed the Policy Committee Minutes dated March 24, 1992 (Attachment G).

Senator Hare thanked the Policy Committee for its hard work and faithfulness this year.

b. University Commissions and Committees

5. Senate President’s Report. President Luedeman referred the Senate to the Report contained in the Agenda Packet (Attachment H).

6. Old Business

a. The Centennial Professorship now totals $90,811.

b. Senator Wells made a motion that the AAUP Statement on Intercollegiate Athletics be referred to the Scholastic Policies Committee for consideration. Motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

c. Senator Baron submitted a unanimous resolution from the Executive/Advisory Committee commending President Lennon for his recognition of the sensitivity of the consulting issue. Resolution passed (FS92-4-1 P) (Attachment I).

7. President Luedeman thanked and recognized the outgoing senators. Remarks from outgoing President Luedeman were then received before he introduced the new Senate President, William Baron. New officers were installed at 5:20 p.m.

Gerald L. Waddle, Secretary

8. New Business

a. President Baron introduced Alan Schaffer and Lucy Rollin as the Vice President/President Elect and Secretary of the Faculty Senate, respectively; and each newly-installed senator introduced her/himself.

b. Senator Vander Mey reported that the Draft Policy of the English Fluency Act will serve as an interim policy until a subcommittee addresses various concerns.

c. Senator Vander Mey reported that the subcommittee to study the issue regarding the Plus Grading System was dissolved.
d. Senator Vander Mey submitted a Draft University-Wide Survey Policy (Attachment J) and urged senators to study it carefully and share with colleagues.

e. President Baron offered his belief that the Faculty Senate is important in the governance of Clemson University, but should become a more effective body. He stated that the Senate could become irrelevant in the important process of President Lennon’s Vision Statement of Goals and Benchmarks; and that the Senate must decide how to participate in this process.

9. Adjournment. President Baron adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

Lucy Rollin, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

DISAPPROVAL OF THE POLICY ON EXCUSED ABSENCES FROM THE COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

FS92-3-1 P

Whereas, the Commission on Undergraduate Studies has promulgated a policy regarding excused absences from class; and

Whereas, there do not appear to be significant difficulties with the existing policy; and

Whereas, the proposed policy greatly reduces the flexibility that faculty can now exercise,

Resolved, that the Provost should not approve the policy.
RESCISSION OF EARLY REGISTRATION FOR STUDENT-ATHLETES

FS92-3-2 P

Whereas, the Provost has approved early registration for student-athletes, even before on-line registration begins; and

Whereas, early registration is extremely valuable in hard financial times when classes are filling up quickly; and

Whereas, allowing student-athletes to register before any other students suggests that student-athletes are more important than other students; and

Whereas, there are costs associated with this early registration; and

Whereas, student-athletes will register even before important information regarding their degree progress is available, therefore ineluctably reinforcing the impression that a degree is not important to most student-athletes,

Resolved, that the Provost should rescind his decision.

This resolution passed unanimously.
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FACULTY MANUAL

Under Honors Committee, after first sentence:

This Committee reviews and recommends to the University 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 the approval of the Honors Director.

Proposed change passed unanimously
PROPOSED CHANGE IN FACULTY MANUAL

(In description of Admissions Exceptions Sub-Committee, page 42)

“Students failing to meet this minimum will be admitted only upon approval of the Admissions Exception Committee or the President.”

Proposed change passed unanimously
FACULTY SENATE
WELFARE COMMITTEE

PROPOSED CHANGES IN GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

B. FACULTY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE I
   2. GRIEVANCES
      a. 1) pp. 32, line 1 ... or through moral turpitude:
         change to --- or through gross moral turpitude;
      2) pp. 32, line 2 ... repeated or significant
         change to --- repeated and significant
      3) pp. 32, line 4 ... limited to violation of
         confidentiality, falsification of
         change to --- limited to falsification of
         pp. 32, paragraph 3, last line ... normal duties.
         change to --- normal duties, as a result of
disability

   3. PROCEDURE.
      a. pp. 33, first paragraph,
         add after last sentence --- The thirty day time period is
         waived in cases of alleged discrimination that does not
         result in dismissal or termination.

C. FACULTY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE II
   2. DELINEATION OF GRIEVABLE AND NON-GRIEVABLE MATTERS.
   pp. 36, paragraph after item g ... Complaints arising
   replace paragraph with --- The Provost shall have the
   authority to determine what constitutes a grievable
   matter. The Provost may refer this determination to the
   Grievance Board.

   3. PROCEDURE.
      a. pp. 36, second sentence ... This discussion must take
         place within ninety days of the matter's occurrence.
         delete the sentence.
e. pp. 37, If the matter is ...
  i. fourth sentence ... (These parties shall not meet with the Panel at the same time.)

  change to --- Both parties to the grievance shall be present during each other's testimony to the Hearing Panel. The Hearing Panel may choose to hear from third parties in private.

  ii. pp. 38, ... In the review ...

  replace paragraph with --- In the review process, the Hearing Panel will determine whether appropriate university, college, and departmental policies were followed. It will also determine whether such policies were enforced fairly. The Hearing Panel will present its findings to the Provost and both parties to the grievance. The Hearing Panel will clearly indicate areas of disagreement and uncertainty.

  f. pp 38, last sentence in paragraph ... The decision of the Provost shall be transmitted

  change to --- The decision and findings of the Provost shall be transmitted
### FACULTY SALARY SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Avg. Sal.</th>
<th>All Institutions</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Clemson University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>44695</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>43603</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>47049</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>44245</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>48520</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>46655</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Asst. Prof</td>
<td>35520</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>59713</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>35565</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>59776</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Avg. Sal.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ALL PROGRAM AVERAGE-AII institutions 1991-92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Avg. Sal.</th>
<th>All Institutions</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Clemson University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>44147</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43616</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>47130</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45733</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>48909</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>49909</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Asst. Prof</td>
<td>35250</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>59713</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>35565</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>59776</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Avg. Sal.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ALL PROGRAM AVERAGE-AII institutions 1990-91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Avg. Sal.</th>
<th>All Institutions</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Clemson University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>43111</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42616</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>47034</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>44655</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>34111</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>43713</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Asst. Prof</td>
<td>27279</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>48909</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>34411</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>52872</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Avg. Sal.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source
- Oklahoma State Survey in which 79 institutions chose to participate.
- None of the Agricultural Engineering faculty had over 50% of their salary charged to instruction.
- Clemson University information is based on faculty who have over 50% of their salary charged to instruction.
- Clemson University program as a % of all institutions for that program
- Clemson University program as a % of region for that program
- Clemson University program as a % of all institutions for Clemson University

### Notes
1. Clemson University as a % of all program average for Clemson University
2. Clemson University as a % of region for that program
3. Clemson University as a % of all institutions for that program

### Prepared by
- Office of Institutional Research, April, 1992.

### Oklahoma State Survey in which 79 institutions chose to participate.
Policy Committee Recommendation
April 14, 1992

The Policy Committee recommends the following change on page 10 of the Faculty Manual: PART II. The University’s History and Administrative Structure
K. The Department Heads

Amend paragraph 3 to replace the underlined sentence:

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.

with the following sentence:

Department heads serve at the pleasure of their respective deans, who formally evaluate their performance in office, subject to the minimum periodic review set forth in Section M.

This change is suggested in order to avoid any confusion regarding the third paragraph on page 12, under:
M. Review of Academic Administrators

which reads:

"Before the end of a department head's second and fifth year in office and every fifth year thereafter, the appropriate dean shall conduct a formal review of that head's performance."

It is the understanding of the committee that the proper interpretation of any apparent conflict, from a legal viewpoint, is to use the section which gives more detail. Thus, the suggested change is one of clarification and does not alter the interpretation of either section K or section M.
Policy Committee Minutes
March 24, 1992

The Policy Committee met March 24, 1992, at 3:30 p.m. in Room LL3, Cooper Library. Members present were: J. Davis, E. Hare, M. L. Moon, W. Owens and L. Rollin. Members absent were: J. Brittain, G. Lovedahl, G. Wells.

The committee recommends the replacement of the underlined sentence in paragraph 3 on page 10 of the Faculty Manual. PART II. The University's History and Administrative Structure. K. The Department Heads

*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.*

with the sentence:

*Department heads serve at the pleasure of their respective deans, who formally evaluate their performance in office.*

When the Faculty Manual was last updated, Provost Maxwell agreed to an initial review of a department head at the end of the second year in office. This change was incorporated into Section M. Review of Academic Administrators. However, the initial description in the third paragraph of Section K could be interpreted as being in conflict with Section M. The suggested change in Section K would avoid such a misinterpretation. It is the understanding of the committee that the proper interpretation of any apparent conflict, from a legal viewpoint, is to use the section which gives the most detail. Thus, the suggested change is one of clarification and does not alter the interpretation of either section K or section M.

The Policy Committee was asked to restore to the Faculty Manual the section dealing with days on which nine-month faculty are required to be available. Senator Davis reported that the desired clarification is found on page 72, under PART VII. Professional Practices, K. Other Leave and Holidays, part 6: "Nine-month faculty receive the regular student holidays listed in the University catalog unless special circumstances require their presence.”

A grievance counselor met with the committee and reported that many of the grievances with which she is currently involved pertain to the contents of the retention, tenure and promotion folder. The fact that the applicant may not examine the contents of this folder has led to problems that have resulted in grievances. In order that the applicant have an opportunity to rebut information which might be misleading, inaccurate or incorrect, it was suggested that this file should be available for examination at every step of the review process.

It was also suggested that grievance counselors should report to someone and that the Policy Committee keep in touch with grievance counselors in order to determine what sorts of problems are causing grievances to be filed. Amending the Faculty Manual in response to these problems may well decrease the total number of grievances.

It was suggested that eventually changes may be incorporated into the Faculty Manual that will help avoid many current grievances.
Policy Committee Minutes, March 14, 1992, page 2:

Senator Owens reported over 40% response to the Social audit. Committee members were asked to remind their faculty to respond.

Resolutions were received from Senator Wells regarding the presence of male repairmen in the ladies' dressing room at Fike, suggesting that University vehicles should have parking stickers, and suggesting that the parking and shuttle services be separated for the purpose of financial support. It was decided that the problem at Fike could best be handled by the Senate president and the other two matters were referred to the Welfare Committee.

Senator Rollin reported that it is still not clear to whom the Traffic and Parking Committee should report. (p. 46, Faculty Manual lists as Subcommittee of Facilities Planning but reports to VP for Administration) She will ask Vice-President Clausen for his suggestions.

Senator Moon reported that the Faculty Development Committee, described on page 48 of the Faculty Manual, is no longer active. According to the Faculty Manual, "This committee formulates and recommends policy related to faculty professional development. Membership consists of the Vice Provost; one faculty representative from each college; and one department head elected by the Organization of Academic Department Heads. One of the faculty representatives shall be designated as chair by the Provost." Senator Davis reported that a faculty development committee for every department and every college is included in the report of the Strategic Planning Committee and, thus, any recommendation with regard to this committee should be delayed. The committee discussed reorganizing the list of committees in the Faculty Manual. It was stated that every committee should meet at a designated time and have a designated minimum number of meetings. It was suggested that an organizational chart showing to whom committees report might be included in the Faculty Manual.

Senator Davis reported the meaning of the codes in the study of administrative growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U2</td>
<td>Full time faculty - 12 mos. appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1</td>
<td>Full time faculty - 9 mos. appointment (incl. temporary full time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Contract services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Classified - 12 mos. appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Classified - 9 mos. appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3</td>
<td>Unclassified staff (coaches, county agents, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE06</td>
<td>Code 1 deans, directors, dept. heads (college administration and above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next meeting of the Policy Committee will be 3:30 p.m., Tuesday, April 21, in room LL3, Cooper Library.
1. Allen Dunn, Joe Louderback, David Senn, Larry LaForge, and I met with President Lennon to discuss the report of the Athletic Council endorsed by the Faculty Senate. President Lennon stated that the Provost is composing a statement to be added to the Faculty Manual stating the current policy on the admission of athletes and its relationship to the Admissions Exceptions Committee. Currently, the votes of the Committee are tabulated, but any athlete meeting the NCAA requirements and offered financial aid is admitted. Dr. Lennon is keeping count of the votes by the Committee, and is tracing the academic record of the athlete to determine the validity of the vote.

2. The budget is in a big mess. The House has approved one budget and the Senate has sent it back to the House. Currently, they are not talking. It may be necessary to pass continuing resolutions in the Legislature to keep the state financially afloat.

3. President Lennon has responded to our resolution concerning his consulting. He has not consulted for Amick Farms since November, and has no plans to resume consulting, for pay, for Mr. Amick. He did point out that there is value to the University when he consults with business and industry. He also pointed out that the misinformation in the resolution could have been avoided if the Senate had discussed the matter with him early on.

4. The administration has responded to our resolution to the increase in parking fees. A sub-committee of the Traffic and Parking Committee has been formed to recommend policy to implement our suggestion. I have been selected to chair that sub-committee.

5. The Academic Council has approved a Student Body Resolution which implements a Dead Day the Friday before Final Examination Week on which only final laboratory examinations can be given, and two Reading Days the Wednesday and Thursday before final examinations on which only make-up and final laboratory examinations can be given.

6. The Graduate Student Association has proposed that all continuing students should be required to make a deposit towards their fees. The interest from these deposits will be used for
increasing library holdings.

7. Because of the problems caused by the State budget, Clemson University will not be able to offer the Visiting Master Teacher Program for 1992-93. Offering of the program in subsequent years will be determined by the budget.

8. The President's Cabinet has endorsed the display of the AIDS Quilt on the Clemson Campus.

9. Fred Sheen authored an amendment to the budget bill which would create a superstructure for supercomputing which he would head. Presidents Lennon and Palms (USC) have offered an alternative which the Legislature appears ready to accept.

10. Congratulations to Larry Bauer, a former Faculty Senate President, upon his receipt of the Master Teacher of the Year Award.
FACULTY SENATE
RESOLUTION TO COMMEND PRESIDENT LENNON
FS92-4-1 P

Whereas, the Faculty Senate at its March meeting approved a resolution calling on the President of the University to give up a consulting activity with the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, in part so as to avoid a public perception of a conflict of interest, and

Whereas, the President of the University had, in fact, recognized the need to give up this consulting activity in November of 1991, and has advised the Faculty Senate that he will no longer pursue this activity,

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate commends the President of the University for recognizing the sensitivity of this issue and for making this personal sacrifice.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Executive/Advisory Committee on March 31, 1992.
UNIVERSITY-WIDE SURVEY POLICY  

The policy below is intended to ensure that the surveys of the university community provide relevant data for planning processes and that the cost, both monetary and human, is maintained at an acceptable level. As the number and scope of surveys increase, the likelihood exists for university-wide duplication of efforts and a reduction in response rates resulting from individuals being asked to complete a large number of surveys.

The University Assessment Committee recommends the policy below for all surveys involving program evaluation with respondents beyond the immediate unit from which the survey originated. That is, an academic department or division would be free to circulate a survey among its own members at any time. However, if a department, college or division were to seek responses from faculty, staff, students or alumni from other departments, colleges or divisions, then the policy below must be followed.

The policy will be used solely for program evaluation. Any evaluation involving research must be sent to Institutional Review Board (IRB), D-140 Poole Agricultural Center (656-5034), for review and approval.

1. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) will, upon request, assist any administrative unit on campus with the development of questionnaires. Assistance will be limited to recommendations regarding format, content, scoring/analysis design, and identification of target audiences.

2. At least twenty (20) days prior to circulation, submit a draft of the survey to the Office of Institutional Research to:
   a. Prevent duplication of existing data
   b. Assist with recommendations regarding content and format
   c. Help determine if survey needs approval from Institutional Review Board office

3. Submit the results of each survey along with a final copy of the instrument to the Office of Institutional Research as soon as the results are compiled to be maintained for future reference.

4. The Director of Assessment will inform the University Assessment Committee of these surveys on a regular basis.

5. Beginning in 1993, the University will survey faculty and staff every three years to gather their opinions on different issues. Units who need information from the university-wide perspective are encouraged to use this mechanism. The university-wide survey will be the responsibility of the Office of Institutional Research with the assistance and cooperation of the Office of Assessment and the University Assessment Committee.
Special Order of the Day
Discussion on FS Standing Committee Goals
Lennon, Jennett, Gogue, S. Thompson,

Policy Committee:

Eleanor Hare: Read goals.

Lennon: What I would like to see happen and hopefully, this dialogue will be the next step in that process, is for the Strategic Planning Committee to be aware of these goals and determine what we can accomplish in a reasonable period of time and get headed in this direction. We hear you and value your input and let’s talk now about some of those that you think deserve more conversation in terms of what we really mean.

Hare: The general idea which is present in many of these that there is more responsibility of administration to faculty and faculty are very unhappy. There is a method for you to listen to us to do something about it.

Lennon: OK, so you have one goal of reviewing the administrators in question of the department leader. Right now we review in depth as you know, every five years. You’re suggesting a little more specific in terms of ability to cause that to happen sooner, is that not in place today? If there is a real unhappy department, there’s not way to deal with that issue?

Luedeman: The only way to deal with it now is to meet with the Provost or the Dean.

Lennon: And that doesn’t work?

Hare: It doesn’t work.

Jennett: 40% vote is clearly a minority in the department. Why would we fire the administrators for the minority and not the majority?

Hare: The Policy Committee considered that what that really meant was a new search where the previous administrator could be included in the search. That if you have 40% really that unhappy you should be looking.

Jennett: That explains the answer tyranny/minority over tyranny/majority?

Hare: Not necessarily. One thing you hear is the idea of permanent chairs rather than department heads across the college.

Jennett: There’s some wisdom to that, that would imply then that they would be genuine faculty members, eligible for all endowments and eligible for membership on the Faculty Senate, eligibility for search committees and promotion and tenure committees.

Hare: Yes, that is implied.

Jennett: It would require a massive change in our current regulations.

Lennon: Do you think the University should move simultaneously with all colleges or is this and issue that should be discussed college by college?

Hare: College by college. However, at the present time it is not possible.
Lennon: Is that true?

Jennett: I have no idea. At least the college I left...

Lennon: I guess I am perceiving a feeling of encumbrance that surprises me.

Hare: May I also comment that this from the Policy Committee, not from the Senate as a whole.

Lennon: We understand that. Are there other comments from the Senate?

Baron: You should also be aware that the feeling with respect to administrators and so on varies considerably from one college to the next. Views of individual faculty members certainly vary also.

Thompson: Does this recommendation result in the fact that the current system that we have in place is not working because it is not being enforced or because it is ineffective? For example, the five year review for department heads. I believe the Faculty Manual says they are reviewed after two years and then five years thereafter. Is that happening? Is that occurring?

Hare: The problem is that every five years is not sufficiently frequent. The Senate asked for a review for every three years, we were turned down. We came back and asked again for a review every three years, and we were given that we would have a review after two years for the initial appointment, and then after three years, and then every five years thereafter. But, there was a case a couple of years ago in the department where, I believe, the number was 13 out of 20 tenure or tenure-track faculty members objected very strongly to a reappointment of the department head. They went to Provost Maxwell, and there was no recourse. There are several other areas on campus at the present time that need looking at. Unless you come up to a five year review, there really is no major way to be sure it is looked at, if it is looked at. The faculty really have no say. Department heads serve at the pleasure of the dean.

Lennon: We all, I think, understand there is nothing concrete about five years. What is reasonable, I think, is the question to be asked, and certainly that's debatable.

Behery: To me, it's not the matter of often to do the evaluation. All I care for is how meaningful or objective the evaluation is. What is the most accurate procedure. One that would be applicable to all departments, and be as objective and honest and fair to faculty and department head.

Lennon: One of the things we might consider doing is asking the department heads themselves to work with the Provost's Office to make sure that we analyze that evaluation of leadership at the departmental level to make sure that our instruments are the best available. Is that a reasonable thing to do?

Jennett: I can bring it to them.

Schaffer: You talk about the instrument used for evaluation of department head, is that what we are talking about?

Lennon: Or the process.

Schaffer: Because we have no instrument, and we have no process. We have individual deans who are obligated to evaluate department heads. How that process is carried out is quite
mysterious to a lot of us, to put it mildly.

Jennett: There is a process, it just isn’t described in the Faculty Manual. The Faculty Manual says they will be reviewed. Provost Maxwell rather rigorously enforced interviewing, he did not require them...you can make a value judgment.

Schaffer: He required the dean who was doing the evaluating to interview all members of the department, but there is no check on the deans. Each faculty member is interviewed individually, and one of the problems is that in a department of 20 people, if 19 voted that the department head was despicable, the dean might not necessarily report that, since the dean frequently is responsible for hiring that individual. We ought to be more aware of the built in problem.

Jennett: Even more common is where the full professors love or hate the individual...assistant professor, now you have a quality measurement that you have to put on there. One Nobel prize winner and 19 aren’t, which way does the Nobel prize winner vote?

Schaffer: Nobody knows except the winner and the dean. The problem is we have no process in place, we have an instruction that it be done. Dr. Lennon, you indicated that you believe there should be a time limit, and I think you used the term 10 years for an academic administrator.

Lennon: I’m accustomed to terms, it doesn’t bother me if its three years, or five years, something reasonable, and that point we’re going to do a serious evaluation, and then the person is reappointed for another term. What I said in that first meeting was that is normal, what’s unusual is to get a third appointment, or a fourth appointment. It would occur on occasion with exceptional leadership, but it would be unusual.

Schaffer: I thought you were suggesting that there should be a ten year limit for academic administrators, that ten years is sufficient for most people in that position. Not for all administrators, just as a general rule.

Lennon: Hear me correctly. I said it would be unusual to get a third term, or a fourth term. But it could occur, it is conceivable. But rather than write in stone that ten years and you’re out, that might not be wise, because we might have that unusual gem. What I am hearing and what I am encouraging us to do, I’m a believer in process. Let’s ask those involved to work with the Provost, I’m sure a dean or two might be interested, to develop a process that may even include an instrument. We have a draft instrument in place for the review of Vice Presidents. That is something this body has talked about historically. The President of the Faculty Senate, do you have a copy of that (Luedeman-yes). We have worked interestingly, and the most concerned office is down in Columbia. They want to make sure that our review instrument is compatible with all of their issues. We think our draft will pass that test. We are now making sure it’s going to give us the information we need...I would assume the Provost would involve the faculty a great deal.
Research Committee:

Russ Marion: Read goals, and chose this item to discuss: "The University will have a clear policy outlining a faculty member's responsibilities and status relative to the three major functions of University; teaching, service, and research. This policy will apply across colleges in an equitable fashion."

Lennon: At the University level, the policy is that we are going to teach with a commitment to excellence, we are going to do research with a commitment to excellence, we will be involved with scholarship with a commitment to excellence, and will be involved with public service with a commitment to excellence. I would ask the colleges and departments to further define that policy because they vary from department A to department, between fundamental science vs. applied science.

Marion: Implicit here is our concern that you reward in each of these areas indiscriminately and in equitable fashion, so that an individual who is service oriented receives rewards.

Lennon: My challenge to you the faculty is help us change the scorecard so that excellence in teaching means something in terms of promotion, tenure and salary adjustments. Help us change the scorecard so that public service means something. I think you pretty well understand. How do we document that commitment to excellence, and then reward.

Marion: Where should the leadership for that come from? Should it come from the administration?

Lennon: I would think that the Provost should be front and center in causing that debate to occur. I think the Provost will accept the challenge. I think it is part of the Strategic Plan. Our first priority is to improve the undergraduate experience. What does that mean? Yes, we will be leading the discussion.

Gogue: I appreciate very much your inviting me to be here. I have had a good year working with the Research Committee and they have been very helpful on a number of issues. I'll mention each one very briefly, but I also want to add one for you to think about.

1) Research quality - it is extremely important, very difficult to define, but I think I know what you're after, you're after true impact in research as opposed to some of the things, accounting, measurements, dollars...I think I understand clearly what you mean.

2) I won't comment on the second one.

3) Multi-disciplinary and inter-University programs - as an ecologist by background, for at least 15 years, one of the most fundamental principles is that diversity equals stability. I think to some extent, we think about stability in a natural system. When we think about the future, we have to think very carefully about these interdisciplinary programs and inter-University programs. There's going to be a lot of stability that comes by forming those kind of partnerships, those kind of teams that will give you the stability that will eventually allow for the growth. So, I think that is a very good recommendation.

4) International Research Programs - we have a long way to go. The state of SC has a very parochial view towards a state institution being involved internationally for a long period of time. I'm glad to see that it is on here and is solicited.

5) This is very difficult for me. Very pragmatically, that's probably, it's available in a highly competitive fashion. We are fooling ourselves if we think the State of South Carolina is
going to provide that money for us to have an internal pool to carry out our research. I don’t
know. That one will be difficult.

6) I totally agree with you.

7) Please think about this. The growth that you have seen in research as far as people
nearly all of it has been in the compliance area and so some kind of wordage would be awfully, if
in fact this group so felt, to talk about the importance of compliance with the federal and state rules
relative to research. There are 41 federal laws that our institution is subject to, everything to
animals to human subjects, to the use of carcinogens in labs to machines that emit x-rays and a
variety of compliance related issues. It’s important that we don’t want to be in a position where
entire areas or entire disciplines of study are closed down and our opportunities are not there
because of non-compliance.
Joe Louderback: Read goals, and requested discussion on items:

(1) The faculty will support joint efforts with the administration to improve the quality of graduate and undergraduate education; (2) and the most important criterion for admission should be academic promise.

Lennon: I would simply say thank you for excellent words that we can accept broadly, and we have no problem at all.

Thompson: The only comment I would like to make is that as we go through each one of these goals, if you go look at the Planning Committee report, you will find most of your recommendations in that report, except for those that deal with the issues of government. I don’t think you should be surprised with that as we have had a workshop and got your input, and it is reflected. What I would like to encourage you to do is to help us, budget - tomorrow afternoon we have a meeting at 3:00 p.m. and we are going to discuss these goals, benchmarks and look at what the standards are going to be after this point. I would encourage each one of you to encourage each faculty in your college to attend this meeting to provide input.

Lennon: I would suggest that we ought to think about a discussion like this once or twice a year with the Strategic Planning process. You have committees who are working and come up with ideas. Senator Hare touched on a very important point where in a couple of departments, things aren’t just as they should be. Unless I’m wrong, I think those departments are on a good course and things are heading in the right direction. This has to be a way for us to learn about some of those problems that are out there. Thank you for some quality time that you have given and have some very, very good ideas. Regarding governance, I realize what you said in the Welfare Committee Report, we remember that Clemson is a maturing institution. Governance will play a different role in the future than it has played in the past. Let’s remember the vital role of the faculty in decisions, whatever that means. You can have our attention any time you want it. If something is not working, please let us know. I really want to thank you, as President, for the input you are giving us. We’ll feed it into the system immediately. Charles Jennett is Academic Vice President and Provost and is going to be the point person academically and I think you will enjoy working with him, there are several things that are already happening. The process is there for you to provide input as it is needed.

Carl Thompson: You made the statement about a mature university that is not directed from the top down but really from the faculty on up. Our strategic plan has an excellent idea. It appears to me that we have these benchmarks and we are encouraged to fit in those benchmarks rather than for us to be creative, and say not everything on those benchmarks...what we’re coming up with, are they going to be included, or will they be pitched out?

Lennon: It’s like a spider on a mirror. We’re going to effect each other. When it comes to benchmarks, don’t let anyone stifle the creativity. That would be a serious mistake. Jay said it well, diversity equals balance. Invite one or two of us occasionally to come interact with you in this process. Don’t rush your process, let it take time.

Thompson: What we will find as we move through this process, we hope to have influence on what colleges and departments do. There should be a meshing to some extent of departmental and university plans. If that doesn’t happen, we going to be ineffective. On the other hand when we get to the department level, I think departments are going to be much more comfortable looking at more specific benchmarks that will fit your department.

Lennon: It’s highly likely that some of yours will work in other places, we hope they will
be replicated. What we are trying to do is to find a way to develop a plan in an academic setting that will allow us to achieve our vision of the 21st Century. That model does not exist. I am convinced that we have to build a new one. We are embarking on this and we are talking to lots of people on other campuses and other places. We have asked the deans to respond to requests for proposals to be involved in trying to learn what total quality management means. You are not being forced to do it. This is something that we want to experiment with, and learn from it. This will require 10-15 years for us to fully understand. Think of the budget process. I can’t think of a better example because if you’re in a department making decisions about resources, what do you do? You identify a way to have a set of books. Why? The system doesn’t give you the information, they need to make good decisions. Another reason is you don’t trust the other members anyway, you want your own. If you’re a dean you do the same thing, and also at the University level. Technology is out there today. Remember, it doesn’t exist anywhere so we have to develop it. We want to identify redundancy and eliminate it and more resources to deal with the issues that we have identified. I hope that we have realized that things are indeed much more open today than it has ever been in the past.

Gogue: You have accomplished more as a faculty in research than I ever thought was possible. When I look and see the things that you do and the things that you are involved with, I never in my wildest dreams thought, and it’s not that I thought you had incapabilities, but it really been a satisfying experience for me to watch and see the things that you have done, as you have grown - from 500 to 1400 in five years. You are successful 58% of the time on your proposals, that is a phenomenal record. Keep in mind that that growth has taxed a lot of the infrastructure at Clemson in ways that you run into every day. It’s a great situation to be in. I’m proud of you and excited to work with you to.
Welfare Committee

John Harris: Read goals, and the goal that Senator Harris chose for the President and Provost to address was, “Departmental budgets should be made available to departmental faculty.”

Lennon: I agree.

Harris: Thank you very much.

Jennett: It’s a part of the Freedom of Information Act.

Behery: The money that comes back from research in our college I don’t know how much comes to the department from the overhead and how much goes anywhere. When we ask...

Lennon: There’s no reason for that.

Jennett: If you hang around, you can get it every year. You get what goes to each college, now what happens within the college...

Lennon: Please remember that not all of us get equally excited about new opportunities...

Behery: That issue should be uniform across the University.

Lennon: I agree.

Behery: So that the Provost will tell everybody, every dean please follow this rule.

Lennon: I predict he will. I hope so.
1. **Call to Order.** President Baron called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated April 14, 1992 were approved as written.

3. **Election of Senate/Faculty Representatives to University Committees.** President Baron noted additional nominations to the Ballot, and received nominations from the floor. Motion made by Senator Rollin to suspend normal voting rules and elect by plurality was seconded and passed. Senators then marked their ballots.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      - **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Alan Schaffer reported that there was no report.
      - **Welfare Committee.** Senator Brenda Vander Mey referred to April Committee Notes in Agenda Packet (Attachment A). She asked that any questions or comments from Welfare Committee members regarding her letter to the Provost about the SACS Response on Faculty Workloads be directed to her.
      - **Policy Committee.** Senator Eleanor Hare briefly discussed the Policy Committee Report (Attachment B).
      - **Research Committee.** Senator Les Carlson reported that there was no report.
   b. **University Commissions and Committees**

5. **Senate President’s Report.** President Baron briefly discussed the President’s Report (Attachment C), and responded to questions.

6. **Old Business**
   a. President Baron provided the Senate with an update of the proposed Attendance Policy, which included the fact that it will be brought to the Academic Council at the June meeting.

7. **New Business**
   a. Senator Hare presented a recommendation from the Policy Committee to amend the Faculty Senate Procedural Bylaws regarding Resolutions and Standing Committee Reports. After a friendly amendment offered by Senator Wells, vote was taken and recommendation passed unanimously (Attachment D).
b. Senator Hare presented a Policy Committee Recommendation to amend the Faculty Manual regarding Faculty Participation in University Governance - Athletic Council. Following discussion, vote was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment E).

c. Senator Conover introduced an Alternative Attendance Policy from Senators Conover, Hare, and Owens (Attachment F). Due to the expediency of this issue, much discussion took place. After friendly amendments were accepted, vote to adopt alternative attendance policy was taken and passed (Attachment G).

d. Senator Hare made a motion to remove from the table Proposed Changes in Grievance Procedures from the Welfare Committee, and transfer to the Policy Committee for consideration. Vote was taken and passed. Senators Schaffer and Vander Mey discussed the possibility of this issue being undertaken by both the Policy and Welfare Committees. President Baron requested that after consideration the two committee chairs report to the Senate next month in which committee this issue will be undertaken.

e. Senator Schaffer questioned the procedure to follow through on the Provost’s response to the Senate regarding the proposed change to the Faculty Manual which concerns the Admissions Exception Committee. President Baron asked the Scholastic Policies Committee to study this response.

f. President Baron commented on his recent FOCUS trip throughout the state, and stated that he would like to meet with different groups on campus in an informal setting to promote better communication.

8. Adjournment. President Baron adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Lucy Rollin, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Brenda J. Vander May, Chair
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee

RE: Notes from the April Meeting of the Welfare Committee

The Welfare Committee met at 4:15 p.m. on Tuesday, April 28, 1992. Members present: John Gilreath, Gerald Lovedahl, John Mumford, Jim Rathwell, and Brenda Vander May.

The Committee identified its focal priorities for AY 1992-1993. These are:

A. Responding to SACS regarding faculty workloads.

SACS has recommended that there be a "clear written policy concerning the division of faculty members' time obligations between research and other academic activities."

The Welfare Committee will ask the Provost to assist the Committee in securing documents relative to current policies on faculty workload distributions. A subcommittee, comprised of John Mumford, Gerald Waddle, and Brenda Vander May, will study these documents, and will propose a written policy.

B. Responding to CU's Strategic Planning Committee Recommended Goals and Benchmarks. Full committee report to be made.

C. Salaries and Benefits.

Jim Rathwell will chair the subcommittee to study the current status of salaries and benefits. John Gilreath and Gerald Lovedahl will work with him. This subcommittee has several major issues before them, including full explanation for salary changes for some faculty during AY 1991-1992, the projected effects of recent salary freezes, and assessing current health plans.

D. Other

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, May 26, 1992 (3:30 p.m.). At that time, the Committee will study the Goals and Benchmarks, and work toward a response.
Policy Committee Report
May 19, 1992

The Policy Committee met April 21, 1992, at 3:30 p.m. in Room LL3, Cooper Library. Members present were: Hassan Behery, Jere Brittain, Janis Cheezem, Eleanor Hare, John Huffman, Mary Lynn Moon, Walt Owens, Gary Wells.

The Faculty survey now has over 62% response. We are verifying the data and are currently fine-tuning programs to process the data.

The following change to the Faculty Senate Procedural Bylaws, 3. Resolutions and Standing Committee Reports was approved by the committee for presentation to the Senate:

"Normally, a written copy of all resolutions and standing committee reports will be provided to the Secretary for distribution to the members of Faculty Senate with the agenda for the forthcoming meeting. Otherwise, a resolution may be placed on the floor only after written submission to the Secretary and to members of the Senate with the approval of 2/3 of the members present."

The addition of the category "Permanent Committees" and the creation of a Finance Committee as a permanent committee were approved at the General Faculty meeting on May 7. The Policy Committee is considering another change to The Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University that would move the Grievance Board from Section 5, Committees to Section 7, Permanent Committees. At the same time, the pool from which members of the Grievance Board are selected would be expanded to include former members of the Faculty Senate. Procedures for the nomination of Grievance Board members, Grievance Counselors and officers of the Faculty Senate are being developed. Other changes may also be considered.

An amendment to the Faculty Manual (page 51) to formalize the custom that the Faculty Senate President represent the Faculty Senate on the Athletic Council was approved for presentation to the Senate.

In order to better inform the Faculty of the contents of the Faculty Manual, the committee recommended that Inside Clemson be asked to periodically print a box containing "Faculty Manual Facts." Four such "Faculty Manual Facts" were approved by the committee. Comments favorable to this proposal were expressed at Executive/Advisory Committee. Inside Clemson has been contacted and will let us know whether or not they can print such a box for us.

We have suggested to Inside Clemson that it would be helpful to write an article ("Don't Copy That Floppy") to publicize the software copyright policy passed by the Senate. They have agreed to do this.

The next meeting of the Policy Committee will be Thursday, May 21, at 3:30 p.m. in Room LL3, Cooper Library.
PRESIDENT'S REPORT
MAY, 1992

1. Council of Academic Deans (April 13th). No significant action taken at the general meeting. The Provost asked the Academic Deans and the Director of the Libraries to stay after the general meeting for a private meeting. The Faculty Senate President was not invited to attend the private meeting.

2. President's Cabinet (April). No significant actions taken at the general meeting.

3. Council of Academic Deans (April 27th). The Faculty Senate President was advised that he was not needed at the meeting of the Deans.

4. Academic Council (May 4th). No significant action taken. Dr. Lennon advised the Council that the budget picture is bad to worse. Dr. Reel advised that the Proposed Attendance Policy will come to the Council at its June meeting.

5. Parking fees have been raised. As requested by Student Senators, the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs, and the Faculty Senate, President Lennon has appointed a committee to consider parking fees for users other than students, staff, and faculty. John Luedeman will chair this committee, and Richard Conover will represent the Faculty Senate on the committee.

6. The Executive/Advisory Committee has been advised that the position of Head of the Department of Entomology was filled without the process of a formal search. The reasons and details for this action have not been fully defined. The Executive/Advisory Committee asked the Senate President to request from the Provost an explanation regarding this matter.
The Policy Committee recommends the following change to the Faculty Senate Procedural Bylaws,
3. Resolutions and Standing Committee Reports
which currently reads:
“A written copy of all resolutions and standing committee reports should be submitted to the
Secretary at the time of presentation.”

The Committee recommends that the following text replace the current text:
“Normally, a written copy of all resolutions and standing committee reports will be provided to the
Secretary for distribution to the members of Faculty Senate with the agenda for the forthcoming
meeting. Otherwise, a resolution may be placed on the floor only after written submission to the
Secretary and with the approval of 2/3 of the members present.”

The Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University, Article II: The Faculty Senate. 6. Rules
of Order states:
“The Faculty Senate shall be empowered to develop those procedural bylaws which facilitate the
achievement of its purposes.”

Unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate
May 19, 1992
POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND
THE FACULTY MANUAL

May 19, 1992

The Policy Committee recommends the following change on Page 51 of the Faculty Manual:
PART VI. FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE
   F. Committee Reporting to the Vice President for Student Affairs
      2. Athletic Council

Amend Paragraph 3 to replace the underlined sentence:

The Athletic Council is composed of 23 voting members chosen or appointed as follows:
   a. ...
   ...
   f. One member of the Faculty Senate appointed by the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate.

with the following sentence:

   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.

Since it is customary for the President of the Faculty Senate to represent the Senate on the Athletic Council, the Policy Committee endorses making that custom explicit in the composition of the Athletic Council, as stated in the Faculty Manual.

Unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate
May 19, 1992
Alternative Attendance Policy

Proposed by Dick Conover, Walt Owens, and Eleanor Hare
May 19, 1992

The current attendance policy is found on page 64 of the Faculty Manual under PART VII, PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES, E. Teaching Practices. 1. Attendance Policy. We propose adding the underlined paragraph.

"The full attendance policy for undergraduates is set forth in the Student Handbook but key points are as follows. The faculty member is obligated to inform students in writing about attendance policy during the first full week of classes. In some departments attendance policy is established on a departmental basis. Students are expected to attend all sessions of lectures and laboratories punctually and regularly. Absences are matters to be resolved between faculty member and student, and it is the student's responsibility to make up work missed due to absence from class. The Student Health Service does not issue official "medical excuses." Students in the infirmary are provided an in/out slip, and a faculty member can telephone the Health Center to confirm an illness. (No diagnosis or other confidential information is given.)

"If a student feels that he/she is being penalized for unavoidable absence from class, he/she may appeal to the head of the department in which the class is taught. If the department head is unable to resolve the problem to the student's reasonable satisfaction, the department head will appoint one member to an ad hoc arbitration committee of departmental faculty created to resolve the problem, and the student and teacher will each appoint one member. In departments too small to accomodate a committee, some members may be drawn from other departments in the college. The committee's determination will be binding on both the faculty member and the student. An "unavoidable absence" shall be defined for this purpose as an absence due to: a) the death of a student's close relative, b) the student's participation in scheduled University sponsored extracurricular or co-curricula activities, whether related to receiving or retaining a University scholarship or otherwise, or c) the student's documented inability to attend class due to illness or injury. In the case of extracurricular and co-curricula activities, the student shall provide a form executed by the sponsor to the instructor, no later than two weeks prior to the event, listing the student's name identification number, the date of the event, and the nature of the event.

"A student who incurs excessive absences in a given course may be dropped from a course by the instructor in accordance with stated course policy. Students may withdraw from a course by obtaining a Schedule Change Form from the Registrar's Office and having it signed by the instructor. The signature indicates that the instructor has been notified of the student's intention to drop the course and is not to be construed as an authorization for doing so. Students who withdraw after the first four weeks of classes shall have grades recorded for those courses. Prior to the last five weeks of classes, this grade would normally be "W." Students are limited to no more than fourteen hours of "W" grades during their academic careers. Transfer students, however, may withdraw from no more than ten percent of their total academic work (up to fourteen hours of course work, whichever is fewer) remaining in their chosen undergraduate curriculum at the time of their transfer to Clemson University."

This policy is an alternative to that proposed by the Undergraduate Commission. We find it preferable because:

1. The policy proposed by the Undergraduate Commission seems likely to require yet another administrator. As the percent increase of administrators has been much greater than the percent increase of faculty recently, the creation of even one unnecessary administrative position should surely be avoided.

2. The policy proposed by the Undergraduate Commission encourages students to take a week of "personal absences." This is equivalent to saying that we do not place a high value on class attendance. Is this the message we wish to send to parents and students?

3. This proposed alternative places the responsibility for reasonable attendance policies with the faculty, thus supporting the principle of faculty governance. Since one assumes that there are only a few faculty with unreasonable policies, peer pressure should correct the problem without much extra work for anyone.
ALTERNATIVE ATTENDANCE POLICY

Friendly amendment offered by Senator Webb Smathers:

“If a student feels that he/she is being penalized for unavoidable absence from class, he/she may appeal to the head of the department in which the class is taught. If the department head is unable to resolve the problem to the student’s reasonable satisfaction, the dean of the college in which the course is taught will appoint one member to an ad hoc arbitration committee of departmental faculty created to resolve the problem, and the student and teacher will each appoint one faculty member. In departments too small to accommodate a committee, some members may be drawn from other departments in the college. The committee’s determination will be binding on both the faculty member and the student. An “unavoidable absence” shall be defined for this purpose as an absence due to: (a) the death of a student’s close relative, (b) the student’s participation in scheduled University sponsored extracurricular or co-curricula activities, whether related to receiving or retaining a University scholarship or otherwise, or (c) the student’s documented inability to attend class due to illness or injury. In the case of extracurricular and co-curricula activities, the student shall provide a form executed by the the sponsor to the instructor, no later than two weeks prior to the event, listing the student’s name, identification number, the date of the event, and the nature of the event.”

Passed by the Faculty Senate
May 19, 1992
1. **Call to Order.** President Baron called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The General Faculty Minutes dated May 7, 1992 were approved as corrected, and the May 19, 1992 Faculty Senate Minutes were approved as written.

3. **Committee Reports**

   a. **Senate Committees**

      **Scholastic Policies Committee.** No report.

      **Welfare Committee.** Senator Brenda Vander Mey referred to Notes from the Welfare Committee Meeting dated May 26, 1992 (Attachment A), and noted changes in the Rough Draft Letter to Provost Jennett regarding the SACS Recommendation for a Workload Distribution Policy (Attachment B).

      **Finance Committee.** Senator James Davis reported that this Committee has met and made assignments, but has nothing to report at this time.

      **Policy Committee.** Senator Eleanor Hare submitted the Policy Committee Report dated June 9, 1992 (Attachment C). Senator Hare stated that Professor Roger Rollin had met with this Committee and it was decided a change in the University policy on Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action regarding sexual orientation was not appropriate. Dr. Rollin will return to discuss the non-discrimination policy contained in the Faculty Manual. This Committee continues to finalize results of the Faculty Survey, and would appreciate any ideas regarding presentation of these results.

      **Research Committee.** No report.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**

      **Community Relations Strategic Planning ad hoc Committee - Senate Alternate Jerry Waldvogel** called attention to the existence of this Committee which has been charged to develop a strategic plan to define interactions between the community and the University.

      **Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits** - Senator Vander Mey reported that this Committee will meet with the Provost on May 11, 1992 to consider the use of monies which appear to be available. She offered thanks to those who submitted suggestions as priorities for this expenditure of monies. Senator Vander Mey noted that the Welfare Committee will also meet with the Provost on May 12, 1992 to offer their opinions, and asked that any ideas be forwarded to President Baron.
4. **Senate President’s Report.** President Baron referred to the updated President’s Report (Attachment D) and a memorandum to the Senate containing items and their disposition discussed at the Council of Dean’s Meeting of June 8, 1992 (Attachment E). President Baron informed the Senate of the creation of a Commission on Public Service within the University by President Lennon. President Baron’s major concern is the participation of faculty and rewards received: if a tenure and promotion recommendation is based solely on public service and some teaching, will this be acceptable for promotion? This question will be asked of the President and the Provost. Input and opinions from senators regarding this important faculty issue were requested by President Baron.

5. **Old Business** (None)

6. **New Business**

   a. Senator Bill Stringer introduced Professor Marty Davis, from the College of Architecture, who discussed the concept of the renovation of the Sheep Barn and provided an accompanying slide presentation. Senator Stringer then presented a Resolution to Renovate the Sheep Barn Into an Inter-Faith/Inter-Cultural Chapel (Attachment F) (FS92-6-1) which was seconded. Following discussion, Senator Wells made a motion to refer this issue to the Policy Committee, which was seconded. Vote was taken and motion to refer was passed.

   b. Senator Vander Mey proposed a Resolution on Parking Fees for University Vehicles (Attachment G) (FS92-6-2). Discussion followed. During discussion, President Baron stated that when he would like to address an issue now and in the future as President, he will - unless a senator requests that he “step down”; at which time he will turn the meeting over to Secretary Lucy Rollin. Vote on parking fee resolution was taken, and failed.

   c. Senator Vander Mey presented a Resolution to Uncouple the Charges for Parking and Shuttlebus Services. Following discussion, vote was taken and resolution passed (Attachment H) (FS92-6-3 P).

   d. Senator Hare introduced a Faculty Senate Procedural Bylaw Change regarding the Nomination of Senate Officers, Grievance Board Members and Grievance Counselors. After discussion, vote was taken and Bylaw Change passed unanimously (Attachment I).

   e. Senator Hare, as Chair of the Policy Committee, submitted a request to reinstate the publication of the Senate Special (Attachment J). After discussion, Senator Hassan Behery made a motion to table this issue, which passed.

   f. Senator Walt Owens made a motion to bring to the floor for consideration a Sense of the Senate Vote regarding the Attendance Policy. Vote to bring to floor was taken and passed. A second to the motion for consideration was seconded. Following discussion and acceptance of changes made to the Sense of the Senate statement as presented, vote to accept was taken, and passed unanimously (Attachment K).

   g. President Baron asked for volunteers to assist Professor Gloria Bautista, Project Coordinator for “Books for the World,” in sorting books to be sent to Third World countries.
7. Adjournment. President Baron adjourned the meeting at 5:27 p.m.

Lucy Rollin, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

NOTES FROM WELFARE COMMITTEE MEETING

Meeting of 26 May, 1992

Members present: John Gilreath, John Mumford, Jim Rathwell, Brenda Vander Mey

A.) Meeting with Policy Committee Regarding proposed Changes to Faculty Grievance Procedures.

---Committee believes this to be a reasonable conjoint endeavor. Senator Hare first indicated to Senator Vander Mey that the third Tuesday in June was preferable, then changed it to the fifth Tuesday in June. Not all members will be able to meet on either of these days. Concluded that on either day at least three members would be able to meet with the Policy Committee. Committee waits for Senator Hare's invitation.

B.) Work Toward a Response to The Strategic Planning Committee Goals and Benchmarks.

---Committee conducted its initial workshop/brainstorming session. Agreed that the most constructive orientation regarding this task is an attitude of optimism and a commitment to cooperation. All criticisms should be constructive in nature and intent.

---Taking an overall view of the goals and benchmarks, the members agreed that there is a pressing need for at least the following: reallocation of resources; as per SACS recommendation, a clear written policy regarding workload distributions; and changes in any policies which at the present time obviate the approximation of goals.

---The Committee intends to have a full report ready by the end of October, 1992. This report will systematically address the goals and what changes (e.g., in policy, structure, university resources) seem necessary in order to realize these goals. Overall, the Committee intends to submit a report emphasizing action rather than more paperwork on the goals per se.

C.) Salaries and Benefits

---Senator Rathwell's subcommittee is busy collecting the information necessary to analyze current salary systems, and projected impact of salary freezes. Will seek explanation for recent increases in some salaries. See also Point 3 below.

D.) Response to SACS Recommendation for a Policy on Workload Distribution

---Committee thought that Vander Mey's letter to Provost Jennett regarding information needed to make a response to this SACS recommendation was fine as written. Would like to get on with the information collection and analysis processes. (Has been revised since.)
E.) Other

1. Reviewed two resolutions, presumed to be originating from the Policy Committee.

   a. Resolution to have units that "own" University vehicles to purchase parking stickers for these vehicles.

      --Committee agrees with this sentiment. Believes, however, that Motor Pool vehicles should be exempted. Also sees as an alternative the possibility that units with permanent access to University vehicles be required to park these vehicles in each unit's own designated area (or, one large area).

   b. Resolution to uncouple the charges for parking and the shuttle service.

      --Committee basically supports this. Thinks that the resolution needs to be rewritten for greater clarity (e.g., expunge side statements and consider not including the statement indicating that "the current parking fee structure comprises an income transfer from faculty and staff to students"). One alternative to said resolution might be implementing a token system of payment for the students who do use the shuttle service.

   NOTE: These 2 resolutions are now before the Faculty Senate to be voted on. Although the Welfare Committee had its own views on wording and such, the resolutions come from a faculty member, pertain to faculty welfare, and deserve consideration by the full Faculty Senate.

2. Discussed a concern brought to the attention of one member by a faculty member. The faculty member wants to know why summer teaching salaries have not increased. This person was under the impression that a 1/4% (from 3% to 3 1/4% per semester hour) increase was to be forthcoming this session.

   --Chair has asked for a transcript of the portion of a recent faculty meeting wherein this issue was discussed. There is a vague recollection that said increase was to be forthcoming.

   NOTE: This has since been clarified. The statement made in Faculty Senate was to the effect that if an increase in summer salaries is forthcoming, it would not appear until next summer.

3. Discussed possible priorities for faculty raises if a limited fund becomes available.

   --Seemed most inclined toward those recently promoted, those who had high annual evaluations, and those still in need of salary adjustments. Questioned the wisdom of giving raises only to "threateners."
Attachment 2 (2 of 2)

Welfare Committee Meeting of May 28, 1992
Notes; Page 2

E.) Other

1. Reviewed two resolutions, presumed to be originating from the Policy Committee.

   a. Resolution to have units that "own" University vehicles to purchase parking stickers for these vehicles.

      —Committee agrees with this sentiment. Believes, however, that Motor Pool vehicles should be exempted. Also sees as an alternative the possibility that units with permanent access to University vehicles be required to park these vehicles in each unit's own designated area (or, one large area).

   b. Resolution to uncouple the charges for parking and the shuttle service.

      —Committee basically supports this. Thinks that the resolution needs to be rewritten for greater clarity (e.g., expunge side statements and consider not including the statement indicating that "the current parking fee structure comprises an income transfer from faculty and staff to students"). One alternative to said resolution might be implementing a token system of payment for the students who do use the shuttle service.

NOTE: These 2 resolutions are now before the Faculty Senate to be voted on. Although the Welfare Committee had its own views on wording and such, the resolutions come from a faculty member, pertain to faculty welfare, and deserve consideration by the full Faculty Senate.

2. Discussed a concern brought to the attention of one member by a faculty member. The faculty member wants to know why summer teaching salaries have not increased. This person was under the impression that a 1/4% (from 3% to 3 1/4% per semester hour) increase was to be forthcoming this session.

      —Chair has asked for a transcript of the portion of a recent faculty meeting wherein this issue was discussed. There is a vague recollection that said increase was to be forthcoming.

NOTE: This has since been clarified. The statement made in Faculty Senate was to the effect that if an increase in summer salaries is forthcoming, it would not appear until next summer.

3. Discussed possible priorities for faculty raises if a limited fund becomes available.

      —Seemed most inclined toward those recently promoted, those who had high annual evaluations, and those still in need of salary adjustments. Questioned the wisdom of giving raises only to "threateners."
MEMORANDUM

TO: J. Charles Jennett, Provost
   and Vice President for Academic Affairs

THROUGH: Bill Baron, President, Faculty Senate

FROM: Brenda J. Vander Mey, Chair,
       Faculty Senate Welfare Committee

RE: SACS Recommendation for a Workload Distribution Policy

SACS has recommended that there be a "clear written policy concerning the division of labor of faculty members' time obligations between research and other academic activities." The SACS report indicated that while "the University Research Policy Manual discusses research policies in reasonable detail... there is not a similar document with a clearly written university policy on either the distribution of the faculty member's time nor the manner in which research funds are used to support a faculty member's salary."

Workload distribution systems appear to be an issue of growing concern for faculty. As Clemson University advances itself as a research institution, many questions arise regarding how workloads are distributed, and the maintenance of quality education and public service. In this vein, the SACS recommendation seems both reasonable and necessary.

However, one certainly could ask why SACS wants this clear written policy. Currently, the Faculty Manual (p. 62) indicates a general policy that allows for tremendous variation within and between units based upon the emphasis and goals of that unit. If SACS intends that there be created a "one size fits all" workload policy, then the recommendation for a clear written policy can not be honored. The reason is simple: As we look ahead to attempting to realize the Goals and Benchmarks identified by the Strategic Planning Committee, it is clear that flexibility and fluidity in workload distributions are necessary. As the Welfare Committee worked through its first brainstorming session on the Goals and Benchmarks, it became obvious that rigidity (e.g., a monolithic policy) would impede if not obviate success. Moreover, the Committee also saw that analyzing current workload policies, and perhaps suggesting some revisions, may be necessary if we are genuinely dedicated to approximating the various Goals and Benchmarks. Furthermore, the question of equity in reward systems may also arise. The question before us is this: Are current workload and reward policies sufficient for the realization of the Goals and Benchmarks? If the workload policies are not sufficient then a different and more clear policy is necessary. If they are sufficient, then the SACS recommendation must be dismissed as merely that. But, if the answer is no to equitable reward systems, then suggestions for changing the reward system will be in order.
The Welfare Committee has been charged with responding to this SACS recommendation. And, of course, we perceive a need to review current practices vis-a-vis the Goals and Benchmarks. Thus, we respectfully request that you help us by securing copies of departmental and college workload and reward policies, criteria, and procedures. The Welfare Committee will then analyze these materials.

Objectives of Collecting and Analyzing Workload/Reward Distributions:

-- To identify the range and types of workload distribution and reward systems extant at Clemson University;
-- To identify the criteria used to establish various workload distributions and reward systems;
-- To identify consistencies and inconsistencies within and between unit(s) with regard to workload distributions and reward systems;
-- To discern the relative weight given research, teaching, and service within and between units;
-- To evaluate the "fit" between current workload and reward policies and the Goals and Benchmarks identified by the Strategic Planning Committee.

Goals:

-- As per the SACS recommendation, to propose "a clear written policy concerning the division of faculty members' time obligations between research and other academic obligations" -- if such a policy is deemed necessary;
-- To make recommendations regarding workload policies and reward systems vis-a-vis the Goals and Benchmarks identified by the Strategic Planning Committee.

We appreciate your help with this task. Thank you.

xc: Professors Michael Bridgwood (224 Riggs), John Gilreath (308 Kinard Lab), Gerald Lovedahl (G-01 Tillman), John Mumford (164 Lee Hall), James Rathwell (283 Barre Hall), Gerald Waddle (252 Sirrine), members of the Welfare Committee.
The Committee met May 21, at 3:30 p.m. in Room LL3, Cooper Library. Members present: Hassan Behery, Jere Brittain, Eleanor Hare, John Huffman, Mary Lynn Moon, Walt Owens, Webb Smathers (for Gary Wells).

Roger Rollin met with the Committee to request a change in University policy on Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action that would prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. He requested that "... [Clemson University] does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or handicap in any of its policies, procedures, or practices ..." be included in the statement printed inside the back cover of the Clemson University Announcements. Several members expressed reservations because of a possible conflict with South Carolina law. Professor Rollin will attend the next meeting of the committee with another proposal designed to take into account the objections raised to an affirmative action policy. Committee members will discuss such a policy with the constituents before the next meeting.

A method of coding and organizing comments for the Faculty Survey is in progress.

The draft of the University-wide survey policy was discussed. The committee was unanimously opposed to this policy, seeing it as detrimental to academic freedom and faculty participation in University governance. A resolution opposing this policy will be considered at the next committee meeting.

It was unanimously agreed that our own newsletter, the Senate Special, should be reinstated and sent to all faculty following each Faculty Senate meeting. It was further stated that the Senate Special should include "Faculty Manual Facts."

It was reported that the Clemson University Bookstore buys books marked "Complimentary copy -- not for sale" from both Clemson University faculty and from wholesale book dealers and others. It was noted that the Senate adopted a policy opposing the sale of complimentary books by faculty. There was discussion of whether or not this policy was incorporated into the Faculty Manual. If not, a resolution to incorporate it will be presented to the committee at the next meeting. A resolution that the bookstore be asked to adhere to our policy and not buy complimentary copies from any source will also be presented at that time.
The Committee recommended the following addition to the Faculty Senate Procedural Bylaws:

7. Nomination of Senate Officers, Grievance Board and Grievance Counselors.

"The Executive and Advisory Committees in a joint meeting shall serve as a nominating committee. Nominations from the floor may also be made at the Senate meeting immediately prior to the election meeting, and from the floor at the Senate election meeting.

"Each nominee (or a sponsor, if the nominee is unable to attend) shall give a brief statement at the election, and shall provide a one page handout to Senate members detailing their relevant Faculty Senate and professional experience. Whenever possible these handouts will be provided to the Secretary for distribution to the members of Faculty Senate with the agenda of the election meeting."

The next meeting of the Policy Committee will be June 11, at 3:30 p.m. in Room LL3, Cooper Library. There is discussion of a possible joint meeting on June 30 with the Welfare Committee to discuss amendments to the grievance procedure.
PRESIDENT'S REPORT

JUNE, 1992

1. At the request of the Executive/Advisory Committee and in light of the State Ethics Bill, I asked Mr. Francis Canavan, Associate Vice President for Public Affairs, whether it was appropriate for a faculty member to sell a book given to him or her by a publisher. Mr. Canavan responded by saying that he advises faculty not to turn books received from a publisher into cash.

2. The Academic Council accepted a third proposal with regard to a revised attendance policy. Consideration of an attendance policy is tabled until March, 1993. In the interim, the Provost will issue a statement to Deans, Department Heads, and Faculty reminding faculty of legal and appropriate responsibilities when dealing with both scholarship and non-scholarship students, and absences from class for University activities. The Provost will also appoint a working group to examine the issue and report to the Academic Council at the March, 1993 meeting.

3. A University Commencement Committee met and accepted proposed changes for the May commencement. It was agreed that we would divide the graduating class into two parties for two graduation exercises: one in the morning and one in the afternoon. It was agreed that the individual graduation ceremony, beginning with the processional, should take no more than two hours. The ceremony will be modified accordingly. These recommendations have been forwarded to the President.

4. On June 2nd, the Provost formed a University Public Service Commission to be chaired by DeWitt Stone. The objectives are not yet delineated, but appear to be to define what is public service and the University's role. At a meeting attended by all the Deans or their representatives on June 2nd, the President indicated his interest in Public Service and his vision that this represented the future of the Land Grant University. The Commission will have representatives from each college, each academic unit dealing in public service, the Faculty and Extension Senates and others. I have previously expressed concern as to the professional purpose of Public Service activities for faculty. I will continue to question.

5. I met with the Library faculty. It was, for me, informative. You will have to ask the Library faculty if they found the meeting to be purposeful.

6. The State's Budget Bill is now law. The University's funding will apparently allow for two means of providing faculty raises. The first, a two percent raise mandated by the State; the second, a $600,000 faculty salary supplement included in next year's University budget. The President and Provost have both asked for advice from the Senate on how the supplementary money might be distributed. From another source, I have been advised that the Deans have asked that ten (10%) percent of the supplementary fund be distributed at their discretion, and that the Provost may convene a committee to review the Oklahoma Salary Survey, and to establish a formula for adjusting salaries based on variances from the Survey's norms. This Friday, the Provost will meet with the Senate's Welfare Committee and me to discuss the distribution of salary monies. If you have any suggestions, please get them to me in writing by Thursday morning.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Faculty Senate President

DATE: June 9, 1992

SUBJECT: Items discussed at the Dean’s Council meeting of June 9, 1992 and their disposition

1. A proposal for summer school revenue disposition was accepted by the Council with an amendment from the Senate President. The amendment called for the Library and the Computer Center to receive fixed amounts of $250,000 and 125,000 respectively.

2. The establishment of a special undergraduate advising unit was rejected.

3. Dean Waller advised the Council that the University’s Assessment Committee is giving the graduating seniors an exit assessment form. I will obtain copies of the form and make it available to you.
MEMORANDUM

TO: J. Charles Jennett
Provost

FROM: Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
Vice Provost

Jerry A. Whitmire
Assistant Dean

RE: Summer Revenue Proposal.

We offer the following proposal for distribution of revenues for summer school to take effect for fiscal 1993-94:

1. Attributed costs.

   A. Annual allotment to deans with accompanying course and credit hour goals.

      1. Salaries and fringe benefits for teaching personnel.

      2. Other direct expenses (e.g., teaching supplies and travel).

   B. Library expense (5% of previous year's revenue).

   C. Computer expense (2.5% of previous year's revenue).

   D. Advertising (1.5% of previous year's revenue).

   E. Minority recruiting ($340,000). An option would be to take this off the top.

   F. Programming (1.5% of previous year's revenue) including concert, lecture, and play sponsorship.

The designation of these would be made by the Vice Provost with the concurrence of the Provost and the Vice President for Business and Finance. This would be included in the regular budget.
Memorandum
J. Charles Jennett
June 27, 1992
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2. Revenues in excess of needs listed above.
   
   A. Provost’s Office (50% of excess).
   
   B. Business and Finance (10% of excess).
   
   C. Colleges (40% of excess).

   1. Based on credit hour production in excess of goal. (1.A.)

The transfer, which would not be in the base but would be treated as one-time funds, would occur in August of each year and would be based not on the summer school year but on the fiscal year.

bms
Earlier in the spring semester you assigned Jim Barker, Bill Barlage, George Carter, Jerry Reel, and myself the task of examining "the entire issue of academic advising and the progress of our freshmen" as they concerned a student's ability to transfer between colleges with varying standards. Our deliberations were enriched with the presence of Bill Beckwith, Walt Castro, Ron Moran, and Sixto Torres.

On Monday of this week, the enclosed proposal for a non-degree granting advising office to be identified as "University Studies" was unanimously endorsed. The rationale, purpose, and budget are embedded in the report. Assuming endorsement by the Council of Deans, we recommend that this administrative action be referred to the Committee on Advising and Retention and to the Faculty Senate's Committee on Scholastic Policies so that these University efforts to serve students more fully may be coordinated.

I ask that you place this item on the agenda for the meeting scheduled for June 8. It would be helpful to have George Carter in attendance as both architect and executor of the proposed advising services for the displaced student. There is an urgency to have the concept approved prior to the beginning of freshman registration on June 15.

I believe you will find this recommendation responsive to the concerns raised by Bill Beckwith and to the charge to the committee.

cc: Members of the committee
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Robert H. Waller, Chairman
   Freshman Program Committee

FROM: J. V. Reel, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies
       George E. Carter, Jr., Director of Undergraduate Academic Services
       W. F. Beckwith, Director, Freshman Engineering and Engineering Graphics

RE: University Studies Proposal

Proposed is a new advising program to serve students who wish to pursue a curriculum into which they are not allowed to enter by transfer due to their low GPR's. Such situations arise because the University's continuing enrollment policy is, in many cases, more liberal than collegiate transfer and/or continuation policies. For example, in Freshman Engineering alone, there are approximately 75 students who wish either to move into a specific engineering discipline or to transfer into another major but are prevented from doing either due to low GPR's. It is estimated that as many as 300 students University wide are in similar dilemmas.

The new advising program, University Studies, would be directed by Dr. George Carter, Jr., Director of Undergraduate Academic Services, and would be housed in the new Undergraduate Studies area of Brackett Hall. University Studies would employ two full time Student Services Program Coordinators III to do student advising and to assist personnel in the Career Planning Center and in the Counseling Center with the large number of referrals anticipated from this program. University Studies would also employ one secretary, have a modest operating budget for advising materials and work in a cooperative arrangement with the College of Education to maintain an internship.

University Studies would be available to students who had completed a minimum of two long semesters at Clemson University. It is not designed to be a new admissions or transfer admissions program. Placement into the program would
beaccomplished by transfer of students by the major department according to criteria established by that department or college (e.g. insufficient GPR to attempt upper level courses). Students could also place themselves into University Studies if, after a minimum of two long semesters at Clemson University, they realized that they were in the wrong majors and lacked the GPR's to transfer to the majors of their choices.

While in University Studies, students will receive academic advising on an intensive basis. Advisors will develop a Retention Management System for each student through use of the Noel/Levitz College Student Inventory. Referrals will be made to the Career Planning Center and other appropriate organizations. Students in this program will be guided in making the academic and social transition to college life. Results of this type of intervention should be improved major selection, increased retention, and improved graduation rate. Precedents for these outcomes have been established by the Science and Technology Entrance Program, PROACT, and the Clemson Scholars Academic Assistance Program.

Exit from University Studies would be accomplished by the student's raising his/her GPR to the level required for transfer into the appropriate major. Students who failed to do this would eventually fall below the University's minimum continuing enrollment policy and would be academically suspended from the University. No student will graduate directly from the University Studies program.

We request funding so that this program can begin in Fall 1992. An estimated budget follows:

**Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Support Specialist (grade 23)</td>
<td>$16,883.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Student Services Program Coordinator III (grade 34) 2 x $25,996.00</td>
<td>$51,992.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$68,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits (24%)</td>
<td>$16,530.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$85,405.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$90,405.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College of Liberal Arts
OFFICE OF THE DEAN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Provost J. Charles Jennett
FROM: Robert A. Waller, Dean
DATE: May 29, 1992
RE: Information Item for June 8 Council of Deans Meeting

Assessment instruments are appearing in a variety of places. As part of our service on the ad hoc committee you appointed a few weeks ago, Bill Barlage and I became aware of a survey being used with graduating seniors.

The existence of this instrument, let alone its use, came as news to us. It seems appropriate that this assessment activity be more broadly known among academic decision makers. Thus, I suggest that you place the enclosed on the agenda as an information item for the next Council of Deans meeting on June 8.

ks
Enclosure
cc: Dean Bill Barlage
Assessment Director David Underwood
Dear Clemson Student:

Congratulations on completing your degree requirements at Clemson! I know you have worked hard to achieve this goal and you should be justifiably proud of your accomplishment. I hope the years you have spent at Clemson have been enjoyable and I am certain that you will find them to be an excellent foundation as you pursue your chosen career or continue your education for an advanced degree.

Your personal experiences in the pursuit of your degree can be beneficial to Clemson as we strive to improve the educational experiences of those who follow you. I would very much appreciate your taking a few minutes to complete the attached questionnaire. The questionnaire asks for your opinion about many of the programs and services offered by Clemson. Be assured that we will take the results of this survey seriously and use the results to identify those areas which are in need of improvement as well as those which are currently strong. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and will be used only for our own improvement. Please return the completed questionnaire when you file your Application for Diploma in the Student Records Office.

Thank you in advance for assisting us in our search for excellence. I wish you all the best as you embark upon your future.

Sincerely,

Max Lennon
RESOLUTION TO RENOVATE THE SHEEP BARN
INTO AN INTER-FAITH/INTER-CULTURAL CHAPEL

FS92-6-1

Whereas, the preservation of Clemson University’s agricultural traditions plays an
important role in defining the University of the future; and

Whereas, the Clemson University Sheep Barn is the last architectural manifestation of this
rich historic past, and

Whereas, the presence of students, faculty, and staff from many faiths and cultures is
essential to meet the global commitment of Clemson University,

Resolved, that the architectural integrity of the Sheep Barn be preserved as a reminder of
the University’s past, and the building be renovated into an inter-faith/inter-cultural chapel for the
University community.

Referred to Policy Committee
June 9, 1992
RESOLUTION ON PARKING FEES FOR UNIVERSITY VEHICLES

FS92-6-2

Whereas, parking has been designated an auxiliary service; and

Whereas, an auxiliary service is intended to generate enough revenue to pay costs; and

Whereas, at any given time, numerous University vehicles are parked on campus without a parking decal; and

Whereas fees paid by faculty and staff cover providing the spaces used by these University vehicles,

Resolved, the Faculty Senate recommends that the units responsible for University vehicles which are normally parked on campus be assess a parking fee for each vehicle equal to the fee paid by University employees for their first vehicle.
RESOLUTION TO UNCOUPLE THE CHARGES
FOR PARKING AND SHUTTLEBUS SERVICES

FS92-6-3 P

Whereas, parking has been designated an auxiliary service; and

Whereas, a shuttle service has been added as part of the parking fee; and

Whereas, the shuttle service routes are designated to be of most benefit to students; and

Whereas, the shuttle service is little used by faculty and staff, especially staff who work non-standard hours; and

Whereas, the shuttle does not run when classes are not in session; and

Whereas, the bulk of the parking fee goes to pay for the shuttle service; and

Whereas, the parking fee is regressive and burdens the lowest paid employees most; and

Whereas, the concept of an auxiliary service is that payment is made for the service received; and

Whereas, the current parking fee structure comprises an income transfer from faculty and staff to students;

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate recommends that charges for the two services (parking and the shuttle service) be decoupled.
Policy Committee Recommendation
to Amend
Faculty Senate Procedural Bylaws

June 9, 1992

The Policy Committee recommends the following addition to the Faculty Senate Procedural Bylaws.

7. Nomination of Senate Officers, Grievance Board and Grievance Counselors.

"The Executive and Advisory Committees in a joint meeting shall serve as a nominating committee, and these nominations shall be presented at the Senate meeting immediately prior to the election meeting. Nominations from the floor may also be made at the Senate meeting immediately prior to the election meeting, and at the Senate election meeting.

"Each nominee (or a sponsor, if the nominee is unable to attend) shall give a brief statement at the election, and shall provide a one page handout to Senate members detailing their relevant Faculty Senate and professional experience. Whenever possible, these handouts will be provided to the Secretary for distribution to the members of Faculty Senate with the agenda of the election meeting."

The Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University, Article II: The Faculty Senate, 6. Rules of Order states:

"The Faculty Senate shall be empowered to develop those procedural bylaws which facilitate the achievement of its purposes."
From the Policy Committee

June 9, 1992

The Senate Special should be reinstated and sent to all faculty following each Faculty Senate meeting.

Tabled
June 9, 1992
MOTION
SENSE OF THE SENATE
JUNE 9, 1992

It is the sense of the Senate that the Faculty Senate President shall support the efforts of the Provost of the University in making the Faculty aware that they must individually and through Departmental policies provide students with a just attendance policy.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
AUGUST 18, 1992

1. Call to Order. President Baron called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The Faculty Senate Minutes dated June 9, 1992 were approved as written.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate Committees

  Scholastic Policies Committee. No report.

  Welfare Committee. Senator Brenda Vander Mey referred to Welfare Committee Notes (Attachment A), and noted that this committee will meet with the Finance Committee on August 25, 1992.

  Finance Committee. Senator Jim Davis stated that a report will be presented at the September meeting.

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

  Research Committee. Senator Bill Bridges reported that the National Science Foundation has asked that Clemson University come up with a policy for disclosing potential conflicts of interest upon submission of proposals for funding. A draft policy must be prepared by Clemson University, and Senator Bridges asked that comments be sent to him.

b. University Commissions and Committees

  Strategic Planning Committee of University Interactions ad hoc Committee - Senate Alternate Jerry Waldvogel stated that subcommittees have been formed to discuss issues such as financial and academic matters. The strategic plan will be prepared by the end of this semester and will be sent to the President and Vice Presidents.

  ad hoc Graduation Ceremony Review Committee - Senate President Baron reported that this committee will report back to the Graduation Ceremony Committee, and through them to the Undergraduate Commission and the Academic Council. This committee has met for the last time and has prepared a final report which contained two items of importance: proposal that the May Graduation will be two exercises; and that the exercise will not be longer than approximately two hours and ten minutes.

  Facilities Planning Committee - Senator Alan Schaffer announced that the proposal to build a Visitor’s Center on Highway 93 passed on the first reading, and asked that any comments be given to him.

  Joint City /University Committee - Senator Schaffer stated that he had heard of a travel committee that was set up to establish a travel policy for the University which will involve using approved travel agents and offices. It is unclear exactly what is being proposed and...
how it will affect faculty, but Senator Schaffer will keep the Senate informed.

Faculty Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee - Senator Vander Mey submitted the final report of this committee (Attachment C).

4. President’s Report. President Baron discussed important items contained in the updated President’s Report (Attachment D).

5. New Business

a. President Baron encouraged senators to attend the Board of Trustees Breakfast hosted by the Faculty Senate on Saturday, September 12, 1992 at 8:30 a.m.

b. Secretary Lucy Rollin submitted a resolution, Resolution on Procedures for Hiring Academic Administrators, from the Executive/Advisory Committee. After a provision of rationale for this resolution, vote was taken and resolution passed (Attachment E) (FS92-8-1 P).

c. Senator Eleanor Hare presented a Resolution to Preserve the Architectural Integrity of the Sheep Barn from the Policy Committee. After discussion, vote was taken and resolution passed (Attachment F) (FS92-8-2 P).

d. Senator Eleanor Hare submitted a Resolution of Affirmation to Support the AAUP Statement on Discrimination (Attachment G) from the Policy Committee. Senator Schaffer offered a friendly amendment (Attachment H), which was seconded. Friendly amendment was accepted by Senator Hare, and discussion followed. Vote was taken on amended resolution, and resolution passed (FS92-8-3 P).

e. Senator Eleanor Hare presented the University-Wide Survey Policy (Attachment I) for discussion.

f. As a member of the University-Wide Parking Task Force charged to work with the issue of parking on campus, Senator Jack Flanigan encouraged each faculty member to provide input as to their individual views on parking. Any suggestions may be submitted through Senator Flanigan or directly to Vice President Almeda Jacks for review.

6. Adjournment. The Faculty Senate Meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Lucy Rollin, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Senators absent: L. Blanton, J. Brittain, F. Eubanks, H. Behery, M. Bridgwood, H. Goodall, S. Oldaker, K. Dieter, R. Williams (J. Waldvogel attended)
NOTES FROM WELFARE COMMITTEE MEETINGS: Summer, 1992

I. Friday, June 12, 1992.

A. The Welfare Committee met with Provost Jennett and Bill Baron.

1. Discussed faculty salary increases for AY 1992-1993. Fairly general discussion. Priorities previously identified by the Committee (see Committee Notes placed in packet for May meeting of the Faculty Senate) were in line with notes, letters, and comments sent to the Committee and to Bill Baron. Vander Mey represents the Welfare Committee and Faculty Senate on the Faculty Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee (a.k.a., the Adjustments Committee; the Catch 'Em Up Committee). Vander Mey indicated that the Adjustments Committee had met the previous afternoon. Faculty concerns and priorities were mentioned. The Adjustments Committee meets again on Thursday, June 18, 1992 at 3:00 p.m.

2. Discussed request for pertinent information in order to respond to SACS request for a "clear written" policy on faculty division of labor and to respond to the Goals and Benchmarks identified by the Strategic Planning Committee. Committee noted that changes in workloads will probably be in order. Committee discussed their approach to responding to the goals and benchmarks via a systems approach to the University and its goals. Provost Jennett indicated his willingness to help in any way that he could.

II. Thursday, June 16, 1992.

A. The Welfare Committee met with Jim Davis, Chair, Faculty Senate Finance Committee.

1. Discussed several issues and concerns regarding faculty salaries, salaries of non-academic employees, and the apparent expansion of some units of the University. It was decided that a systematic analysis of university growth and salary changes was needed. Davis agreed to work with the Welfare Committee to a) collect necessary information and b) to analyze this information. Davis agreed to send a letter to David Larsen requesting a copy of the CU Salary Roll. Vander Mey agreed to locate an organizational chart so that the Committees could chart growth patterns. The chart(s) are dated 1-31-88. It was agreed that the Finance and Welfare Committees would meet at 1:00 p.m. Tuesday, July 14, 1992, to proceed with their analyses.

2. Senator Rathwell continues to collect salary and budget information.

The Committee inspected a report on salaries for faculty making $50,000 and higher, 1987-1991. It would be premature to draw conclusions (see paragraph above).
3. A faculty member requested that the Welfare Committee demand that the $400,000 allocated to Classified Employees be given to faculty instead. The Committee will not honor this request.

4. The Committee reviewed a raw draft of the letter to be sent to Deans and Department Heads as per the SACS recommendation and making a response to the Goals and Benchmarks.

5. The Welfare Committee truly appreciates Senator Davis' willingness to help slide them up the "learning curve" on matters related to budgets and salaries. The Committee looks forward to working with him and the rest of the Finance Committee on key questions regarding university growth patterns and patterns of salary allotments.


A. Welfare Committee Meeting with the Policy Committee

1. Reviewed and discussed each proposed change in grievance procedures (as per a proposal from John Harris, Chair of the Welfare Committee AY 1991-1992). By consensus, all proposed changes except for the last one listed were rejected. The accepted change is as follows:

p. 38 (Faculty Manual), last sentence in paragraph . . . The decision of the Provost shall be transmitted

change to — The decision and findings of the Provost shall be transmitted.

2. By consensus, the members present agreed to make one additional change:

p. 38 of the Faculty Manual, first sentence under "Protection of the Faculty Members and Others Involved in Grievance Procedures."

All persons involved in grievance procedures shall be free....

change to — All persons involved in grievance procedures, including the Grievance Board, shall be free....

3. By consensus, it was resolved that future proposals to change grievance procedures would be handled by and through the Policy Committee.
3. A faculty member requested that the Welfare Committee demand that the $400,000 allocated to Classified Employees be given to faculty instead. The Committee will not honor this request.

4. The Committee reviewed a raw draft of the letter to be sent to Deans and Department Heads as per the SACS recommendation and making a response to the Goals and Benchmarks.

5. The Welfare Committee truly appreciates Senator Davis' willingness to help slide them up the "learning curve" on matters related to budgets and salaries. The Committee looks forward to working with him and the rest of the Finance Committee on key questions regarding university growth patterns and patterns of salary allotments.


A. Welfare Committee Meeting with the Policy Committee

1. Reviewed and discussed each proposed change in grievance procedures (as per a proposal from John Harris, Chair of the Welfare Committee AY 1991-1992). By consensus, all proposed changes except for the last one listed were rejected. The accepted change is as follows:

   p. 38 (Faculty Manual), last sentence in paragraph . . . The decision of the Provost shall be transmitted

   change to — The decision and findings of the Provost shall be transmitted.

2. By consensus, the members present agreed to make one additional change:

   p. 38 of the Faculty Manual, first sentence under "Protection of the Faculty Members and Others Involved in Grievance Procedures."

   All persons involved in grievance procedures shall be free....

   change to — All persons involved in grievance procedures, including the Grievance Board, shall be free....

3. By consensus, it was resolved that future proposals to change grievance procedures would be handled by and through the Policy Committee.

A. Joint Meeting of the Welfare and Finance Committees.

1. Studied Jim Rathwell's raw data summary of salary patterns for CU faculty and staff making over $50,000, 1987-1991. Asked that categorical analyses be done. Senator Davis agreed to work on a similar analysis for employees making $30,000-50,000.


A. The Welfare and Finance Committees held a joint meeting.

1. The members reviewed the preliminary analyses of salary information as per calculations and summaries by Jim Davis and Jim Rathwell. It was decided that a few more breakdowns of data categories were necessary. It also was decided that the analyses completed thus far are too preliminary to be distributed.


3. Department Heads have been returning workload distribution summaries to Vander Mey, as per her request on behalf of the Welfare Committee. (Sent from Provost Jennett's office.)

4. There was general discussion about the outcome of the work done by the Salary Adjustments Committee.

5. There was general discussion about administrative growth within academic units, where the money came from for raises during AY 1991-1992, and FTEs per academic unit. These discussions were phrased as questions that probably will be raised vis-a-vis growth and salary pattern findings.

6. The Committees agreed that, given the small turn out, neither Committee should conduct official business until the school year resumes.
The next meeting of the Welfare Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, August 25, 1992, in LL3. Time: 3:30 p.m. The Welfare Committee will meet with the Finance Committee. Members will review salary pattern analyses. Then, the Welfare Committee will have a separate meeting. All members should bring with them all requests from faculty that they have received over the summer. In addition, the Committee will discuss the status of the responses to the request for workload distribution information.
The next meeting of the Welfare Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, August 25, 1992, in LL3. Time: 3:30 p.m. The Welfare Committee will meet with the Finance Committee. Members will review salary pattern analyses. Then, the Welfare Committee will have a separate meeting. All members should bring with them all requests from faculty that they have received over the summer. In addition, the Committee will discuss the status of the responses to the request for workload distribution information.
Policy Committee Report
August 18, 1992

The Policy Committee met June 11 and August 4.

Todd May (Phil. & Rel.) presented several proposals for including non-discrimination clauses in the Faculty Manual. The committee did not recommend changing the Faculty Manual, but supports a resolution endorsing the AAUP position with respect to discrimination, p. 87 of Policy Documents & Reports, 1990 Edition.

Farrell Brown presented concerns regarding the under-representation of female and minority students on committees of the Commission on Graduate Studies (p. 44, Faculty Manual). The committee will study this issue.

A resolution (excerpted from Senator Stringer’s original resolution) requesting preservation of the Sheep Barn as a reminder of the University’s past was approved for presentation to the Senate.

President Baron has been requested to appoint an ad hoc committee to further examine the possibilities for use of the sheep barn, including cost, financing possibilities, heat/air-conditioning (if needed), etc.

We have been told that the “University Commencement Committee” that recommended two graduations next May is not the Graduation Ceremony Committee, which the Faculty Manual states “formulates and recommends policy related to academic ceremonies ....” The committee requested President Baron to insure that the Faculty Manual is followed.

The committee considered the following two questions suggested by the Provost:

1. Should Department heads and deans be allowed to run for Faculty Senate?
2. Should we have a policy that might allow for directed funding for endowed chairs for department heads and deans?

It was decided that these, and other questions, should be discussed with the Provost.

Francis Canavan, Associate Vice-President for Public Affairs, met with the committee August 4 to discuss the problem of complimentary copies of textbooks, as it relates to the local bookstores. At the request of the Policy Committee, President Baron had written to Mr. Canavan, suggesting a letter to the three local bookstores in support of the Faculty Senate position on sale of complimentary copies of textbooks. After discussion with the committee, Mr. Canavan suggested that the procedure should be a resolution from the Senate, rather than a letter from him. A resolution presented to the committee will be revised for submission to the Senate.

The data processing on the social audit is near completion. A summary of the data will soon be ready for distribution to the Faculty Senate and to the Provost and President. Copies will go to the Provost and President before distribution to the Faculty Senate membership.

A resolution strongly objecting to the proposed University-wide survey policy was approved.

The next meeting of the Policy Committee is scheduled for 3 p.m. Monday, August 24. Please note that the time is one-half hour earlier than our usual meeting time.
MEMORANDUM

TO: J. Charles Jennett, Provost

FROM: Faculty Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee

Gordon Halfacre, Chairman
Charles Barron
Gene Bishop
Sam Buckner
John Newton
Herman Senter
Jimmy Sheriff
Brenda Vander Mey

The Faculty Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee wishes to thank the administration of Clemson University for making special funds available for salary adjustments in order for us to be more competitive with other institutions.

The enclosed report distributes $450,000 of the $610,000 annual E&G allocation and is submitted for your consideration in response to your charge to this committee. The report was prepared with basically the same peer group (see attached) and assumptions as the last three faculty salary studies except for the total amount to be distributed.

It was our understanding that we should direct our efforts to those faculty salaries most out of line with those of peer institutions. Department Heads, Deans, Directors, visiting faculty, and instructors/lecturers were not included nor was there any discrimination as to such variables as sex, race or minority status. The allocation model for faculty salary corrections adjusts for past shortfalls and does not give consideration to factors of individual or department merit.

We make a few specific recommendations for distribution:

1. That college deans pass the adjustment money directly to the department heads for distribution within department ranks per the enclosed calculations.

2. That department heads distribute the adjustment money from the deans according to the total dollars in each of the ranks: professor, associate and assistant, and that money from one rank not be moved into another rank.

July 17, 1992
3. That college deans utilize other funds coming through their college for individual inequities in faculty salaries such as:

   a. Those returning from Sabbatical or leave and who were not counted because of the Oklahoma State University reporting guidelines.

   b. Those who were acting department heads or department heads.

   c. Other cases of low faculty salaries which were not otherwise covered in our calculations.

The Committee gives special recognition to John Newton for his extreme helpfulness and to Herman Senter for his statistical work on the data.
SELECTED INSTITUTIONS IN SALARY STUDY
FOR CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Auburn University (AL)
Florida State University
Georgia Institute of Technology
University of Georgia
Purdue University (IN)
University of Kentucky
Louisiana State University
University of Maryland at College Park
Michigan State University
Mississippi State University
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
North Carolina State University at Raleigh
Cornell University (NY)
Clemson University (SC)
University of South Carolina
University of Tennessee at Knoxville
Texas A & M University
University of Virginia
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
West Virginia University

TOTAL INSTITUTIONS = 20

Ohio State University did not respond to the Oklahoma State University 1991 Faculty Salary Survey.
1992 FACULTY SALARY ADJUSTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
BY RANK AND COLLEGE,
EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1992
(Based on Fall 1991 Salary Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture *</td>
<td>$38,409</td>
<td>$6,423</td>
<td>$2,277</td>
<td>$47,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>12,602</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>18,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td>28,141</td>
<td>19,428</td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>55,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6,245</td>
<td>6,272</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>14,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>67,668</td>
<td>16,659</td>
<td>12,533</td>
<td>96,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry *</td>
<td>3,983</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>3,612</td>
<td>8,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>35,179</td>
<td>22,386</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>91,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>72,884</td>
<td>23,242</td>
<td>18,403</td>
<td>114,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total E&amp;G Funds</td>
<td>$267,297</td>
<td>$99,005</td>
<td>$83,701</td>
<td>$450,003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Agriculture |

Forestry  |

Total Matching PSA Funds |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$80,794</td>
<td>$14,102</td>
<td>$8,587</td>
<td>$103,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>8,004</td>
<td>11,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Matching PSA Funds</td>
<td>$81,954</td>
<td>$16,263</td>
<td>$16,591</td>
<td>$114,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE=ENG</td>
<td>COLLEGE=COMM</td>
<td>COLLEGE=PHIL</td>
<td>COLLEGE=ENG</td>
<td>COLLEGE=COMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total dollars in each rank based upon full-time equivalent FTE funding.*

**Summary of 1992 Salary Adjustments by College**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>OBS DEPT</th>
<th>CU DEPT</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>TOTAL DOLLARS</th>
<th>PROF DOLLARS</th>
<th>ASSOC DOLLARS</th>
<th>ASSIST DOLLARS</th>
<th>PROF PERSON</th>
<th>ASSOC PERSON</th>
<th>ASSIST PERSON</th>
<th>TOTAL PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0905</td>
<td>BIOENG</td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>181.49</td>
<td>135.84</td>
<td>45.28</td>
<td>369.4</td>
<td>61.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0907</td>
<td>CER.ENG</td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>3790.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3790.7</td>
<td>421.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0909</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>1001.81</td>
<td>888.60</td>
<td>112.21</td>
<td>1286.7</td>
<td>525.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0911</td>
<td>CIVIL</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>888.60</td>
<td>3622.40</td>
<td>3622.40</td>
<td>13567.8</td>
<td>872.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0915</td>
<td>ELEC</td>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>6034.23</td>
<td>5705.28</td>
<td>633.92</td>
<td>39132.6</td>
<td>1262.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0927</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>GRAPH</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0919</td>
<td>ENV.HLT</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>6848.3</td>
<td>6848.3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6848.3</td>
<td>978.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0902</td>
<td>FRES.</td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>386.81</td>
<td>386.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>386.6</td>
<td>386.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0920</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>7736.8</td>
<td>3622.40</td>
<td>3622.40</td>
<td>13967.8</td>
<td>1105.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0921</td>
<td>MECH</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2616.49</td>
<td>2616.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2616.49</td>
<td>452.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>FORESTRY</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>3083.21</td>
<td>2599.55</td>
<td>483.66</td>
<td>5582.6</td>
<td>650.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>PRTH</td>
<td>FORS</td>
<td>5073.82</td>
<td>250.22</td>
<td>2823.59</td>
<td>5073.8</td>
<td>405.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>22153.2</td>
<td>14757.97</td>
<td>7395.28</td>
<td>22153.2</td>
<td>714.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>FOR LANG</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>11469.0</td>
<td>546.14</td>
<td>10912.86</td>
<td>11469.0</td>
<td>546.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>HISTORY</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>14843.3</td>
<td>1501.35</td>
<td>13342.0</td>
<td>14843.3</td>
<td>824.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>PER ARTS</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>6193.5</td>
<td>471.96</td>
<td>5721.54</td>
<td>6193.5</td>
<td>476.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>9398.8</td>
<td>1251.12</td>
<td>8147.68</td>
<td>9398.8</td>
<td>1044.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>POLSCI (REL)</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>5936.0</td>
<td>742.01</td>
<td>5194.0</td>
<td>5936.0</td>
<td>742.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>PSYCH</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>15495.9</td>
<td>801.11</td>
<td>14694.8</td>
<td>15495.9</td>
<td>860.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>SOCIO</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>6309.5</td>
<td>208.98</td>
<td>6100.57</td>
<td>6309.5</td>
<td>573.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>22153.2</td>
<td>14757.97</td>
<td>7395.28</td>
<td>22153.2</td>
<td>714.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>PSYCH</td>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>9398.8</td>
<td>1251.12</td>
<td>8147.68</td>
<td>9398.8</td>
<td>1044.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>SOCIO</td>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>6309.5</td>
<td>208.98</td>
<td>6100.57</td>
<td>6309.5</td>
<td>573.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total dollars in each rank based upon full-time equivalent E&G funding.*
1. We have invited the President of the University, Dr. Max Lennon, to meet with the Senate at our meeting of September 8; the Provost, Dr. Charles Jennett, on October 13; the Vice President for Institutional Advancement, Dr. Gary Ransdell, on December 8; and the Vice President for Research, Dr. Jay Gogue on January 12. We have also invited the Chair of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Bill Amick, to meet with us at our February or March meeting. I expect to devote 45 minutes of each meeting to a dialogue with our guests. We will make every effort to restrain ourselves and others during the remainder of our agenda. To make effective use of our time, I will ask each of our guests to make opening remarks limited to 15 minutes. We will then proceed with written questions. If you wish to submit a written question, send your question in duplicate to Senator Rollin. She and a second senator of her choosing will select those to be sent to our guest. Senator Rollin will not serve as an editor or censor, rather, she will sort to avoid duplication and try to choose those questions that can be answered within our time frame and those that will be of interest to the greatest number of the Senate. Senator Rollin will make copies of the questions available to us prior to the Senate meeting. Questions must be in Senator Rollin’s office (315 Strode Tower) one week after the Senate meeting prior to our guest’s appearance. Following written questions, we will ask our guest to take questions from the floor.

2. The Clemson University Board of Trustees organized a three-day retreat with members of the University administration. The President of the Faculty Senate could not be there - he wasn’t invited. To date, the Senate’s President has not been invited to the Provost’s private meeting with the College Deans and the Director of the Library.

3. We have invited the Board of Trustees to join us for breakfast on Saturday, September 12th, in the Shanklin Room of the Clemson House. Breakfast will be at 8:30 a.m. Upon receipt, please respond to your invitation as soon as possible. The cost of this event will be covered by the Vending Machine Committee, so please drink some extra cola between now and September 12th.

4. Dean Waller is so pleased to have the “Books for the World” out of his basement that he has invited the entire Senate to dinner. He just doesn’t yet know that he extended us the invitation. Our thanks to Professor Gloria Bautista for organizing the drive. Some 75 cartons of books were sent off. We also owe Professor Hassan Behery a great debt of thanks. We found to our dismay that it was to cost approximately $7,000 to ship the books. Senator Behery reached the cultural attache at the Egyptian Embassy who offered to take the books from us and see that they were delivered to people who could use them. Thank you, Hassan.

5. An explanation from the President of the Senate regarding the resolution relating to the Department of Entomology: In December, 1991, the faculty in the Department of Entomology petitioned the administration of the College of Agriculture to appoint the Acting Department Head as the permanent Head without following the search process defined in the Faculty Manual. The Petition was signed by every faculty member in the department. The Petition was accepted by the College and University administration. The matter was brought to the attention of the Executive/Advisory Committee. The Committee asked the Provost for details. We also invited two of the faculty members who initiated the Petition to meet with the Executive/Advisory Committee. The attached resolution is a result of our deliberations.
6. Mr. Alan Godfrey, of the Budgets and Financial Planning Office, will conduct the second of our business seminars for faculty Senators on Thursday, September 17th at 3:30 p.m. in a location to be announced. The third seminar entitled, "Institutional Private Revenues and Their Use," will be presented by Dr. Gary Ransdell, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, on Thursday, November 5th at 3:30 p.m.

7. Campaign to Fund the Centennial Professorship Update: Total now equals $94,515.

8. In a memo to the Provost, Dean Waller expressed concern as to the availability of faculty during the Fall semester break to hear appeals from students dismissed as a result of the mid-semester check. At the August 3rd meeting of the Academic Council, I offered the services of the Faculty Senate in finding faculty to meet this need. Dr. Reel said it was not necessary. Dr. Lennon, then, assured me that the mid-year probationary check would be initiated this December. He advised me to check with the Provost who, subsequently, indicated to me the mid-check would proceed. At the Provost's Council meeting of August 10th, a motion was made to suspend the mid-year check. The motion was passed unanimously, less one. The motion is now on the agenda of the Academic Council's September 7th meeting.

9. Parking - The Provost’s response to the Senate’s resolution, To Uncouple the Charges of Parking and the Shuttle Bus System, is attached. A memorandum from Vice President Almeda Jacks relating to parking is attached. Ms. Jacks now has the responsibility for traffic and parking issues on the Clemson campus.

10. Attached please find a legislative report on insurance costs. The statement indicates that the legislature has covered this year's increased insurance. Had they not, it certainly appears as if our increased health insurance costs would have exceeded our expected salary increase. What’s going to happen next year? Is anyone concerned? I have asked the College of Nursing to consider a forum on this issue. I will also ask the Director of the Thurmond Institute if they might have an interest in examining this issue.

11. There is high expectation that a four to six percent budget cut will be announced within this next week. If this does not occur at this time, there is concern that if there is no significant economic improvement, a budget cut will occur at mid year.
RESOLUTION ON PROCEDURES FOR HIRING ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

FS92-8-1 P

Whereas, twice in the recent past academic administrators have been appointed without following the procedures established in the Faculty Manual, and

Whereas, in neither case did the University administration consider it important to justify its disregard for the clearly stated Faculty Manual provision calling for the establishment of search and screening committees and the other procedures for hiring academic administrators, and

Whereas, such actions undermine the integrity of all hiring procedures established by joint action of the University administration and the Faculty Senate, and approved by the Board of Trustees,

Resolved, that Page 24, Paragraph 1 of the Faculty Manual be revised as follows:

...Such cases may be justified when a qualified individual may be promoted from within the institution, when time is of the essence, when University operations would suffer as a result of an interim appointment, or when a person is available who is uniquely qualified for a position. By their very nature, such cases are rare. Such an appointment must be made on an acting basis only, with the understanding that a proper search, including adherence to all affirmative action guidelines, will be conducted as soon as possible. The acceptability of such cases...

(The clause to be deleted, the sentence to be added)

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on August 18, 1992.
RESOLUTION TO PRESERVE THE ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY OF THE SHEEP BARN

FS92-8-2 P

Whereas, the preservation of Clemson University's agricultural traditions plays an important role in defining the University of the future; and

Whereas, the Clemson University Sheep Barn is the last architectural manifestation of this historic past,

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

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on August 18, 1992.
Policy Committee Resolutions
August 18, 1992

Resolution 1:

Resolved, the administration be requested to affirm its support of the AAUP statement on discrimination.
RESOLUTION OF AFFIRMATION TO SUPPORT THE AAUP STATEMENT ON DISCRIMINATION

FS92-8-3 P

Resolved, the Faculty Senate affirms its support of the AAUP statement that "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" is improper practice in an academic community.

Resolved, the Faculty Senate requests the administration to affirm its support of the AAUP statement on discrimination.

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on August 18, 1992.
UNIVERSITY-WIDE SURVEY POLICY

The policy below is intended to insure that the surveys of the university community provide relevant data for planning processes and that the cost, both monetary and human, is maintained at an acceptable level. As the number and scope of surveys increase, the likelihood exists for university-wide duplication of efforts and a reduction in response rates resulting from individuals being asked to complete a large number of surveys.

The University Assessment Committee recommends the policy below for all surveys involving program evaluation with respondents beyond the immediate unit from which the survey originated. That is, an academic department or division would be free to circulate a survey among its own members at any time. However, if a department, college or division were to seek responses from faculty, staff, students or alumni from other departments, colleges or divisions, then the policy below must be followed.

The policy will be used solely for program evaluation. Any evaluation involving research must be sent to Institutional Review Board (IRB), D-140 Poole Agricultural Center (656-5034), for review and approval.

1. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) will, upon request, assist any academic or administrative unit on campus with the development of questionnaires. Assistance will be limited to recommendations regarding format, content, scoring/analysis design, and identification of target audiences.

2. At least twenty (20) days prior to circulation, submit a draft of the survey to the Office of Institutional Research to:
   a. Prevent duplication of existing data
   b. Assist with recommendations regarding content and format
   c. Help determine if survey needs approval from Institutional Review Board office

3. Submit the results of each survey along with a final copy of the instrument to the Office of Institutional Research as soon as the results are compiled to be maintained for future reference.

4. The Director of Assessment will inform the University Assessment Committee of these surveys on a regular basis.

5. Beginning in 1993, the University will survey faculty and staff every three years to gather their opinions on different issues. Units who need information from the university-wide perspective are encouraged to use this mechanism. The university-wide survey will be the responsibility of the Office of Institutional Research with the assistance and cooperation of the Office of Assessment and the University Assessment Committee.
1. **Call to Order.** President Baron called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting dated August 18, 1992 were approved as written.

3. **Special Order of the Day.** A. Max Lennon, President of Clemson University, shared his current perceptions of important items. Nine colleges are now involved in developing a planning and assessment model, which involves planning strategically in an academic setting. Continuous improvement will be associated with that activity, and ultimately, everyone will be involved in one way or another. Certain people will be identified to assist in developing strategies to achieve our goals. Dr. Lennon believes that this process is fundamental because in his judgement, most successful land grant institutions in the next century will look different. It is possible Clemson may re-organize in order to achieve these goals. The problem at Clemson is not the people, but the organization that is in their way. Continuous improvement will force us to look at teaming and how to work across the institution in order to accomplish goals and soften constraints. The experience is that this process works. We are asking Clemson University to be aware that we have a very aggressive strategic planning process in motion, and we now have our priorities. Drivers include the budget and the permanent restructuring in the world economy. We have to develop the environment where faculty and students will want to be.

President Lennon introduced David R. Larson, Vice President for Business & Finance, and each responded to questions from the Faculty Senate which were previously submitted. Questions and answers are on file in the Faculty Senate Office, and are available upon request.

4. **Committee Reports**

   a. **Committee Reports**

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Alan Schaffer reported that this Committee had met and considered a proposal from the Commission on Undergraduate Studies regarding the proposal of a plus/minus grading system. The Committee voted to support this grading system with the proviso to include an A+ grade.

   Senator Schaffer then introduced a Resolution on Admissions Policy (Attachment A). Following the unanimous passage of a two-thirds vote to bring resolution to the floor of the Senate, discussion followed. Senator John Huffman moved to table resolution which was seconded. Vote to table was taken, and failed. Vote to accept resolution was taken and passed (FS92-9-1 P).

   **Welfare Committee.** Senator Brenda Vander Mey referred to Welfare Committee Notes dated August, 1992 (Attachment B).

   **Finance Committee.** Senator James Davis submitted the Finance Committee Report (Attachment C), and noted that this Report was for informational purposes only.
Policy Committee. Senator Eleanor Hare referred to Policy Committee Report dated September 8, 1992 (Attachment D), and urged senators to share Findings of the Faculty Survey with colleagues.

Research Committee. Senator Bill Bridges brought forward, as an information item, the memorandum regarding the restructuring of URGC and the Provost Awards (Attachment E), and asked that any comments be directed to him.

b. University Commissions and Committees

Facilities Planning Committee - Senate Alternate Joanne Deeken reported that this Committee had a first reading and waived a second reading on the disposal of radioactive waste, and requested that any knowledge or feelings to share be given to her.

5. President’s Report. President Baron referred to the President’s Report dated September, 1992 (Attachment F). Additional items President Baron discussed included:

   (1) the Academic Council had voted to suspend the Mid-Year Check indefinitely (during discussion Jason Elliott, President of the Student Body, referred to people who may be suspended and have been at Clemson at least three semesters as “dead-wood”. Mr. Elliott and two additional students on the Council voted against suspension of policy);

   (2) the faculty in Agricultural Sciences are part of a faculty and we support their difficulties and want to assist. The people in Extension are going through a painful process now which should be impacted by all. A newspaper stated that there might be a need for furloughs in January. An Extension Director said that a furlough would not mean a reduction in work, but a reduction in pay. That’s unacceptable. President Baron’s proposal would be that Extension should take the furlough days as days where Extension simply closes down. If the pain of a furlough is felt only at the University and makes no impact across the state, then we can expect to have this every year.

6. Old Business

a. President Baron encouraged senators to attend the Board of Trustees/Faculty Senate Breakfast on Saturday, September 12, 1992 at 8:30 a.m.

7. New Business

a. President Baron informed the Senate that calls for nominations for the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence have been mailed to the Deans and Department Heads, and that information regarding this Award may be obtained from the Faculty Senate Office.

b. Senator Hare submitted from the Policy and Welfare Committees three Faculty Manual changes (Attachment G) to be considered by the Senate. A vote was taken on each individual change, and all passed.

8. Adjournment. President Baron adjourned the meeting at 5:46 p.m.

Lucy Rollin, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Senators Absent: W. Stringer, J. Liburdy (D. Leigh attended), R. Williams, J. Waldvogel attended
Scholastic Policy Committee
Resolution on Admissions Policy

"Students failing to meet this minimum may be admitted upon approval of the Admissions Exception Sub-Committee. Students rejected by the Sub-Committee may appeal to the President of the University who may accept or reject their application."

The Welfare Committee met with the Finance Committee on Tuesday, August 25, 1992, at 3:30 p.m. in LL3 of Cooper Library.

1. By consensus, it was agreed that Jim Rathwell's report "Faculty/Staff Salaries ($50,000+) by Categories, 1988 and 1991" (see attached) and Jim Davis' report "An Analysis of Budget Changes" were ready to be released. (Davis' report appears in the Finance Committee minutes.)

2. Holly Ulbrich sent a letter to Senator Vander Mey asking that the Welfare Committee review and evaluate the use of emeritus faculty and the rights and privileges accorded them. At the present time, the Faculty Manual (p. 21) indicates that emeritus faculty can participate fully in all faculty meetings. In addition, the University is to enable emeritus faculty to use as many of its services and facilities as possible. Thus, emeritus faculty can be given office space if space is available, for instance. Emeriti faculty can be granted parking privileges, use of facilities for a reduced fee, and so on. The only condition for these privileges is that they are not to "exert undue financial burdens upon the University."

Given the economic press now apparently upon the University, the Welfare Committee has postponed responding to Professor Ulbrich. The Committee asks that each senator ask his/her constituents for input regarding this matter.

3. The Committee postponed responding to a request that the Smoking Policy be re-examined. Apparently, two faculty members are concerned about second-hand smoke in buildings with closed HVAC systems. More information about health hazards from second-hand smoke and other elements in the air in buildings with closed HVAC systems and inoperable windows must be studied before any conclusions are reached. Currently, the Smoking Policy permits smoking in enclosed private offices. The Policy appears in full in Clemson's Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, Section VIII, Subject C, Page 3.

4. There was a general discussion about responding to President Baron's request for input on the possibility of RIPs. Persons in attendance agreed to fax their responses to him. There was, however, a perception that more information was also needed.

The next meeting of the Welfare Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, September 22, 1992, at 3:30 p.m. in LL3, Cooper Library.

Attachment: "Faculty/Staff Salaries ($50,000+) by Categories, 1988 and 1991."
### Faculty/Staff Salaries ($50,000+) by Categories, 1988 and 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>1987 NO. GROSS SALARY</th>
<th>1991 NO. GROSS SALARY</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
<th>AVER CHG PER YR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT DH/ASSIC PROF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT DH/PROF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>115939</td>
<td>55470</td>
<td>112293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALUMI PROF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>578090</td>
<td>57609</td>
<td>1184041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DIR/LECT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC DIR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>115060</td>
<td>57350</td>
<td>273111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC PROF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>228918</td>
<td>57230</td>
<td>3055571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC DEAN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>196993</td>
<td>65664</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC DEAN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>267712</td>
<td>53542</td>
<td>910151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC DEAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52408</td>
<td>52408</td>
<td>57863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC DEAN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>264880</td>
<td>66170</td>
<td>646128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC DEAN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>189141</td>
<td>63047</td>
<td>294439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASS OC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST PROF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO EXT D/PROF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>210200</td>
<td>57230</td>
<td>243479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO EXT D/PROF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO ORD/ASSOC PROF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA PROC MGR II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN/PROF</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>676509</td>
<td>75168</td>
<td>1030528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT NO/ASSOC PROF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT NO/LECT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>172410</td>
<td>57470</td>
<td>320334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT NO/PROF</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1460610</td>
<td>66953</td>
<td>3656273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR/NON ACADEMIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR/ACADEMIC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113742</td>
<td>56871</td>
<td>1040410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST EXT D/ASSOC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111615</td>
<td>55808</td>
<td>119235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENAMEL CHAIR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>296085</td>
<td>74021</td>
<td>513857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG ASSOC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXEC ASST TO PRES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>115607</td>
<td>57804</td>
<td>149692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT ASSOC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50544</td>
<td>50544</td>
<td>12150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC DESIGN ASSOC I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52907</td>
<td>52907</td>
<td>185208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LECTURER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>225889</td>
<td>56472</td>
<td>481303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARIAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50043</td>
<td>50043</td>
<td>50433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMED PROF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>582656</td>
<td>58266</td>
<td>1250579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER DIR III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88917</td>
<td>88917</td>
<td>117915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>8206163</td>
<td>56608</td>
<td>18056364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF/VP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91000</td>
<td>91000</td>
<td>108250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES DIR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>314891</td>
<td>62976</td>
<td>535932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST Ext LDR/ASSOC P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61710</td>
<td>61710</td>
<td>75389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STU AFF/STU SER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60753</td>
<td>60753</td>
<td>227370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE PROV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>321449</td>
<td>80362</td>
<td>292828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPV CRANTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS MGR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERINARIANS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISITING/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106875</td>
<td>54438</td>
<td>174850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>381080</td>
<td>76216</td>
<td>491330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SOURCE: Office of Institutional Research, Clemson University.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>1987</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
<th>AVER CHG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT DH/ASSOC PROF</td>
<td>110939</td>
<td>55470</td>
<td>118401</td>
<td>56780</td>
<td>14.18%</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT DH/PROF</td>
<td>110939</td>
<td>55470</td>
<td>18401</td>
<td>56780</td>
<td>14.18%</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALUMI PROF</td>
<td>576090</td>
<td>57609</td>
<td>50800</td>
<td>50800</td>
<td>10.41%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIST DIR/LECT</td>
<td>115060</td>
<td>57530</td>
<td>27311</td>
<td>68278</td>
<td>18.68%</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC DIR</td>
<td>228918</td>
<td>57230</td>
<td>505571</td>
<td>53607</td>
<td>-6.53%</td>
<td>-1.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC DEAN</td>
<td>196993</td>
<td>65664</td>
<td>910151</td>
<td>70012</td>
<td>30.76%</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC VP</td>
<td>267712</td>
<td>53542</td>
<td>6461258</td>
<td>76876</td>
<td>16.18%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIST DEAN</td>
<td>52408</td>
<td>52408</td>
<td>57863</td>
<td>57863</td>
<td>10.41%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT NO/DEPT NO/LECT</td>
<td>264680</td>
<td>66170</td>
<td>294439</td>
<td>73610</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT ND/ASSOC PROF</td>
<td>189141</td>
<td>63047</td>
<td>245479</td>
<td>61370</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT ND/LECT</td>
<td>196993</td>
<td>65664</td>
<td>910151</td>
<td>70012</td>
<td>30.76%</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT ND/PROF</td>
<td>267712</td>
<td>53542</td>
<td>6461258</td>
<td>76876</td>
<td>16.18%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR/ACADEMIC</td>
<td>676509</td>
<td>75168</td>
<td>1030528</td>
<td>93684</td>
<td>24.63%</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT NO/ASSOC PROF</td>
<td>172410</td>
<td>57470</td>
<td>320334</td>
<td>64067</td>
<td>11.68%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT MD/PROF</td>
<td>1406019</td>
<td>66953</td>
<td>3636275</td>
<td>79049</td>
<td>18.07%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT MD/LECT</td>
<td>66953</td>
<td>112821</td>
<td>56620</td>
<td>56620</td>
<td>18.07%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT MD/PROF</td>
<td>1406019</td>
<td>66953</td>
<td>3636275</td>
<td>79049</td>
<td>18.07%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELONGD CHAIR</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG ASSOC/</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXEC ASST TO PRES</td>
<td>113742</td>
<td>56871</td>
<td>1040410</td>
<td>65026</td>
<td>14.34%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT ASSOC</td>
<td>113742</td>
<td>56871</td>
<td>1040410</td>
<td>65026</td>
<td>14.34%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC DESIGN ASSOC I</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td>172410</td>
<td>57470</td>
<td>320334</td>
<td>64067</td>
<td>11.68%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LECTURER</td>
<td>496065</td>
<td>74021</td>
<td>513857</td>
<td>85643</td>
<td>15.70%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARIAN</td>
<td>113742</td>
<td>56871</td>
<td>1040410</td>
<td>65026</td>
<td>14.34%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMED PROF</td>
<td>113742</td>
<td>56871</td>
<td>1040410</td>
<td>65026</td>
<td>14.34%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER DIR III</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>113742</td>
<td>56871</td>
<td>1040410</td>
<td>65026</td>
<td>14.34%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROV/VP</td>
<td>113742</td>
<td>56871</td>
<td>1040410</td>
<td>65026</td>
<td>14.34%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES DIR</td>
<td>113742</td>
<td>56871</td>
<td>1040410</td>
<td>65026</td>
<td>14.34%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST EXT LDR/ASSOC P</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STU AFF/STU SER</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE PROV</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPV GRANTS</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS MGR</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERINARIANS</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISITING/</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Office of Institutional Research, Clemson University.
Report of Finance Committee

September 1992

Analysis of Budget Changes

(in thousands) () = decreases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1990-91 vs. 1991-92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Unrestricted Funds**
- Basic E & G $1,586
- Ag. Exp. Station 384
- Coop. Ext. Service (930)
- Regulatory and Pub. Service (51)
- Livestock & Poultry Health 10
- Forest and Recreation Resources (131)
- State Energy Program (9)
- Bioengineering Alliance (3)
**Total Unrestricted** $856

**Auxiliary Enterprises** 5,751

**Restricted Funds** 304

**Subtotal** $6,911

**Capital Improvements** 22,828

**Debt Service** 422

**Total Budget Change** $30,161

---

*Breakdown One*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classified Salaries</td>
<td>$2,780</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified Salaries</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>(576)</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages, Other</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>(584)</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>(1,137)</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships, Fellowships &amp; Grants</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>(2,200)</td>
<td>-16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Codes</td>
<td>(323)</td>
<td>-20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmandatory Transfers</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>359.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Total**                                 | $6,911        | 2.3            |

Special Codes - Professional Development, P. Plant services to user depts.
Mandatory Transfers - Required by state statute, e.g., student fees to plant funds, percent of revenue to debt services, etc.
Nonmandatory Transfers - from one fund group to another, e.g., to E&G from Auxiliary Services when shortfalls occur.
Breakdown Two Format for the period 1985-86 to 1991-92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$2,141</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Ag. Exp. Station</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Public Service</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Pub. Ser. Cooperative</td>
<td>(684)</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Pub. Ser. Regulator</td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>(521)</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Administration</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>(435)</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>(915)</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmandatory Transfers</td>
<td>(1,289)</td>
<td>-914.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>5,932</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,911</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A Not applicable because some items were combined in earlier years
*Breakdown Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$2,141</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Ag. Exp. Station</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Public Service</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Pub. Ser. Cooperative</td>
<td>(684)</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Pub. Ser. Regulator</td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>(521)</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Administration</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>(435)</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>(915)</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmandatory Transfers</td>
<td>(1,289)</td>
<td>-914.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>5,932</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,911</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown Two Format for the period 1985-86 to 1991-92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$19,961</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Ag. Exp. Station</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research</td>
<td>25,335</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Public Service</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Pub. Ser. Cooperative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Pub. Ser. Regulator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Extension and Public Service</td>
<td>12,869</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Administration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Academic Support</td>
<td>14,424</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>6,404</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>4,665</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmandatory Transfers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>23,054</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A Not applicable because some items were combined in earlier years
The Policy Committee met August 17 and August 24.

The Findings of the Faculty Survey has been distributed to President Lennon, Provost Jennett, Deans, Department Heads, Faculty Senators and Alternates (both 1991–92 and 1992–93). At President Lennon’s request, copies have also been sent to the Board of Trustees, the Strategic Planning Committee, and the Leadership Development Council. The Findings of the Faculty Survey was printed on recycled paper (except for a few copies printed on borrowed paper, which was replaced with recycled paper). The study was completed without the use of direct public funds.

The Committee discussed the purchase of textbooks clearly marked “Complimentary Copy – Not for Resale” by the Clemson University Bookstore. A resolution dealing with this problem has been sent to the Bookstore Committee for comment.

The next meeting of the Policy Committee is scheduled for 3 p.m. Tuesday, September 15, in the conference room of Cooper Library. Please note that the time is one-half hour earlier than our usual meeting time. Dr. Tom Keinath, Dean of the College of Engineering, has been invited to meet with us to discuss chaired professorships.
MEMORANDUM

To: Charles Jennett, Provost
From: University Research Grants Committee
Re: Restructuring of URGC and Provost Awards

April 15, 1992

After more than a year of deliberations, drafts, consultations, and iterations, the University Research Grants Committee would like to propose several fundamental changes to the organization and implementation of the URGC and Provost Awards programs. Although the past programs have been extremely valuable in fostering research scholarship at Clemson, we believe that there are several improvements in efficiency and quality that can further enhance those programs. These proposed changes and implementation strategies are described below.

Provost Awards for Scholarly Achievement

Each Spring, a competition will be held for up to ten Provost Awards for Scholarly Achievement. These awards are not for lifetime achievement, but are to be based upon a recent, well-specified, and distinct scholarly accomplishment, as documented by impact on the professional field and scholarly community. The awards will be $1,000 cash prizes, to be accompanied by a plaque or medallion and awards banquet, and if possible by named recognition at the May commencement.

Early each Spring semester a call for nominations will be circulated among all Deans, Department Heads, and faculty. Candidates may be self-nominated, although Department Head and Dean signatures will be required on the application cover page. An application will consist of a cover page and no more than two pages of text describing the nominee’s distinctive achievement, and with attached supporting materials as appropriate (documentation of peer recognition, professional prizes or awards, citations, and external reviews). In addition, at least three letters from professional colleagues should be included attesting to the merit and importance of the nominee’s scholarly contribution.

A selection committee will be comprised of one representative from each College, with the representative appointed to a three-year term by the College Dean. Committee members will not be eligible for the award. Furthermore, named and distinguished professorships, having already received the University’s highest honor for scholarly achievement, also will be ineligible (and therefore are preferred representatives from Colleges with such a faculty member). A faculty member can be nominated for this...
PRESIDENT'S REPORT

SEPTEMBER, 1992

1. Dr. Hassan Behery is home and doing well. He recently spent some "vacation" time in Anderson Memorial Hospital as a result of heart distress, not the amorous kind. We wish Hassan good cheer and a speedy recovery. He can receive mad phone calls and visitors.

2. The Faculty Survey has been compiled by the Policy Committee and released. Copies of the survey were sent to the President, Provost, Faculty Senators '91-'92 and '92-'93, Deans and Department Heads. They were not sent to each faculty member. I suggest that each colleges’ Senate delegation make arrangements to see that each faculty member in their college receives at least the first pages of the Survey.

3. From the Athletic Council: The Admissions and Scholarships sub-Committee of the Athletic Council reviewed the average GPR for each of the University's intercollegiate athletic teams. The Committee reported to the Council, that for scholarship athletes, five teams had average GPR's that exceeded the average GPR of the Student Body. These teams were described as exceptional. There were seven teams that had average GPR’s for scholarship athletes that were near or approaching the grade point average of the Student Body. These teams were described as acceptable. Two teams, men's football and basketball, had average GPR’s for their scholarship athletes, which were significantly below that of the Student Body’s. These records were deemed unacceptable. A motion was introduced by the Chair of the Committee which called on the coaches of the Men’s Football and Basketball teams to take actions to improve the situation and to provide a written response by the end of the Fall semester, 1992.

4. From the Provost's Council: At the August 24 meeting of the Provost’s Council, the University Assessment Committee reported on the CHE Component 15 Assessment of Administrative and Financial Processes and Performance. Dr. Trapnell advised the Council that the Assessment Committee would be choosing or developing an assessment process for administrators, including deans and department heads, which would make use of a subordinate questionnaire. The Council voted to accept the proposed procedure. A pilot program, with the evaluation of two department heads, using a standardized questionnaire, hopefully, will take place this academic year. A concern that I have is as to the rigor of the evaluation process for administrators. In the first run-through in developing assessment programs for individual departments, Dr. Maxwell chastised the faculty and returned to us, our proposed assessment programs, because they were not sufficiently specific or rigorous in either goals and benchmarks, or in the assessment procedure. It seems to me the proposed assessment of administrators lacks the rigor that was expected of departmental programs.

There was a discussion of confidentiality of peer review files. No conclusion was reached.

5. Attached is the final report of the Salary Adjustment Committee. I would suggest that you distribute copies of this report to all of the faculty in your college.

6. President’s Cabinet - Budgetary Comments: At the President’s Cabinet Meeting of August 24, Dr. Lennon advised the Cabinet that the University’s E&G Budget would be cut by 3.3 million dollars, and Extension’s, by 1.2 million dollars. He asked whether we would prefer to see the University’s budgeted salary adjustment monies used for that purpose or retained to offset a possible reduction of personnel necessitated by the budgetary shortfall. It was for this reason I requested an opinion from each Senator on this issue. The opinions from the Senate appear to be
evenly split between the two given alternatives. At a subsequent meeting with the President, I reminded him that under Grievance Procedure I, a matter of State Law, that faculty terminated due to financial exigency had to be given twelve months’ notice. This would make reduction of faculty an ineffective process to accommodate this year’s budget crisis. This procedure may also preclude furloughs. This interpretation of State Law was substantiated by Mr. Dick Simmons of the University Personnel Office. Recognizing that faculty could not be immediately terminated, I have suggested to the President and Provost that staff not be terminated for the specific purpose of meeting this year’s budgetary crisis. I have spent several hours with the senators in Agriculture. We met with Mr. Whitmire and Mr. Gable to discuss the financial crisis in the PSA budgetary process. During one of our meetings, I was told that Extension is continuing to advertise for a number of positions presently unfilled. I informed both the President and the Provost of this situation and suggested that they consider freezing these positions. I will suggest to both of them at future meetings that all faculty and staff hiring be temporarily frozen until such hirings can be rejustified. It would seem appropriate for the faculty to offer suggestions for budgetary restraint and savings. In fact, several of you have already done so. Let me suggest that you direct proposals of this sort directly to the President and the Provost as the matter is rather urgent. Please copy your proposals to me. Let me suggest that your proposals be specific, succinct and positive in attitude. Telling the Provost that you can do without your dean probably won’t get a favorable response.

7. I have invited Mr. Jason Elliott, Student Body President; Ms. Sandy Smith, Chair of the Commission on Classified Staff; Frank Bartek, Graduate Student Association President; and Larry Hudson, President of the Extension Senate to join us at our Breakfast with the Board of Trustees. Please be especially nice to Jason. On more than one occasion I have suggested to him that this would be a marvelous place to work if we could get rid of the students. He has responded by suggesting that there might be less of a need for faculty if there were no students. He does have a point.

8. The Provost will meet with us at our October meetings. Please forward written questions to Senator Rollin.

9. I have met with the Library faculty and the Faculty Senators in Agriculture. I am available for meetings with other faculty groups.
evenly split between the two given alternatives. At a subsequent meeting with the President, I reminded him that under Grievance Procedure I, a matter of State Law, that faculty terminated due to financial exigency had to be given twelve months’ notice. This would make reduction of faculty an ineffective process to accommodate this year’s budget crisis. This procedure may also preclude furloughs. This interpretation of State Law was substantiated by Mr. Dick Simmons of the University Personnel Office. Recognizing that faculty could not be immediately terminated, I have suggested to the President and Provost that staff not be terminated for the specific purpose of meeting this year’s budgetary crisis. I have spent several hours with the senators in Agriculture. We met with Mr. Whitmire and Mr. Gable to discuss the financial crisis in the PSA budgetary process. During one of our meetings, I was told that Extension is continuing to advertise for a number of positions presently unfilled. I informed both the President and the Provost of this situation and suggested that they consider freezing these positions. I will suggest to both of them at future meetings that all faculty and staff hiring be temporarily frozen until such hirings can be rejustified. It would seem appropriate for the faculty to offer suggestions for budgetary restraint and savings. In fact, several of you have already done so. Let me suggest that you direct proposals of this sort directly to the President and the Provost as the matter is rather urgent. Please copy your proposals to me. Let me suggest that your proposals be specific, succinct and positive in attitude. Telling the Provost that you can do without your dean probably won’t get a favorable response.

7. I have invited Mr. Jason Elliott, Student Body President; Ms. Sandy Smith, Chair of the Commission on Classified Staff; Frank Bartek, Graduate Student Association President; and Larry Hudson, President of the Extension Senate to join us at our Breakfast with the Board of Trustees. Please be especially nice to Jason. On more than one occasion I have suggested to him that this would be a marvelous place to work if we could get rid of the students. He has responded by suggesting that there might be less of a need for faculty if there were no students. He does have a point.

8. The Provost will meet with us at our October meetings. Please forward written questions to Senator Rollin.

9. I have met with the Library faculty and the Faculty Senators in Agriculture. I am available for meetings with other faculty groups.
Policy/Welfare Committees
Proposed Changes to the Faculty Manual

September 8, 1992

(1) In Part V. Grievance Procedures, C. Faculty Grievance Procedure II, 3. Procedure, Sections a and b (p. 36) currently read:

"a. A faculty member with a grievance shall first meet with the department head ... b. If the matter cannot be resolved at the level of the academic department, the faculty member shall meet with the dean ..."

Append to paragraph b:

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

(2) Section f, (p. 38), should be changed to read: (addition is underlined)

"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 and findings of the Provost shall be transmitted in writing to the faculty member, the Hearing Panel, and other parties directly concerned."

(3) Section 6. Protection of the Faculty Members and Others Involved in Grievance Procedures, (p. 38), should be changed to read: (addition is underlined)

"all persons involved in grievance procedures, including the Grievance Board, shall be free... "
1. Recently, local newspapers have quoted Vice President Larson as saying that the administrative portion of Clemson University has already sustained “major hits” as a result of state budget reductions, and that there is little or no room for further cost savings in administrative areas. Thus, says Larson, the academic activities of the University must now be cut, resulting in fewer classes of larger size.

a) Could you please specifically identify those “major hits” which the administrative budget has taken, and make a case for why no further cuts are possible?

David Larson: That comment refers to, I don’t know how familiar you are with the way the budget is put together, categories, such as they are and how they are spread amongst the colleges. Has there been a lot of information shared about that? In July 1 we obviously implemented a series of cuts and last fiscal year we implemented series of cuts. My comments today will refer to the fact that in every case those cuts were tiered in a way that the percentage reductions were much higher in the administrative areas throughout the University, including the deans’ offices, the President’s budget, my budget, and so on. The lower percentage of cuts impacted the college. To give you a specific example, there is also another side to the equation, that the cuts that we are experiencing now are so sizable, that there is really not much way to avoid cutting all parts of the campus. That doesn’t mean the administrative units are not being cut more... I’ll give you some specific examples. In July 1 when we cut the budget, prior to this latest cut, there were small cuts in the colleges totaling about $600,000, just the colleges themselves. The administrative units considerably more than that, dollar-wise and percentage-wise. That’s only the tip of the iceberg. At the same time, 1.3 million dollars in research money was added to the college budgets. $470,000 in funds have been added to the college budgets for additional enrollment, and there was a small discretionary account available to the Provost for about $300,000. My point is, as of July 1, in the college setting there was almost 2 million dollars in positive additions and a cut of $600,000. The net was positive. I’m not saying that’s a lot of money, I’m just quoting the numbers. Administrative cuts were just cut. They do not come out of the positive numbers. That was quite intentional. All along the cuts have been tiered, lower percentages were in the colleges, higher percentages were in the administrative areas, and any of the positive allocations all bottomed out...enrollment, what we call the enrollment management fund, innovation fund. None of those go to any administrative units. Research money, 90-something percent of the 25% money goes to the colleges. With this latest cut, if you look at it in total, the tiering effect, total cuts now for this fiscal year, the low is 2.5% and the high is 5%. All low percentages are in the colleges. The five percent is all in the administrative units. At the same time there is still that positive addition to the academic area, now the net effect of that is about zero right now, in the academic area, whereas the administrative cuts are definitely in negative numbers. There are two things at work that’s in the budget. This is why I made that statement. Not to say that the administrators can’t be cut. The range of these cuts is 2.5-5%. You’ve got these tiering percentages, with the lower percentages always being in the college area, the higher the percentage is always from administration. The positive allocations for research, enrollment and so on except for salary adjustments for classified staff, all have to do with the academic area. In the past, those positive allocations were canceled out in total. The impact of the cut, that’s no longer true. These cuts are finally so deep, that we will actually see a reduction in the academic area. That’s a first, that hasn’t happened before. In the prior fiscal year there was over 1.5 million dollars in research allocations and that cancels out the net effect. I’m not saying it
doesn’t impact every college, but this is the first time when all of a sudden there is a net reduction in the academic area of college.

Bill Baron: You mentioned $400,000 that was added for tuition, or to the colleges for instruction. Our enrollment is approximately 200-300 students more than we had anticipated. Two hundred students would bring in about $400,000, so that additional money was essentially needed for instructional resources that had not been planned for or predicted beforehand. So, I think it is a little unfair to say the colleges were getting some additional money.

Larson: I’m not trying to diminish the impact of the cuts on anybody. Whether they had zero change of dollars with an increase in activity, I’m not aware of that. I know there is considerable differences among the colleges because some college. Some colleges had plus and minus enrollment. Some college did not perceive a positive increase through the research money, and therefore didn’t get any from the research allocation. The cuts are serious all over campus. I’m just trying to make a point that just by looking at the cash flows, the negatives are on the administrative side, considerably higher.

Rathwell: How does the balancing in cuts come now based on the growth over the last four or five years of the administration. Are you saying these cuts were based on the fact...there are people who have indicated the administration has grown more rapidly over the last five years, than has the colleges, so the impact of the cuts to the administration are probably less cut than the impact to the colleges because the administration has grown rapidly. In 1987, we had five associate v.p.s and today we have 13; we had twelve directors and we have 27 now.

Larson: The way that the cuts were determined, the tiering as I call it, David Maxwell called it progressive taxation system. What we did for each college and each administrative institutional support which is the broad definition of institutional costs, physical plant, and academic support, those were our categories. We specifically looked at the formula dollars generated for those units, and looked at the actual dollars they were receiving internally, deducted their research money so we could see what each college, or what I refer to as each budget center was receiving as a share of state appropriations...we then calculated an internal percent of formula funding to see who was better off, or worse off. Who was doing better in regards, the money was being generated to the institution. That behavior ranged from a low of 68% formula to a high of 86% of formula. That percentage was used as a basis for breaking the cuts into four tiers and varying percentages and the higher your percentage of formula funding, which deals back to administrative units, resulted in a much higher cut. If you feel that those increases on administrative costs over the last few years have been unjustified, then you’re right, maybe the net of that is about the same. You’re cutting a higher percentage, of a higher number.

Lennon: I would suggest that some of these issues need to be separated. You need to invite David back to talk at more length than we will today about administrative growth or issues in his area. It’s all in here, the numbers are all there, and if it can’t be defended then we need to know. Also, I think you need to invite Gary Ransdell because his area has also been criticized by some faculty. Some people that were called something else are now called associate and assistant vice presidents, or whatever. On the other hand, I’ve added people very deliberately. We need to better understand what they do and what has happened, and then we’ll make a judgment.

Larson: I might add that recent studies done, I want to know as vice president where the growth incurred in my area of responsibility since I came to Clemson, in dollars and in FTE’s, and then why did it grow? What new programs are being offered, what new initiatives have been made, what were costs of additional staff. The report lays exactly where I put additional positions and attempts to get at what causes the administrative area to grow. I’m not saying its perfect, it’s the first one I have tried to do that way.
Schaffer: It would help the faculty tremendously if we were given, not percentages, but what are you losing? What is each administrative unit over the next year giving up specifically? How much travel are you losing, how much supplies are you losing? How much of what? We know you aren’t losing positions because, I think very wisely, this university decided not to do that. Where are the cuts being made?

Larson: We are losing positions. The President asked of each of the vice presidents and the provost was to come back with a summary and exactly detail the cuts by September 23rd. So, we’ll actually have in place what each budget center or each vice president did to achieve the cuts and quote what they gave up. We did that quite intentionally because we have been asked that question.

b) Since the principle mission of the University is education, has consideration been given to administrative furloughs and/or salary reductions as a possible way of saving money during the current budget crisis? How about combining departments that have low enrollments?

Lennon: I just said that there are state laws and any person at Clemson would have all sorts of rights and all those have to be respected. The combination of departments makes incredible sense but I can assure you that if a dean began to lobby for the merger of departments as a major priority, or if the president or provost said we were going to merge departments, all you would do was find a new dean, provost, or president. Based on my experience, we should concentrate on developing our priorities, learn to use the skills of continuous improvement. I wish politics weren’t what they are, but let’s work on continuous improvement.

c) If so, what would be the relationship between academic and administrative budget cuts? Would the same percentage reduction apply to, for example, Vice-Presidents and Deans as would apply to Faculty?

Lennon: Last year, this year, again I can assure you that the budget reduction, administratively, on a percentage basis, will be higher. The smallest percentage will be in the academic area. That is a stated priority, and it will continue to be so.

d) Furlough/reductions in hours deal with symptoms of our budget problem. Are you ready to implement measures that deal with causes? An example is to provide an incentive for retirement.

Lennon: I agree completely and please have every confidence that is our top priority, how to convince the state to develop some sort of incentive that would encourage early retirement rather than deal with furloughs and a reduction in force. That would be a last resort, believe me. There are all sorts of rules either at Clemson or in state law or in labor law and those are very difficult. Given that and given the negative morale associated with it then why don’t you recommend something like this and that is our first message to us and to Columbia, please if it takes legislation then let’s be there in January with some. We do not think this is a temporary problem, the world economy is changing, it’s changing significantly and permanently. So, we agree completely.

e) Is there any truth to the persistent rumors of widespread hiring and promotion within Business & Finance during these times of fiscal crisis?

Larson: No, the only way I can promote individuals in Business & Finance last
year as with any campus unit, I would have the authority to propose re-classifications with the state personnel office, we did do that. We did re-classify individuals, they did receive raises, there is a master list of all those, and I think if you look at that you will find numbers of individuals in my area being re-classified is perfectly consistent given the size of our organization on the whole campus. I'll be happy to share that with you. The only way I can promote and re-classify this year is if you recall there were two allocations made that allowed some discretionary decisions on salaries. There was a $600,000 allocation for salary adjustments for faculty, and there was a $400,000 for re-classifications for classified staff. That's distributed based on the number of employees you have. From that $400,000 pool, because I have 750 employees, I received $125,000. I am right now working on a list of individuals to nominate for consideration to receive some kind of promotion.

2. Clemson has advertised that it is seeking to fill administrative positions, such as a graduate dean and a position in TIWET. How can we justify such hiring and at the same time anticipate furloughs and reductions in force?

Lennon: Graduate dean pressure came from faculty, the TIWET issue it is my understanding that the outside search is not going to occur, but rather, people are being reassigned within the university temporarily.

Larson: Temporarily Charles Tegan has been assigned to serve as Business Manager probably until the close of the fiscal year. At that time they will try to hire a permanent business manager for the Toxicology Institute.

3. Dr. Wise stated during the recent Division-wide meeting that you dictated a solution to the TIWET budget deficit problem. This solution imposed costs on the general E&G budget ($600,000) and the Experiment Station budget ($600,000). Should not the units involved have been allowed to manage this budget problem? Is not this particularly the case given: (1) that TIWET was brought to Clemson as a self-supporting unit and (2) the projections of a continued drain on budgets as the result of TIWET?

Lennon: Any time you look at our budget process if something "on the bubble" is going to appear so the date on when to look at it, this year, back two years ago, we are making some University decisions and are looking at some of these activities very carefully. Whether we are talking about Clemson Scholars, or a whole host of what I would call university decision impact us. Impact you. A decision to be aggressive with compensation, it's a university decision because obviously, if you are aggressive there will be fewer of us. TIWET surfaces because of the audit that we did and the resulting investigation and talking with the media, and therefore, everyone becoming very concerned, very anxious and any time that happens to that degree, there business is going to be impacted. So, they had a significant downturn. There's a lot in the pipeline, some major projects that you will read about very soon, that that group will undertake. So, if we didn't believe completely that this is and will be an asset in a lot of ways then obviously other decision will be made.

4. The recent Faculty Senate survey suggests a negative view among faculty of some areas of administration. How will you address these concerns?

Lennon: Personally, I will spend more time on campus this next year, than I have ever spent. Given the decisions that I can make, I just turned down today, two invitations to go to other universities to talk, I couldn't learn very much from those. Given our situation, I would be better off spending my time here at Clemson, rather than take a day off and take a trip like that. I will say to the vice presidents, "I think you need to be on campus to find out what the real problems are." I will say to the deans, "I think you need to be out working with your faculty and developing partnerships with the rest of us to try to find resources we need to pull us through this
issue. That's what I plan to do.

5. What can you, as President, do to encourage administrators to be more aware of their obligation to act in accordance with policies set forth in the Faculty Manual and in departmental and college by-laws?

Lennon: We will continue to say to, in my case, the vice presidents, we have asked the Provost to talk with the deans, about the importance of the Faculty Manual. I will trust that anytime you see someone ignoring it, to let us know.

6. What can you, as President, do to alleviate the situation where some Deans and Department Heads actively discourage Faculty from serving on the Faculty Senate?

Lennon: I really think that number 6 is going to take care of itself as we at Clemson continue to mature. The role of the faculty is becoming more and more significant, not less and less. You know that and I know that. We are learning together how to develop a way to communicate so that faculty aren't overused, but that we have an orderly process of decision-making. Quite frankly, folks, I am proud of you. I think you have come a long way. I think you are respected significantly more today than you have ever been in the past as a Faculty Senate. I think that's going to continue. I can encourage others to love you, but it's awfully hard to make them love you. You are earning that respect, and I don't want you to take that lightly.

7. Charles Dunn, the previous head of the Political Science Department, has publicly announced his filing of a suit against the University and against several faculty members. Will the University provide legal counsel and liability insurance to the faculty members involved?

Lennon: It's awfully hard to talk about litigation, particularly with our good friend from the Greenville News with us. The University will do everything possible to provide sound legal counsel for people at the University. Most of the time, that is sufficient, sometimes it depends on the nature of the suit. I am generalizing now. In some cases, individuals will be encouraged to retain their own attorney. Where possible, the University legal counsel, and remember that the state attorney general is ... We do everything we do legally in consort with the attorney general's office and again, depending on the nature of the case, the attorney general may encourage us (the University) to obtain additional legal counsel. I think the faculty would be well-advised at some point to talk about risk as it relates to the world in which we live. It may be in our best interest to have an ad hoc committee approach and look at this issue because, many times, are giving advice and so forth, what is involved here, what is the need for "additional insurance"? I think this issue should be addressed from time to time and we should be at a comfort level, and we are doing it right now for our Board of Trustees.

Jim Davis: Is it more complicated in this case because it's employee against employee versus student vs. faculty member or an outsider of this University?

Lennon: I think no two cases are the same, and what we'll do again, is analyze it very carefully, and will base it on the advice we get from our legal counsel and the attorney general. No two cases are the same.

Schaffer: In this particular case, no decision has been made?

Lennon: That's true. We do not know what action has been taken. We have not been so notified. It will take some time to get everyone informed. I mention risk assessment because I think it's, from time to time, important. We have some very bright people who have been helping with that, but I think the faculty can contribute to that study and look at other universities to see what they
8. Where do you see the operating budget for the Brooks Center for the Performing Arts coming from? Will this unit be considered a separate University budget item (i.e., do you expect the State to give us extra money to run the Center), or will this expense be taken as a proportion of the budgets of all of the colleges, or will the operating expenses for the Brooks Center come from the operating budget of the College of Liberal Arts? If there is an endowment provided to operate the Center will you please share with us the available amount and where the donations came from?

Lennon: I touched based with a few folks to get more accurate information. Dean Waller is here and he might be able to help us. What we are trying to do is take advantage of any efficiencies as we can because if you remember, we did have a performing arts series and there is a great deal ongoing, a student union, activities, events. Those people have been talking since the very beginning about how we can structure ourselves so that we have a ticket office, without a lot of redundancy. A lot of planning has taken place, some very bright people have been working. I might also point out that it is my belief that in order to minimize the financial risk it is essential to have what I call “decision ...that includes us but it includes others. Those activities began eight months ago receptions, dinners, activities depending on what those people wanted to tell about what is happening, what the plans are, get them involved. There is a large number of people now from different areas in addition to faculty and staff that are so involved. That is a continuing effort. The response was more in number and enthusiasm than we thought might be possible. The key here is very good leadership and very tight control. As a result, we can enrich the campus in a variety of ways without losing a lot of money. You know and I know, if activities like this are attended, it is like having about 1000 horses in the pasture—you are looking at a lot of money. I know from experience. With good leadership though, it’s a great thing to have, and the costs aren’t that great. It takes involvement.

Schaffer: The question was very clear. It says where do you see the operating budget coming from?

Lennon: Existing operating budgets, we are asking the public to become more aggressive in their support, and therefore, will minimize the amount needed. It is a University commitment. We are going to leverage performing arts all we can, we’re going to leverage the college all we can, and then we’ll leverage the Provost. That’s after we do all these other things. Again, I perceive very little criticism for this commitment on the part of the University. My assumption from the beginning we have to manage it from a fiscal standpoint extremely well. Those numbers are public information so we will be responsible.

Brenda VanderMey: I’m not fully sure that I understand this completely. With the budget crisis is it possible that some of the units in liberal arts will actually be punished by the institutional support of the Brooks Performing Center, and part of the liberal arts total budget goes over toward that Center? Is there any punishment or take away from other academic units in Liberal Arts because of the support that must go to the Center?

Lennon: I really hope not. If we manage well we should attract more resources because of that event. There is a risk involved. It’s reasonable to help them with a birthing process. It’s a tough, but real, philosophy. Those activities should help us; they shouldn’t drain our resources. We are doing things because it’s the right thing to do given our circumstances. At some point, let’s cut our losses.

Jerry Waldvogel: Is it safe to assume there is a time limit, at least implied, on this birthing process. Given that the primary mission of the University as stated in our strategic plan is educational excellence, and given that supporting institutions like TIWET, and perhaps the Brooks
Center, if it doesn't come in as a money-making operation right away, or self-supporting, that take away from existing funds that are our primary goal. There is a distinct time line associated with the birthing process, and we can trust you will stick to that.

Lennon: Without question. We are getting ourselves organized and we have an assessment concept as we think of strategic planning. It becomes real. These questions are extremely fair questions for all of us. If you're not comfortable, then let's evaluate what we do.
OPTIONAL QUESTIONS

1. Are or have University affiliated foundations purchased life insurance policies that build case value for individual employees (i.e. whole life or universal policies)? If so, are these policies viewed as part of the compensation package?

   Lennon: I have been unsuccessful in finding a situation where foundations are purchasing life insurance. Please, remember we have a large number of foundations, am I missing something? What have you heard? Point me in the right direction, I guess is what I'm saying. Can you give me more information? We have tried to get out of the business of supplements at Clemson from foundations, but there are obviously, large contributions from the foundations faculty, that is, endowed chairs. I know you aren't questioning that, but some do oddly enough. Point me in the right direction and we'll check that out.

2. Is Clemson Extension headed toward charging fees for all services? How about the campus-wide extension effort?

   I think there will be great a greater expectation in the future for individuals to pay for certain services. This would be true for Extension. Parenthetically, let me add something that is very important. We talk about strategically planning a great deal at Clemson, and most of that dialogue has to do with teaching and scholarship. Most of us can identify what we need by the terms teaching and scholarship. We have asked a group of people to develop for us very specifically, the strategic plan for service. Obviously, a large piece of that is cooperative extension. Every college has a significant service component. We have asked that group to look at it this way: traditional teaching is 8-5 on campus; research and scholarship, we think we know what that is, now service is all the teaching that occurs other than 8-5. Evening programs, on and off campus. What is our strategic plan for that part of our land grant mission. I have alerted that group that yours will be the most difficult task of any of our strategic plan because some people will want to protect things others won't fully understand it, we don't have an award system, and so on. That part of it will be extremely complicated, and more difficult in our process. With budgets being what they are, I would predict that most new extension activities will be grant-funded or paid for by the user. A lot of the traditional activities will continue. It's not necessarily pleasant, but I think it is the reality.

3. Are you aware of the contractual arrangements Amick Farms has recently had with Clemson? Were the departments involved fairly compensated for their work?

   Lennon: Yes, I am. Bill Amick is one of the most conscientious people I have ever known. For example, he had a group, at my urging, to do a feasibility study for him. In his first discussion with me about it, he was going to hire a consultant to do the feasibility study. My suggestion was, "why don't you get faculty at Clemson, because they can do that." The point is people in his industry do not see Clemson as a source. They see Georgia, NC State, and Texas A&M as a source, but not Clemson. It was a very difficult project to manage, but in every case an effort was made so that we could go back and do an audit. We made sure that we compensated Clemson appropriately, why? Because he is on the Board. He's going to be very concerned about this. If there is a concern, we can send an auditor over to check it out or whatever. Again, if you learn more, let me know because he would really be embarrassed if someone thought that he was doing something inappropriate.

4. Should the Faculty Senate continue to conduct surveys like the one just released?

   Lennon: Of course, I would prefer that you come closer to the strategic planning activity
called, assessment. They have accumulated lots of instruments that might be more effective. One of the issues in any organization is morale. Well, there are instruments there for that purpose, and how frequently do you need to measure? Well, regularly, but not the entire organization. You can do the entire organization every couple of years, but you do a sample every few months, so that you know what the morale is, as an example. We are going through a lot of change and there are lots of issues like those suggested in the survey that are extremely important. With a certain amount of naivete, we can really get ourselves into a lot of difficulties. The strategic planning group is trying to learn more about this part of assessment. I would hope that you could stay close to them in the process so that we don’t have redundancy.

5. How do you see the public service mission of Clemson University changing over time, with respect to state funding and distribution of faculty involved?

Lennon: I think I have talked about that. Teaching research and service are equally important in the mission of a land grant institution. My dream is to get every discipline at Clemson appropriately involved and people and communities, o have an award system, a system that provides incentives, etc. I would hope that we can organize it ourselves with as little redundancy as possible. This is not centers and institutes, this is re-directing that thing we used to call cooperative extension to include the entire university and to broaden the curriculum in the community. That’s much more difficult to accomplish, but if we have an institutional commitment, it survives several presidents. If we form institutes, and the director of that institute leaves...This can’t be personality commitment; it’s much, much more important than that. We at Clemson are one of the few land grants in the country, and I am one of the few presidents that is convinced that this is the way to do it. I may be wrong, but I have studied this issue perhaps as much as anyone and I think I am right.

6. Since the Legislature doesn’t fund us according to formula, wouldn’t it be more economical for the University to admit only the number of students for whom the formula provided?

Lennon: Interesting question. If one were to carry that thought to the extreme, and I know that wasn’t the intended case, during these difficult times we would simply put ourselves out of business. We are funded, current formula, based on numbers. We are trying to reduce the undergraduate population, but as we reduce that enrollment and replace them with graduate students, the graduate student attracts more money to the formula than does an undergraduate. That’s another reason about 1,200 would be a target for suggested by the strategic planning process. If we happen to be funded at 50% of the formula and if we then suddenly decided to accept only 50% of the students, we would have a dramatic reduction in student fee income that year. This would be a self-defeating philosophy. Fortunately, even though we had budget cuts, we have more graduate students and therefore, more fees. Fortunately, we had more, because without them we wouldn’t have...I would also point out that Almeda Jacks would argue with us that if we had more students, she had more expenses, not just more instructional fees.

That is the list of questions that you provided. I appreciate the invitation. Please invite me as often as you would like to talk. Your president is very aggressive in communicating for you. He is a member of several groups, and is very good at saying, “Whoa, we the faculty need more time to study this issue.” That is his responsibility, he is articulate, he expresses the point of view very well, and I congratulate you on growing in stature on this campus, and we encourage you to continue to do that. One of the most important things you could do this year, is what you are planning to do by bringing the vice presidents to your meetings and have them respond to a standard set of questions about administrative growth in their area - what are we getting for our investment in you? Are you worthwhile? Can we get along without you? Again, these are reasonable questions, and if we can’t defend them, let’s re-evaluate. Anything before we go?
1. **Call to Order.** President William Baron called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The General Faculty Minutes dated August 19, 1992 were approved as written. The Faculty Senate Minutes dated September 8, 1992 were approved as written, subject to a response to the question posed by Senate Alternate David Leigh: the two-thirds majority vote on the passage of FS92-9-1 P, Resolution on Admissions Policy. (After checking the Faculty Manual and notes, it proved to be that two-thirds vote is necessary in order to change the Faculty Manual, and that the vote was 19 votes in favor of resolution, with 10 votes against.) Therefore, resolution failed; and the Minutes of September 8, 1992 will be revised to reflect this action.

3. **Special Order of the Day.** Provost J. Charles Jennett responded to questions which had been 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. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Committee Reports**

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Alan Schaffer reported that this committee will study the success of the STEP Program to determine the possibility of extending it to other students. This program has an excellent record of raising grade point averages of students.

   **Welfare Committee.** Senator Brenda Vander Mey referred to the committee report (Attachment A) citing that the resolution in Item #2 was rejected, not killed; and informed the Senate that the Provost will meet with the Welfare Committee to discuss morale issues on October 27th. A meeting will also be held with members of the Student Government and the Graduate Student Association on this same topic on October 23th.

   **Finance Committee.** Senator Jim Davis made reference to the Finance Committee Report (Attachment B) which is an analysis of the reduction of this year's budget.

   **Policy Committee.** Senator Eleanor Hare presented the committee report (Attachment C), and stated that the committee is considering a resolution to empower the Faculty Senate to elect the faculty representative to the NCAA and the ACC. Senator Hare noted possible Faculty Manual violations that are being examined by this committee.

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

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**

   1) Senator Gerald Waddle reported that the Commission on Undergraduate Studies met and voted to recommend to the President and Provost that the Mid-Year Check be implemented as soon as possible. President Baron noted that the Scholastic Policies
Committee will examine a resolution from the Student Senate that would allow students to repeat two courses with the option to change the original grade.

2) Senator Vander Mey informed the Senate that the 1893 Centennial Committee is considering three items: student as citizen, student as whole person, and student as intellectual. Names of Clemson graduates who are exemplary in their areas and would be good speakers during this celebration are to be directed to Senator Vander Mey.

3) Senator Vander Mey reported that the Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee is discussing how salary adjustment procedures could be improved in the future.

4) Senator Schaffer stated that the Joint City/University Committee discussed the issue of conflict between the business activities of the University and the business activities of the businessmen in Clemson.

5. **President’s Report.** President Baron discussed the President’s Report (Attachment D), and particularly noted that the Budget & Control Board is now preparing for next year’s budget. If things go forward as is, Clemson University would face an additional minimum six million dollar reduction based on this year’s budget. President Baron further stated that if Freshman enrollment is limited next year, he understands that there would be a reduction of two million dollars. The budget picture does not look much better than this year, and could possibly be worse.

6. **Old Business**

   a. Senator Bridges submitted and explained results of a review by the *ad hoc* Committee on Graduate Studies (Attachment E). Senator Schaffer moved that the Faculty Senate accept this Review. Vote for acceptance was taken, and passed unanimously.

7. **New Business**

   a. Senator Gary Wells presented the issue of course selection priorities, and suggested that this policy be evaluated by the Scholastic Policies Committee for review. After discussion, President Baron referred this issue to the Scholastic Policies Committee. Any information concerning this topic should be directed to Senator Schaffer.

   b. Senator Hare brought to the floor proposals to amend the Constitution (Attachment F) regarding standing committees, the Executive Committee, and the Grievance Board. Following an explanation of each recommendation, vote to accept recommendations was taken and passed unanimously.

   c. Senator Hare submitted two proposed *Faculty Manual* changes (Attachment G) for consideration. Following a discussion of the change regarding composition of the Commission on Graduate Studies, Senator Vander Mey moved to table the issue which was seconded. Vote to table was taken, and passed. This issue will be re-considered by the Policy Committee. Senator Hare provided information regarding the description of the Fine Arts Committee. Vote to accept this change was taken, and passed unanimously.

   d. Senator Richard Rice submitted a Resolution on Mid-Year Check Suspension and Dismissal by the Academic Council (Attachment H) which was seconded. After the history of this topic was provided, the vote was taken. This resolution was unanimously passed by the Senate (Attachment I) (FS92-10-1P).
e. Senate Alternate Leigh sought information regarding the recent altercations on campus, and asked if levels of security had been lessened due to budget cuts. Senator Vander Mey responded, and provided the names of Thea McCrary and John McKenzie for more information.

f. President Baron announced that the seminar, "Institutional Private Revenues and Their Uses" with Gary Ransdell, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, will be on Thursday, November 5, 1992 at 3:30 p.m. in the Nancy Thurmond Room of the Thurmond Institute.

President Baron informed the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate of a meeting on Thursday, October 15, 1992 at 8:00 a.m. in the Provost's Office to discuss special admissions.

g. Senator Mary Lynn Moon informed the Senate of two Library issues: the improvement of the recall process (any suggestions may be directed to Senator Moon); and that the Anti-vandalism Committee of the Clemson University Libraries is conducting a major campaign to keep food, drink, and tobacco out of the Library. Patrons of the Library are asked to please adhere to this policy.

8. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

Lucy Rollin, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Senators Absent: H. Allen, W. Owens (L. Duke attended)
WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT

For meeting held September 22, 1992.
3:30-5:15 p.m.; LL3 Cooper Library.

1. In early July, Senator Vander Mey requested that all Department Heads fill out a modified Form 2 so that workload distributions could be studied. This request was sent through Provost Jennett’s office. The response rate is too low for an informed response to the SACS recommenda
tion that there be a "clear written policy" regarding workloads. Senator Vander Mey sent a note to Provost Jennett asking him to remind the Deans of the importance of this matter. Provost Jennett has done so. The Welfare Committee anticipates making its response to SACS at its (the Welfare Committee’s) next meeting.

2. The Committee passed the following resolution as a proposed addition to

   the Faculty Manual:

   "All personnel matters are confidential and matters of trust. Persons responsible for current, pending, and future personnel decisions/matters are required to restrict revelation of their opinions, the deliberations of personnel committees, the decisions and deliberations of others also charged with personnel matters and decisions, and so on, to only those directly involved in these matters."

   This change would become the new second paragraph on p. 25, under the heading "Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure and Promotion." As such, that would then make the existing second paragraph the new third paragraph, the existing third paragraph the new fourth paragraph, and so on.

   NOTE:ALTHOUGH NO OFFICIAL VOTE WAS TAKEN, THIS RESOLUTION WAS KILLED IN THE LAST MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE/ADVISORY COMMITTEE. One person apparently perceived this change as denying candidates right of access to their files. Another person did not like the way the second sentence was written. THE CHAIR OF THE WELFARE COMMITTEE REQUESTS THE FOLLOWING:

   a.) That all Senators recognize the need to make it explicit - in the Faculty Manual - that personnel matters are confidential and matters of trust. Those of us responsible for these matters must maintain this confidentiality;

   b.) That those individuals who have criticized the proposal as it was passed by the Welfare Committee now help create a statement that they find more to their liking yet still gets done what needs to be done (i.e., make this matter explicit);

   c.) That the Faculty Senate give consideration to the proposal as it was passed by the Welfare Committee, suggesting changes as you see fit.

It is the opinion of the Welfare Committee that a change such as this must be made - and must be made soon. We appreciate your comments and help with this matter.
3. Several individuals had requested that the Committee conduct a morale study of the faculty. The Committee perceived it to be too soon after the release of the Faculty Survey to get a reliable reading. However, it was felt that a study that specifically measures morale might be feasible in about six months. The Chair called David Fleming to discuss this issue and to see if his office had morale scales and instruments that had been tested for validity. Fleming indicated that all Clemson Faculty will have an opportunity to participate in the nation-wide UCLA Faculty Survey. (Clemson also participated a few years ago.) This survey has the advantage of giving us a comparative view on our faculty opinions and morale issues. The Survey should be distributed early next semester.

David Fleming agreed to let the Welfare Committee preview this Survey, and suggest some specific "local" questions if they seem necessary.

The Welfare Committee encourages all Senators to make their constituents aware of this Survey. Please encourage full faculty participation.

4. The narrative for the salary patterns ($50,000+) was edited and appears as Attachment A.

5. Senator Rathwell is reviewing the Business & Finance Productivity Study.

6. Senator Vander Mey submitted some questions to USA WEEKEND for their upcoming special on health dangers in the 1990s. Her questions revolved around office environments and potential health hazards in buildings with closed HVAC systems and inoperable windows. The special issue of USA WEEKEND is scheduled for the first Sunday in January. (This news magazine appears as a supplement to the Sunday edition of the Anderson-Independent Mail.) Based on the call for questions from readers, it appears that the editors of this magazine have hired a panel of experts to address an array of health issues confronting us in the 1990s.

7. The Committee discussed its responsibility to respond to morale issues and concerns. Several ideas were shared. This included sending an open letter to all faculty. While this was considered a good idea, the exact content was not articulated. However, it was agreed that the Committee should meet with members of Student Government and the Graduate Student Association to get their views on morale concerns among their constituents, and to find any common ground. While one individual voiced displeasure with this at the Executive/Advisory Committee meeting, the Welfare Committee strongly believes that they should respect this part of their charge. We welcome any suggestions that you and your constituents might have.

8. The next meeting of the Welfare Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, October 23, 1992, at 3:30 p.m. in LL3, Cooper Library. There are three main agenda items: Responding to the SACS recommendation regarding workloads; Responding to the Goals and Benchmarks; and, Morale Concerns/Issues.

For data reduction purposes, positions were classed as follows: professor, college, directors, president/vice-president, and, other. (See Table attached.) Given the small number of some positions within a class, the percent numerical change may not be useful (e.g., going from 0 to 4).

Excluding "other," it appears that the class professor at $50,000+ increased the most from 1987 to 1991. This class increased by 135%. Second in increase was the class directors (120%). College came in third (95.23% increase), followed by president/vice president, with an increase of 44.4% in this salary category.

No doubt, some of the expansion in this salary category can be attributed to raises, promotions, seniority, salary adjustments, and cost of living increases that would "push" individuals toward the $50,000+ category. The "graying" of the faculty/administration (as per the "graying" of the general population) also may be a factor. However, these data will not yield information about new hires in this category between these time points.

**Professor Class, $50.000+.** Numerically, rank professor predominated in both 1987 and in 1991, although the percentage increase in full professors making $50,000+ was only 103.45%. The average salary change for faculty of this rank was 8.13%. This salary growth contrasts with the 26.26% average salary change among named professors, the 15.70% average change among endowed chairs, and the 14.18% average change among alumni professors making $50,000+. Moreover, the average salary change for associate professors making $50,000+ declined by 6.33% from 1987 to 1991. This decline may be associated with the tremendous increase (from 4 to 57, or 1,325%) in associate professors at this salary rank.

**College Class, $50.000+.** According to the available figures, associate deans numbered three in 1987 and none in 1991. Since 1987, the number of assistant deans has increased by three and the various categories of department head/some faculty rank (excluding professor) have increased by one or two. The number of assistant department heads has increased from three to eight (collapsing subcategories of assistant department heads). There has been a 119.5% increase in the number of department head/professors making $50,000+. In 1987 there were 21; in 1991 there were 46.

From 1987 to 1991, there was a 95.23% increase in academic administrators in the salary category $50,000+. Some of this increase may be related to the growth of colleges and departments themselves. It also may be that some of this increase is attributable to the need to respond to more laws, policies, and procedures. Again, the data do not yield the reasons for the patterns.
Overall, the average salary change in the dean/professor rank increased (24.63%) the most during these time periods. The second highest average change increase in salary was found among acting department acting head/professors (24.34%), followed by department head/professors (18.07%), assistant department head/professors (16.75%), department head/lecturers (11.48%), and then by assistant deans (10.41%). Increases could not be calculated for some categories within the class college because these positions were not in existence at this salary level in 1987.

Directors Class. $50,000+. This is the class with the second highest rate of overall numerical increase (120%; from 25 to a total of 55). As the table illustrates, several new categories of director paid $50,000+ have emerged since 1987. No category of director has seen a decline in average yearly salary from 1987 to 1991. Furthermore, academic directors paid $50,000+ increased by 700% (from 2 to 16). In addition, while no nonacademic director positions at $50,000+ existed in 1987, there were 11 such positions by 1991.

President/Vice Presidents Class. $50,000+. This class has seen a numerical increase of 44.44% (from 18 to 26 positions). This increase is concentrated at the associate vice president rank, which grew by 8 positions (160%).

In this class, the largest average salary change was in the position of president (32.61%), followed closely by associate vice president (30.76%), and then by executive assistant to the president (29.48%), vice president (28.93%), vice provost (21.46%), and last by provost/vice president (18.96%).

Other Class. $50,000+. In this class, the greatest increase for the salary category was among athletic coaches (340%). In 1987, CU had five coaches in this salary category; by 1991 there were 17. However, the average salary change for persons in this class and salary category declined by 4.8% - perhaps for reasons similar to the decline in yearly average salary among comparably paid associate professors. A similar decline is shown for student extension leader/associate professor, which grew from one to four positions in this salary category while evidencing a 6.44% decline in average salary.

This class also reveals an increase in positions paying $50,000+ (e.g., data processing manager, engineering associate, supervisor of grants, and so on). Again, it is not possible to discern whether these positions existed before 1987, but in a lower salary rank - or if these positions were created between 1987 and 1991 at this higher salary rank.

**SUMMARY**

No class in the $50,000+ salary category evidenced an overall numerical decrease nor overall decrease in yearly average salary, though some decreases are to be found within some of the classes. These within-class exceptions (e.g., associate professors and athletic coaches) tend to have grown substantially in numbers, thus probably depressing the average salary figure for the entire rank.
In absolute numbers, the greatest increase in persons making $50,000+ was professors (by 150 persons; or, 103.45%), followed by associate professors (by 53 persons, or 1,325%). The largest decline was among directors/non specified, from 10 to 2, followed by associate deans (from three to none). For positions existing in both 1987 and 1991, the greatest average salary change was among director/non specified ($30,862; 47.57%), followed by the president ($28,998; 32.61%). The greatest average salary decrease ($3623, or 6.33%) was among associate professors, followed by athletic coaches ($3155, or 4.8%). These average salary decreases are probably a function of the numerical increases in these ranks. (Note: Salary decrease among student extension leader/associate professor is less notable because of the small absolute increase, from one to four, in that category.)

It is important to note that this report focuses only on positions paying $50,000+.

In all classes, seemingly "new" positions have appeared in the $50,000+ range. Some of these positions probably existed before 1987, but in a different salary range (e.g., associate professors). It is not possible to discern how many of these positions were "created" in this salary range from 1987 to 1991. The Committee attempted to unravel this question by comparing organizational charts from 1988 and 1991. However, the charts were not fully comparable and information was missing from some units.

The Committee has suggested some possible factors that may have prompted the salary patterns discerned herein (e.g., promotions, "pushing," aging/seniority). The reader may wish to offer other reasons for these patterns. The Committee welcomes your input.

Attachment: Salary Groupings by Selected Classes, $50,000+
## SALARY GROUPINGS BY SELECTED CLASSES ($50,000 AND UP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GROSS</td>
<td>AVER</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>GROSS</td>
<td>AVER</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>576090</td>
<td>57609</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1184041</td>
<td>65780</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Prof</td>
<td>228918</td>
<td>57230</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3055571</td>
<td>53607</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>876726</td>
<td>54795</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof</td>
<td>296085</td>
<td>74021</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>513857</td>
<td>85643</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52907</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>185208</td>
<td>61736</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chair</td>
<td>225889</td>
<td>56472</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>481303</td>
<td>60163</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52907</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>185208</td>
<td>61736</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named Prof</td>
<td>582656</td>
<td>58266</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1250579</td>
<td>73563</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52907</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>185208</td>
<td>61736</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Dean</td>
<td>196993</td>
<td>65664</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td>4555</td>
<td>10.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Dean</td>
<td>52408</td>
<td>52408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52408</td>
<td>52408</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst To The</td>
<td>67509</td>
<td>75168</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1030528</td>
<td>93684</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Prof</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>184797</td>
<td>65999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act DH/Assoc</td>
<td>110939</td>
<td>55470</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>112293</td>
<td>56147</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH/Prof</td>
<td>189141</td>
<td>63047</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>294399</td>
<td>73610</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act DH/Assoc</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>245479</td>
<td>61370</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH/Assoc Prof</td>
<td>172410</td>
<td>57470</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>320334</td>
<td>64067</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH/Prof</td>
<td>1406019</td>
<td>66953</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3636275</td>
<td>79049</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Dir/Lect</td>
<td>115060</td>
<td>57530</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115060</td>
<td>57530</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Dir</td>
<td>264680</td>
<td>66170</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>461258</td>
<td>76876</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Dir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>158350</td>
<td>52783</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Ext Dir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>622821</td>
<td>56620</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir/Non Academ</td>
<td>113742</td>
<td>56871</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1040410</td>
<td>65026</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir/Academ</td>
<td>648820</td>
<td>64882</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>191488</td>
<td>95744</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir/Prof</td>
<td>111615</td>
<td>55808</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>199235</td>
<td>66412</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist Ext Dir/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57185</td>
<td>57185</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof</td>
<td>314891</td>
<td>62978</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>535932</td>
<td>66992</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES/VP'S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc VP</td>
<td>267712</td>
<td>53542</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>910151</td>
<td>70012</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst VP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69206</td>
<td>69206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec Asst To</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88917</td>
<td>88917</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>117915</td>
<td>117915</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov/VP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108250</td>
<td>108250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Prov</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>321449</td>
<td>80362</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/VP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>381080</td>
<td>76216</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>Lowest Salary</td>
<td>Highest Salary</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Change in Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ext. Ldr/Assoc P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61710</td>
<td>61710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supv. Grants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53597</td>
<td>53597</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>53597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sys. Mgr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>162140</td>
<td>54047</td>
<td>39837</td>
<td>24.50%</td>
<td>40193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu. Aff./Stu. Ser</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>214093</td>
<td>53523</td>
<td>32114</td>
<td>15.13%</td>
<td>20439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Selected Volumes, Office of Institutional Research, Clemson University
Finance Committee

October Meeting, 1992

SUMMARY OF CU E & G FUNDS REDUCTION PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Revised cut per Supreme Court ruling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Center Reductions</th>
<th>$2,260,384</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Student Fees</td>
<td>554,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Indirect Cost Recoveries</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMET FY 1992-93</td>
<td>(580,021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary savings (Oct. raises, etc.)</td>
<td>162,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility savings (mild summer)</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. adjustments*</td>
<td>242,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,179,586</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Items such as Auxiliary Surcharge, Performance Credits, and Fringe Benefits.

PSA Deficit to be covered by programs, details not publicly available at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Center Reductions</th>
<th>$ 600,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest and Recreation Resources</td>
<td>117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory and Public Service Programs</td>
<td>97,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and Poultry Health Program</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Budget Center Reductions</td>
<td>423,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,723,513</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Committee Report  
October 13, 1992

The Policy Committee met with Dean Thomas M. Keinath on September 15 to discuss the interpretation of the Faculty Manual with regard to a department head holding an endowed chair. Dean Keinath would like to combine the search for a Department Head of Environmental System Engineering with the search for an endowed professorship in hazardous waste management. There are currently two faculty vacancies, one of which the department wants to fill with a junior person. The departmental faculty see this as an opportunity to bring in a truly outstanding person in hazardous waste management as department head. There are currently no faculty in this area. The department head will be expected to both teach and do research. The committee will attempt to draft a proposal for a Faculty Manual change that addresses this situation.

The committee unanimously recommended an addition to the Faculty Manual to allow the Dean of the Graduate School to request the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate to appoint up to two additional women or minority faculty members to the Commission on Graduate Studies.

The committee discussed a proposal that administrators be eligible to serve on Faculty Senate. The committee was unanimous in opposing administrators serving on Faculty Senate, but would consider it appropriate for department chairs, who are elected by the faculty and subject to recall by the faculty, to serve on Faculty Senate.

The support given by administrators for Faculty Senate service was discussed. The possibility of an exit interview for Faculty Senators will be considered. (What incentives/support did you receive for your service? What credit were you given? Was it reflected in your annual evaluation? etc.)

Some members of the Board of Trustees asked questions about the Faculty Survey at the breakfast September 12. Board members were observed to have copies of the Findings of the Faculty Survey with them. Since so much interest was shown, President Baron will be requested to invite the Board of Trustees to meet with the Policy Committee to discuss the mechanics of the survey. This invitation should be extended through President Lennon.

The committee gave final approval to recommendations to amend the Constitution that:

- Add the word "standing" to the heading "Section 5. Committees."
- Add the Executive Committee to "Section 5. Standing Committees."
- Move the Grievance Board to its own section: "Section 8. Boards."
- Expand the membership from seven to eight members, and enlarge the pool from which members may be elected to include former members of the Faculty Senate

A list of Violations of the Faculty Manual is being prepared. Information is being gathered on several possible violations and letters are being sent requesting information pertaining to search committees. A form is being constructed, having a place for the signature of the chair of the search committee. This form will be submitted to Provost Jennett for his approval. We hope that such a form will decrease the number of appointments without a proper search.

A substitution for the current description of the Fine Arts Committee, which was unanimously proposed by the Fine Arts Committee, was approved by the Policy Committee:

All present favored a resolution giving the Faculty Senate the authority to elect the faculty representative to the NCAA. Such a resolution has been drafted.

The October 6 meeting of the committee is cancelled. The next meetings of the committee will be October 20 (3 p.m., LL8 Cooper Library) and November 17 (3 p.m., Library Conference Room).
PRESIDENT’S REPORT
OCTOBER, 1992

1. The budgetary crisis is for real. People will be laid off in Extension. Cuts in services, labor, supplies, travel, etc. are real in the Colleges. But the worst may be yet to come. Next year, the state budgetary situation certainly looks no better and is likely to be more critical. Dr. Lennon suggested to the Deans that they invite Mr. Paul Michaud over to discuss options for savings. I suggested that if such meetings are held, that faculty representatives be invited to participate. Please advise me as to whether your college holds meetings on cost containment and if and how faculty are invited to participate.

The budgetary crisis is for real. I believe faculty can contribute, if they choose to do so, to develop the schemes that are necessary to carry us through the tight times. This will, however, require that we ask questions about our departmental and college budgets. As per the word we received from the President and the Provost, the budget information is ours. If you can’t get it, advise the Senate.

2. We formed an ad hoc Committee of the Senate to consider women’s issues on the campus. The Committee proposed to Dr. Lennon that he create a Presidential Commission on the Status of Women at Clemson. He has agreed to do so.

3. At the request of the President of the University, the Provost has established an ad hoc group “to study the specific issues addressed in the recently distributed report, “Findings of the Faculty Survey, August 1992.” The Committee members include: Eugene Bishop, Joel V. Brawley, Jr., Elizabeth B. Galloway, Dixie Goswami, Gene Haerting, and Cecilia Voelker.

4. The Review Committee for the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence has been appointed by the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate. Members of this Committee include: Provost Charles Jennett, Dixie Goswami, Joel Brawley, Lloyd Blanton, Don McKale, Arlene Privette. The alternate has not yet been appointed.

5. At a Provost’s Council meeting, the Provost asked the deans if they would like to have their faculty meet with the Provost to discuss the results of the Faculty Survey. I suggested that he might ask the Faculty Senators of a given college to arrange such meetings. He left it up to the Deans. If the senators of a college sense that their colleges want a meeting with the Provost, let me suggest that you arrange it.

6. Attached is a proposal offered to the Deans by Dr. George Carter, Jr., Director of Undergraduate Academic Services. The proposal was, in theory, endorsed by the Provost’s Council which asked Dr. Carter for more information.

7. Attached is a proposal from the Graduate School to increase fees for non-resident graduate students. The proposal is being made to stave off a penalty in the formula for institutions not charging a fee differential to non-resident graduate students. USC has, as a result, initiated a differential fee structure for graduate students.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Charles Jennett, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs

THRU: Dr. J. V. Reel, Senior Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies

FROM: George E. Carter, Jr., Director of Undergraduate Academic Services

RE: The First Class Program

By this memorandum I am suggesting that Clemson University begin a new program, called The First Class, to provide academic support to entering freshmen.

All accepted freshmen would be invited to join The First Class by way of a mailing subsequent to their notices of acceptance. For a fee of $225.00, plus regular tuition and academic fees, First Class participants would enter second summer session and enroll in their first English or mathematics courses, University Success Skills, and possibly an appropriate developmental studies course. A proctored study hall complete with English and mathematics tutors would be provided for four nights per week.

Additionally First Class students will complete the College Student Inventory, a Noel/Levitz retention management instrument, and will discuss the results of this inventory and their academic and social transition to college in weekly meetings with an academic advisor. All students will be referred to Career Planning during this summer session.

Benefits to students will include easier transition to college life, a supportive environment in which to complete their first five or six college credits, an improved awareness of career opportunities, and a head start toward graduation. Benefits to the University will include additional summer session revenues, less pressure for fall enrollment in English, mathematics, University Success Skills, and developmental studies, and better service to our students.

I will anxiously await your thoughts about the First Class Program. Please contact me if you need additional information.

GEC/CSR
Increasing Fees for Non-resident Graduate Students

1. Why is it being considered?
CHE established a penalty in the formula for institutions not charging fee differential to non-resident graduate students. The penalty will be partial for 1993-4 and full in 1994-5.

2. How much difference should we charge?
- CHE recommended 2.5 times the fee for residents.
- USC has implemented 2 times resident fee.
- Suggestion for Clemson: 2 times resident fee.

3. Who will be exempt from the extra fee?
- Residents of SC
- Graduate Assistants
  Minimum stipend $1000 per semester or $2600 per year
- Graduate Fellows
  Minimum award $1000 per academic year or $1300 per full year
- Academic Common Market students
- Grandfathered students
  Enrolled during the 6 years prior to August, 1993
- Other special cases

4. How many non-residents would be exempt from the extra fee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>Non-US</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag Sc</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; I</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F &amp; RR</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib Arts</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nur</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>678</strong></td>
<td><strong>477</strong></td>
<td><strong>1155</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers based on 1992 Graduate Assistants and Fellows
5. How many non-residents may be subject to the extra fee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>Non-US</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cr≥12</th>
<th>for Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag Sc</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; I</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F &amp; RR</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nur</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Of the 829 who may be subject to the extra fee, what are the likely outcomes? (Analysis based on survey.)

- Non-residents, non-assistants and non-fellows: **829**
  - Internationals: 314
  - Known residents of neighboring states: 100
    - Number definitely affected: 414
    - Number remaining for consideration: 415
      - Have become residents: 95
      - Likely to become residents: 70
      - Now or potential residents: 165
  - Number not likely to become residents: 250
- Minimum number who must pay: 414
- Maximum number who must pay: 664

Assumption: 400 will come and pay the extra fee

7. What is the estimated impact of implementation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 93-94</th>
<th>FY 94-95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formula Revenue (reduction)</td>
<td>$1,307,740</td>
<td>$2,943,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Revenue</td>
<td>$292,026</td>
<td>$292,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,599,766</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,235,177</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. How will we compare with other graduate schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-resident</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC State</td>
<td>$1,324</td>
<td>$7,908</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga Tech</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>6,531</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>2,948</td>
<td>5,896</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>4,084</td>
<td>5,794</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>5,757</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>2,762</td>
<td>5,524</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>4,899</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How should we proceed?

A. Decide if this is what we want to do.
B. Begin the process of gaining appropriate approvals.
C. Communicate with faculty and staff.
D. Communicate with graduate students.
   • Will not impact them.
   • Reasons for extra fee.
   • Estimate of impact.
E. Communicate with the public.
   • Why we are adding extra fee.
   • Why we have not charged the fee in the past.
   • Explain the impact:
     Clemson University
     Students from neighboring states and
     International students

AWB & FBB: 10/5/92
Date: September 29, 1992

To: Faculty Senators

From: Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Studies Issues
      William C. Bridges, Jr.
      Eleanor Hare
      Alan Schaffer

Re: Policies from Commission on Graduate Studies

The two attached policies were drafted last academic year by the Commission on Graduate Studies. We have reviewed these policies and believe they are ready for discussion by the full Senate.

/Attachments
March 25, 1992

TO: Members of the Clemson University Commission on Graduate Studies

FROM: Graduate Studies Advisory Committee of the University Commission on Graduate Studies

SUBJECT: Policy on Student Evaluation of Graduate Instruction

Clemson University recognizes the importance of effective teaching in the education of graduate students. Furthermore, the University recognizes that constructive evaluation may play a positive role in promoting and building effective teaching methods. It also recognizes that graduate education differs in significant ways from undergraduate education, and therefore that the requirements for effective graduate teaching may differ from those for effective undergraduate teaching.

In particular, the University distinguishes the following characteristics of graduate education and their relation to course evaluation:

(i) Graduate students often work individually with faculty advisors in mentor-student relationships. Feedback regarding course quality is thus often derived from close working relationships.

(ii) Graduate classes are often small, or desired to be so. Thus the statistical accuracy of any evaluation instrument may be questionable. Heavy reliance upon summary statistics of evaluation performed in such circumstances is not appropriate.

(iii) Graduate courses often deal with material which is new to the field. Consequently, material is sometimes new to both faculty and students, and formal course materials may be limited. To some students courses may seem less organized or structured. These characteristics are natural outcomes of graduate education, and should not be considered to be deficiencies in an instructor's teaching ability.

(iv) It is further recognized that formal evaluations may not always be appropriate, due to factors including small class size, cultural orientation, or specificity of research topic.

(v) In recognition of the unique characteristics of graduate education, alternate means of determining instructor effectiveness for the purpose of personnel actions should be utilized. Such alternative means include, but are not restricted to, letters from former students, peer evaluations, and participation in seminars aimed at promotion of effective teaching.

(vi) Care should be taken in the use of aggregate quantitative comparisons of evaluations among faculty and departments due to wide differences between disciplines, as well as the other factors mentioned above.
The following paragraphs set forth the University policy on student evaluation of graduate instruction. The intent of this policy is to endorse and promote constructive evaluation, while at the same time recognizing the important differences between graduate and undergraduate education, and the concerns of many faculty regarding academic freedom and privacy.

1. The University directs that specific evaluation processes be established and administered in a manner specified by the colleges. All evaluations are to be administered in a manner consistent with points (i) through (vi) above. All evaluation policies shall be documented and promulgated throughout each college.

2. No one evaluation instrument can adequately serve all disciplines. Colleges may utilize a university-supplied, scientifically prepared evaluation form if they choose. Otherwise, the forms used for evaluations may be developed by individual colleges or departments.

3. Results of any evaluations are confidential to the course instructor. Submission of evaluations for the purposes of tenure and promotion is the sole discretion of the instructor.
TO: Members of the Clemson University Commission on Graduate Studies  
FROM: Graduate Studies Advisory Committee  
DATE: March 23, 1992  
SUBJECT: Criteria for Faculty Participation in Graduate Education

Faculty are commonly called upon to oversee research activities of graduate students, to serve on advisory committees of graduate students, and to teach graduate courses. In order to maintain quality, pursue excellence in graduate programs, and in recognition of the diversity of graduate education among disciplines, all colleges are directed to establish and maintain policy statements which specify eligibility criteria for participation in:

1. Graduate course teaching  
2. Direction of theses and dissertations  
3. Graduate student advisory and examination committees  
4. Developing graduate admission policies.

Criteria specified by the colleges can be in addition to, but must be consistent with, the university-wide criteria below:

1. Possession of a relevant terminal degree in the academic discipline or recognition of substantive and distinctive contributions to the discipline involved  
2. Evidence of current interest and involvement in scholarly research and/or creative activity in the field of expertise  
3. Demonstrated successful teaching, advising, and directing of graduate students. (For new and junior faculty, search committees must establish that professional records and interviews give the expectation that teaching, advising, and directing will be performed satisfactorily.)
Recommendation to Amend the Constitution

Presented by the Policy Committee
October 13, 1992

The Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University. Article II. The Faculty Senate. Section 5. Committees (page 59, Faculty Manual) requires that the majority of the members of all committees of the Faculty Senate shall be members of that body.

-----------------------------
Insert the word "standing" in Section 5. Committees.

Section 5. Standing Committees
The Chair-person and at least a majority ... concern.

The standing committees of the Faculty Senate shall be as follows: ...

-----------------------------
Add the Executive Committee is added to Section 5.

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.

-----------------------------
Establish a new category: Section 8. Boards. Move the Grievance board from Section 5. to Section 8 and make the underlined substantive changes.

Section 8. Boards
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 shall 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) 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 Board hears grievances brought to it in accordance with Faculty Grievance Procedure II.

Any change to the Constitution must be presented to a general Faculty meeting. A simple majority vote (of the Faculty Senate) is required for the proposed amendment to be submitted to the Faculty. The Provost shall publicize a proposed amendment at least three weeks prior to the meeting at which action is to be taken. Amendments may be considered at either of the regular Faculty meetings held at the conclusions of the long semesters. A two-thirds majority vote of the members present is required for passage. Any amendment passed by the Faculty shall become effective upon approval of the Clemson University Board of Trustees.
Rationale for
Recommended changes to the Constitution

Policy Committee
October 13, 1992

The Policy Committee recommends that, in order to have a larger pool from which members of the Grievance Board are to be selected, former members of the Faculty Senate should be eligible for election. This change will allow the Senate to choose qualified individuals who are not currently members of the Senate, but who have made substantial contributions to the work of the Senate in the past, as well as current Senators and Alternates. In order to avoid a conflict with the provision of Section 5, Committees that "a majority of the members of all committees of the Faculty Senate shall be members of that body," Section 8, Boards should be created, and the Grievance Board moved to that section.

A joint meeting of the Welfare and Policy Committees (June 30, 1992) recommended that the number of members of the Grievance Board be increased from seven to eight. The Grievance Board selects a three-person Hearing Panel to hear each complaint. An increase in the size of the Grievance Board will not change the size of the Hearing Panel. Members of the Grievance Board have expressed a need for enlarged membership.

Two other changes restrict membership on the Grievance Board to tenured faculty and designate the method for filling temporary vacancies.

In Section 5, Committees, the committees listed are referred to as "standing committees." For clarity, and to differentiate these committees from Section 7, Permanent Committees, the Policy Committee recommends inserting the word "standing" in the heading Section 5, Committees, to read Section 5, Standing Committees.

Although the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate meets regularly with the Advisory Committee, the Constitution does not recognize its existence. Therefore, the Policy Committee recommends the addition of the Executive Committee to Section 5, Standing Committees.
Dr. Farrell Brown, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, met with the Policy Committee to discuss the problem of imbalance in the subcommittees of the Commission on Graduate Studies, due to an insufficient number of women and minority faculty elected to the Commission.

The Policy Committee unanimously recommended the following addition to the Faculty Manual:

The following statement is to be inserted on page 44 of the Faculty Manual under 2. The Commission on Graduate Studies:

If it is necessary to increase representation by minorities and/or women, the Dean of the Graduate School may, at his or her discretion, request that the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate appoint up to two additional women or minority faculty members to the Commission. These special appointees may be from any college which offers graduate degrees, but if two members are appointed, they shall be from different colleges.
Policy Committee Recommendation
to amend
the Faculty Manual

October 13, 1992

The following substitution for the current description of the Fine Arts Committee (page 49, Faculty Manual) was unanimously proposed by the Fine Arts Committee and approved by the Policy Committee:

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 advice 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 elected 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.
RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL’S POSTPONEMENT OF THE MID YEAR (DECEMBER) CHECK FOR SUSPENSION/DISMISSAL

Whereas, the Academic Council recently voted 10 to 8 to postpone implementation of the December check for determination of whether a student is subject to suspension/dismissal on academic grounds, and

Whereas, the December check is an integral, inseparable part of the 1990 revision of the continuing enrollment policy arrived at after lengthy study by faculty, students and administrators - including the Faculty Senate, the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Academic Council -- and represents a compromise “package” in which the December check was counterbalanced by adoption of generally more “compassionate” GPR versus credit level criteria as well as a liberal “escape clause” (2.2 GPR in the most recent semester), and

Whereas, postponement of the December check without concomitant reversion back to the pre-1990 policy amounts to a drastic lowering of the academic standards required for continuing enrollment, and

Whereas, it is believed that the Deans voting for postponement of the December check may have been inadequately informed on the issue and/or unduly influenced by unsubstantiated information alleged to exist in what has come to be called “The Mayfield Report”,

Resolved, that the Administration should reject the recent advisory recommendation of the Academic Council that the December check be suspended.
QUESTIONS FOR PROVOST CHARLES JENNETT
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1992

1. What academic units are responsible for equipping classrooms? How would you characterize the quality of Clemson classrooms? How many classrooms have you visited since becoming Provost? Are supplies adequate to teach classes at Clemson?

2. What percentage of Clemson's recent $101 million fund-raising campaign will be devoted to teaching? To what use will the remaining income be put?

3. How do you insure that good teaching is rewarded at the departmental level, that research is not privileged over teaching in annual evaluations? Do you favor a department being able to limit qualified students (e.g. non-majors who have taken a courses's prerequisites) from taking its courses?

4. In your opinion, is there a lower percentage of non-tenure track faculty in the classroom today than when our strategic planning process began? What plans have you made to improve the undergraduate program?

5. What is the rationale for using E&G money to bail out TIWET, a nonacademic unit?

6. What is your response to the perception among many faculty that academic search procedures as outlined in the Faculty Manual have not always been followed in the hiring of academic administrators? What constitutes a waiver of affirmative action, how is it accomplished, and how can it be defended at a time when we need to hire more black men and women faculty and more women administrators? What can you do to insure that faculty and administrators follow the procedures in the Faculty Manual?

7. Apparently, all new grant proposals are now required to include a budget request for 25% of the principal investigator's academic year salary. This is not permitted under NSF guidelines (see the attached excerpt from the NSF application guide), and is routinely disallowed by NIH. These budget requests may result in adverse peer reviews for those proposals submitted to agencies which do not normally fund academic year salaries. Would it not be in the University's best interest to encourage such requests but to leave the final decision to the principal investigator, his or her department head, or the individual colleges?

8. In today's stringent fiscal climate, the payback to the administrative units from sponsored research is bound to make a difference. Many faculty feel that this payback has taken precedence over the academic value of the research. In your view, is there any way to prevent the commercialization of an endeavor that should have academic aims?

9. In the Greenville News, you are quoted thus: "At Clemson, we are going from being a college where we teach the original thoughts of others to being a university where we generate original thoughts and teach them quickly." Were you quoted correctly, and if so, do you really believe that the research this quote implied is the most desirable? Have your responses to the Faculty Senate Survey been accurately reported in the media?

10. What procedures do you think ought to be put in place so that the Faculty Senate and the Provost can work together harmoniously in the future?

(Over for Attachment to Number 7)
Equipment proposals should include the information described above within the 15-page project description. These normally compete with proposals for research or education projects. Some instrumentation programs have special guidelines for support of equipment that may include special cost-sharing or other requirements. See individual program solicitations or announcements for specific requirements.

Proposals to the Directorate for Engineering

Proposals for consideration by the Directorate for Engineering should, within the 15-page project description, include a separate section that describes the impact of the proposed research. This section should discuss potential new discoveries or advances that are expected as a result of the research, and the specific contributions the proposed work will make toward expanding or developing the knowledge and technology base. Reviewers will be asked to provide specific comments on this aspect of the research. The likelihood that the proposed research will lead to new discoveries or fundamental advances in the knowledge or technology base will be an important criterion on which Engineering program staff will base its decision on whether to support a particular proposal.

Proposals Involving Vertebrate Animals

For proposals involving the use of vertebrate animals, sufficient information should be provided within the 15-page project description to allow for evaluation of the choice of species, number of animals to be used, and any necessary exposure of animals to discomfort, pain, or injury. Check the box on page one of the cover sheet indicating that the research involves vertebrate animals. All proposals involving Vertebrate animals must have approval from the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) before funding. NSF recommends inclusion of this approval form with the submission of the proposal.

Bibliography

A bibliography of pertinent literature is required. Citations must be complete (including full name of authors, title and location in the literature).

Biographical Sketches

(Limited to 2 Pages per Investigator)

The following information is required for all senior personnel:

A. Vitae, listing only academic essentials and investigator mailing address.

B. List of up to 5 publications most closely related to the proposed project and up to 3 other significant publications, including those being printed. Patents, copyrights, or software systems developed may be substituted for publications. Do not include additional lists of publications, invited lectures, etc. Only the list of up to 10 will be used in merit review.

C. List of persons, other than those cited in the publication list, who have collaborated on a project or a book, article, report or paper within the last 48 months; otherwise, “None”.

D. Names of each investigator’s own graduate and postdoctoral advisors.

The information provided in C and D is used to help identify potential conflicts or bias in the selection of reviewers.

For equipment proposals, provide the following for each auxiliary user:

A. Short biographical sketch

B. List of up to 5 publications most closely related to proposed acquisition.

For the personnel categories listed below, the proposal may include information on exceptional qualifications of the individuals that merit consideration in the evaluation of the proposal.

A. Postdoctoral associates

B. Other professionals

C. Students (research assistants)

Budget

(NSF Form 1020)

Unless a particular program brochure provides otherwise, each proposal must contain a budget for each year of support requested and a cumulative budget for the full term of requested NSF support. The budget format (Appendix V) may be reproduced as needed. Locally produced versions may be used, but do not make substitutions in prescribed budget categories. The proposal may request funds under any of the categories listed so long as the item is considered necessary to perform the proposed work and is not precluded by specific program guidelines or applicable cost principles. In addition to the forms, the proposal should include up to 3 pages of budget justification. The need for each item should be explained clearly.

Salaries and Wages

Policies: As a general policy, NSF recognizes that salaries of faculty members and other personnel associated directly with the project constitute appropriate direct costs and may be requested in proportion to the effort devoted to the project. NSF regards research as one of the normal functions of faculty members at institutions of higher education. Compensation for time normally spent on research within the term of appointment is deemed to be included within the faculty member’s regular institutional salary. Grant funds may not be used to augment the total salary or rate of salary of faculty members during the period covered by the term of faculty appointment or to reimburse faculty members for consulting or other time in addition to a regular full-time institutional salary covering the same general period of employment. Exceptions may be considered for classes or for administrative work done at overload (see GPM 511).
"INSTITUTIONAL PRIVATE REVENUES AND THEIR USES"

WITH

GARY A. RANSDELL

VICE PRESIDENT FOR INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1992
3:30 P.M.

NANCY THURMOND ROOM
STROM THURMOND INSTITUTE
1. What academic units are responsible for equipping classrooms? How would you characterize the quality of Clemson classrooms? How many classrooms have you visited since becoming Provost? Are supplies adequate to teach classes at Clemson?

The short answer to that is that if the classroom is retained by a college or department head as is, "this is our building, this is the College of Architecture, we want it," then they get the bill. If it's a general classroom, the Provost's Office gets the bill. There are a few notable exceptions. Environmental Systems Engineering is paying for its entire building and gets all the bills for all of its classrooms. TIWET is paying for its building and gets all the bills for all of its classrooms. Entomology pays for the Cherry Hill classroom, and we're not quite sure why. I only found out about it this morning. I'm still looking into that. The slightly longer answer is this: there are 196 classrooms on campus, 182 of which belong to and are equipped by the departments which own them. One of the quaint customs at Clemson, and you notice it when you come from another university, is a sort of sacred right to have your office, your classroom, your laboratory, and your students all in one place. No other university in the world does it. It's kind of a stupid idea and it costs us a lot of money, but it's there. It does allow for a lot of problems. The fourteen classrooms, mostly large lecture halls that belong to the Scheduling Office are essentially mine. The Scheduling Office oversees it, but somewhere along the line the Provost's Office gets the bill. Personal opinion of quality of classrooms, very highly. I got two answers back. The technical answer is the quality of Clemson's classrooms is considered to be slightly above-average for comparable universities. All classrooms are air conditioned, 61 classrooms have new or nearly new furnishings, including Bracken and Daniel. Most of the classrooms now are equipped with overhead projectors, and $150,000 has been spent in the last two years to add high-tech, computers, multi-media projections systems, to the larger lecture halls, P&A Building, Newman, McAdams, and Brackett. My personal opinion, no, they are not well-equipped. The first thing to be cut and the last one to be put back in by most of the Deans is the chalk and erasers. The College of Engineering set out some time ago to equip all of the classrooms with overhead projectors and had them all stolen, we're not sure by who. We're not sure what you do with a stolen overhead projector, but we lost quite a number of them. We've tried a lot of systems. We have talked about having a centralized system for handling this on campus that would add to the administrative structure of the campus, and even if we stole them from you, it would be counted that way, so we haven't. Are supplies adequate? If you're talking about chalk and stuff, my feeling, as I said, no. If you're asking about the supply of classrooms, the answer to that is kind of strange. The new requirement that spreads our classrooms over prime time seems to be working. At least now there are 20-30 classrooms vacant in each time period somewhere on campus. They just may not be in your area. There are two time periods, 10:00 MWF and 11:00 MWF, where there are no large classrooms. Now, we define that as 100 seats or larger.

2. What percentage of Clemson's recent $101 million fund-raising campaign will be devoted to teaching? To what use will the remaining income be put?

To be quite honest with you I had to ask Dr. Ransdell. Dr. Ransdell is coming over to talk with you all, but in one sense all but 7% of it going to teaching. I did get some data on this, though. Dr. Ransdell is coming to see you, the Faculty Senate Committee on November 5th as a committee and December 8th as the full one. If you are curious, I will give it to you. When all the goals are in, you will have 25.7 million dollars dedicated to faculty enrichment, 19.4 million
dollars to student enrichment, 22 million dollars for program and endowment (which is remarkably low for a university our size), 1.2 million dollars for library enrichment (which is terribly low), 14.6 million for teaching and research equipment, 12.4 million to new facilities and 5.8 million to annual support. If I am right and added that up which I was just doing over in the Library, over here, it works out to be about 93% of the total, in one way or another, goes to support teaching. It depends on how you define the engineering building and a few other things, student enrichment, but the remaining income, the 5 million bucks a year, about 7-8% of it is used to raise more money, and the remainder goes to a variety of things, all the way from drinks at the Faculty Senate party at the beginning of the school year on down. It is a wild variety of issues.

3. How do you insure that good teaching is rewarded at the departmental level, that research is not privileged over teaching in annual evaluations? Do you favor a department being able to limit qualified students (e.g. non-majors who have taken a courses’s prerequisites) from taking its courses?

I don’t know why I have the impression that someone wrote this question with the answer in mind. These are two totally unrelated questions. First, I don’t insure that good teaching is rewarded at the department level. It is not my job. It is the faculty’s job. The faculty get to vote on their department heads and deans every five years. Once you’re tenured there is virtually no vote on the reverse. My feeling is that we all work together on these issues, and that there is no, it’s not my job. The effort to reward good teaching falls heavily on the faculty. It is they who determine the initial steps in tenure. When I was in the College of Engineering, I saw more people denied tenure for teaching than any other single issue. The second largest, by the way, was failure to get along with their colleague, almost in a tie with bad teaching. Often, they were related. Way down on the list was research. I don’t know how it is in all the other colleges, but I do know that one very well. Most of the faculty were judged in the end on the research because most of the College of Engineering faculty were fired at the end of three years. The net result was about the same. They were almost always for bad teaching. We defined it in a variety of way. Bad results on the student evaluation, or if you taught the junior level course and found that you were getting a whole bunch of idiots from the sophomore level courses, did tend to get known. Anybody here who taught junior fluids, knows why. The second and more or less unrelated question, as far as I could tell, interestingly enough I sent that out to my staff, I got a variety of answers. Some favored it and some didn’t. I will tell you only my personal opinion. This is a departmental issue. My personal opinion is, I find it important. I do believe in the German tradition where you can, in fact, go and take courses in other programs. My post-doc was in environmental geo-chemistry. They had never, in the history of the imperial college had a civil engineer in the school of mining in environmental geo-chemistry. But they did not think it was particularly flaky - they thought I was particularly flaky. They had never seen a pair of cowboy boots. I am absolutely certain of that. I personally don’t think that one should exclude a person on the basis of race, color, or creed, or major, but that’s just personal opinion. I have also noticed that wherever people start teaching, English for English students, English for Engineers, Chemistry for Chemistry, etc., automatically degrades the other courses.

4. In your opinion, is there a lower percentage of non-tenure track faculty in the classroom today than when our strategic planning process began? What plans have you made to improve the undergraduate program?

Once again, two more or less unrelated questions. The answer to the tenure-track one, that took me a while to find. The strategic planning process actually started in 1986. We actually tend to date it with the strategic planning committee meeting of 1989 which began with George Keller. It depends on how you count it. According to the IDEDS Reports filed by Clemson University in 1987-88, the full time teaching faculty non-tenured track positions was 15% of the total full time teaching faculty. The 1989 Fall Report, the non-tenured track was 17%. The last report completed by Clemson University in the Fall of 1991-92, the percentage was 15%. So, it was actually lower
at that time in 91-92 than it was in 89-90. My feeling is that there isn’t a straight answer to that. When I was dean in Engineering, we always had a fair number of people because I managed with flexibility. In the nine months since I have left, they have replaced, in electrical engineering, for example, a number of temporary with permanent people. My feeling is there are fewer people on sabbatical, that sort of thing, in the College of Engineering, right now. On the hand, the Colleges of Sciences and Liberal Arts, my feeling is that it is larger because we get them with a surprise load the first two weeks of the Fall semester. Nursing as far as I can tell is about the same as it was last year and the year before. I'm sure this is a straight answer, but within two percent the answer is about the same. To improve the undergraduate program plan - once again, I would submit to you that isn't my job. My job is to help the faculty do this, and I would hope the Senate would take a leadership role in it. There are a number of issues that we are looking at, and we would hope that you all would look at, appropriate class sizes, for different types of classes and different levels, freshman vs. senior, etc. The Commission on Higher Education made a rather startling statement yesterday when I was down there, it doesn't cost any more to teach a senior than a freshman. Well, you should hold in mind that our future is in the hands of the 33 people who spend five million dollars a year who have never, without exception, taught a college class. This is sort of like the Pope giving advice to the family. I shouldn't have said that. Another thing: revitalizing the Honors College, appropriate uses of technology, like multi-media, E-Mail, computing, television, this sort of thing. When we get the optical fiber link, in theory, we could have the world's greatest lecturer in nuclear physics, give a lecture here as easily as he or she gives a lecture in wherever they are. We could have classes of guest lecturers to talk about enzymes if you wanted to, and for all practical purposes, in the next five to six years, we would swear that human being was here, if we're willing to spend the money. It's an interesting trade-off. Setting standards for student communication skills is an area we would like to work in. Re-working the core curriculum. I'm still convinced that we can find an answer to that. Addressing the question of studying abroad and other global matters, the freshman year experience at Clemson. There are an infinite number of these things that I would like to have us working on - telecampus, equipment, optical scanning devices, better ways to grade, better ways to do tests. However, all I can do is facilitate the planning process for the academic side of this thing. But one of the strange and quaint devices around here it takes a hell of a lot of papers to become a department head, it takes a lot of research to become a dean, it takes a lot of skills in academia to get this and you are presumed not to have a part in the rest of the process. Nevertheless, we can work to find ways to work together on it. I'm interested in working with you.

5. What is the rationale for using E&G money to bail out TTWET, a nonacademic unit?

I don't know why, but I have the impression someone's already made up their mind on this one too. I should tell you that this non-academic unit has 61 full time graduate students. It teaches several thousand graduate student credit hours. Having said that, it has a larger academic program than some departments on campus. What we chose to do, when TTWET came on board, they promised not to have an academic program. Now, they have one. That was not my judgement or decision at the time, I was Dean of Engineering. They do have a program and as a result of sort of reniging on their deal, of my predecessor and me, we were a little sore and so we didn't support them. We did not pay them for student credit hours, we allowed them to pay the rent on their building, we allowed them to pay the electricity on their building, and we did not pay any expenses whatsoever, out of the academic budget. They are, as you understand, going in the red. Though I think I should put it in perspective. Total amount TTWET went in the red is 117th of Agriculture's current red. We do support other non-academic programs: dropout prevention center, a wide variety of them, alright? Should we? Beats me, but we have over the years. In TTWET's case, what we are paying is essentially the same as we pay bioengineering for an equivalent number of students. We are paying for their academic programs, I'm still not paying their rent, I'm still not paying for their chalk. I did, as a result of this, take over oversight of the budget. Agriculture no longer oversees that budget directly. My office does. We have a committee that oversees it. We did RIF twelve people, we did put a freeze on hiring, we did put a freeze on travel, and it takes 4
signatures to hire anybody and if you all feel that you need the same management control in your own colleges and departments, I will be glad to see that it is imposed. The truth of the matter is, I suppose it ought to be mentioned here, it comes up several other times. In the last analysis folks, we are a university. We are bailing them out because they are a part of the university family. We are bailing them out because we all live in a town of 10,000 people, and we all live together. We are bailing them out because it's the right thing. I think you should know, for those of you who are not into statistics, 1/2 of all colleges at Clemson University on any given year are bailed out. The other half are not. Work on it for a while, I'm sure it will come to you as to why this is a mathematical truism.

6. What is your response to the perception among many faculty that academic search procedures as outlined in the Faculty Manual have not always been followed in the hiring of academic administrators? What constitutes a waiver of affirmative action, how is it accomplished, and how can it be defended at a time when we need to hire more black men and women faculty and more women administrators? What can you do to insure that faculty and administrators follow the procedures in the Faculty Manual?

First, in spite of what you may or not think, affirmative action is not under the Provost's Office. The fellow you want to ask about this, is the Director of Human Resources. He works for Nick Lomax, and his name is Frank Mauldin. Frank says that we are really upset about three or four cases. Many of them before I came. One, is Entomology where he feels we both got sandbagged. We were told that they were in 100% agreement, that that individual should be made department head, their dean and vice president swore this was true and asked Frank to waive it. Frank, not being entirely stupid, can count 100% vote and figure out how much it costs, Frank said, if I'd waive it, he'd waive it, we'd waive it. Later on we were told that this was not right. I should tell you that while there are many faculty, because the statement says so, that are upset about the way we follow the Faculty Manual, the fact of the matter I have only been asked four times since I have been the Provost. None by Entomology. According to Frank, only in instances when time is a factor, whether there is a qualified individual for that particular position has the University not conducted a widespread recruitment effort. In the case of 85-90% of them, they are temporary employees like the type we hired in September. We're short two physics profs, we've got the physics high school and higher. Very small percentage. Only in a small percentage of time when extenuating circumstances exist and then the Provost has to make some quick decisions. We essentially follow the guidelines set forth in the Faculty Manual, Part 4, Page 24 which outlines these things. It involves filing a form 1AA1 alerting the Human Resources Dept., a form 2AA2 Information for Federal Reporting, and a form AA3. In most of the cases where faculty have been involved, we have waived it in order to hire underrepresented blacks, females, American Indians, etc. Waiving of the posting of the position under these circumstances we believe can be justified. The College of Engineering was able, using this technique, to hire 6 women, 2 African Americans, and one I'm still not sure of. We have two Hispanic faculty members, one who admits to it and one who just doesn't think it is terribly important. Those are the circumstances I know of. Frank won't swear that it hasn't happened. One of the problems we don't know how to handle, we don't have a very good system to handle it, particularly in times of tight money. Personal leave. You combine two jobs, give it to the person that exists and change the title. Should we run a nationwide search for doing that? There's a fair amount of that going on now. To be honest with you we have taken the faster, cheaper way of doing it, but I did inform Dr. Hare that in the future what I would do, in part, to answer the last of the question, we'll give them a call. I would contact the Faculty Senate. It is interesting to note that the Faculty Manual, in fact, does only address the issue of academic administrators, it does not address the issue of non-academic administrators. Through one of the peculiarities of history, the title dean can be given to almost anybody. I did ask the question, if we were more concerned about titles than substance and the impression I had was, yes. Hare: that was not the question. Jennett: I believe the question I asked was if I made the first and second most powerful persons in the Provost's Office and called them a dog catcher, would we be less inclined to protest and I had the impression that you would be. But in any case,
what we are going to try to do is work with the Faculty Senate. The objective of this thing is to have a positive affirmative action program. I very strongly believe in affirmative action programs. When you’re adopted it affects your whole attitude on this issue, I assure you. We’re going to work with you on it. My perception is that we have several problems being a small, rural southern university. Half the world really thinks our politicians represent us, so we have that problem and we need to get out and be both affirmative and active. If you are affirmative and active, I don’t care what field you are in you can eventually find women, African Americans, Spanish and American Indians. The courts of the United States, by the way, have held that South Carolina is only responsible for African Americans. I’m the Provost and I don’t agree with the Supreme Court. I think you should, in fact, find Hispanic Americans, American Indians, anybody you want. I think you will have trouble getting an Eskimo coming to our summers, but I would not object to it. My feeling is that if you get out and beat the bushes, you can find people. Our students need it. If you’re from Punkintown and you’re black you may never have seen a black woman Ph.D. in your field. That’s a crying damn shame. We just lost our one in Engineering. If I were you, I would get out and hustle because you may find that I’m more stringent at this than anybody else on campus. Baron: Have you said the same things to the deans and department heads? Jennett: Yes, but I was probably a little more graphic.

7. Apparently, all new grant proposals are now required to include a budget request for 25% of the principal investigator’s academic year salary. This is not permitted under NSF guidelines (see the attached excerpt from the NSF application guide), and is routinely disallowed by NIH. These budget requests may result in adverse peer reviews for those proposals submitted to agencies which do not normally fund academic year salaries. Would it not be in the University’s best interest to encourage such requests but to leave the final decision to the principal investigator, his or her department head, or the individual colleges?

I swear to God, I have not been able to find anybody who has heard that, other than the person who wrote the question. In any case, it is not true, never was true. It is true that every department and college does this a little bit different. When I was Dean of Engineering, I put in a rule that if you’re going to have three months in the summer and work half time during the academic year, you ought to charge as much off during the academic year as you were in the summer. But we were very flexible about this. I am a reviewer, for those of you who don’t know it, for the National Science Foundation in Chemistry, Geology, and Engineering. When I see a proposal come in that has 100% time in the summer, zero percent time during the academic year, and it’s a two year proposal, I turn it down on the grounds the investigator is too stupid to get the money. If the underlined statement in the attachment is a justification for not charging 25 cents on the dollar, someone here needs to read because the sentence above it, not underlined, reads (see attachment). I have had millions of dollars in NSF money as sole investigator and they do pay release time. I think it paid for both my children, I know it helped pay for the college of their education. It is true though that everybody does this a little differently. NIH, I know, it’s hard to get release money from. The Ford Foundation won’t pay it. But, I assure you, the National Science Foundation will. Now, you have to justify it. My personal experience has been in recent years, they have been very hard to justify large amounts of release time with. But, I believe there is one faculty member in Engineering and Science on 50% leave right now, and took their sabbaticals to do it. I agree totally (with the last part of the question). Absolutely. I just don’t agree with the first two sentences which just historically, theoretically, actually, and in real life wholy and accurate statement.

8. In today’s stringent fiscal climate, the payback to the administrative units from sponsored research is bound to make a difference. Many faculty feel that this payback has taken precedence over the academic value of the research. In your view, is there any way to prevent the commercialization of an endeavor that should have academic aims?

Two questions, really. One is, would we change the way we do business solely for the buck,
are we running a whorehouse. I would say, I hope not. I would hope that the faculty were the judge of this. I would hope that we would do only quality work. Now, I would go further and say to you, the fact that money comes from industry and has commercial value, I do not find anything wrong with that. I understand that the architects in this building would regularly require this type of work as an exhibit of their skill. I would think that that's not a bad thing for professionals to do. Engineers could do a little practice, architects could do a little practice, lawyers, doctors, whatever. I think these are, to some degree separable, but I would hope the value of the work we do, if it involves graduate students, if its new and original work, as opposed to consulting, it makes no difference to me whether it brings in large sums of money. I will tell you, personally, I think universities should help do a certain amount of research. When an engineer says research, everybody in this room thinks I am talking about funding - I am not. I'm talking about scholarship. Alright? It happens that my field of research is a very expensive field. For those of you in the room who don't know, my field is toxic and hazardous waste, treatment and an awful lot of the work I do involves nuclear waste, they're called mixed waste. The equipment is unbelievably expensive. The safety precautions are endless and the paperwork is worse. To set me up in a lab, new, today would probably cost somewhere between 1/4 and 1/2 a million dollars. Do I think the state should pay for that? The answer is no. I think I should. For the record, I have over the years. However, I was a theoretical fluid academician and all I needed was a graduate student, six yellow pads and number 2 pencils. do I think the state should help me with that? Yeah. Certainly below average costs. All you need is a little time to think, fill the pads and work with the graduate student. I think there we should pay a disproportionate amount of costs. The same thing could be if I compared a philosopher to a biochemist. Actually, I think the worst and most expensive degree we have around here right now is biochemistry. A few years ago it was organic. The price of chemical has gone up 110 % per year. I think what we are trying to do is to do scholarship. I think that is the issue.

9. In the Greenville News, you are quoted as saying: "At Clemson, we are going from being a college where we teach the original thoughts of others to being a university where we generate original thoughts and teach them quickly." Were you quoted correctly, and if so, do you really believe that the research this quote implied is the most desirable? Have your responses to the Faculty Senate Survey been accurately reported in the media?

Once again, two separable and more or less unrelated questions. First, do I really believe that we are going from being a college where we teach the thought of others to being a university where we generate original thoughts and teach them quickly? Yeah, I do. I believe that is a historic fact. In 1965, we offered our first Ph.D., in 1960 we were doing our first funded research. What do I base this on? Well, when you talk to reporters you base it on some, you don't really snap those out as much as you think. The definition of a college - self-governing body of a university offering living quarters and instruction but no degree. Please note the definition does include the word research, in any one of the 14 that were listed because I got this from Webster's. The definition of a university - an institution of higher learning providing facilities for research and teaching and authorized to give a degree. By definition, we have two of those. We are a land grant university, it isn't in Webster's New Collegiate at least not on my computer, where I got these. We have public service, we have public service because it is in the law, its our tradition, and because Mr. Clemson asked us to. In this regard, I was quoted accurately. I was not quoted completely because I had a long discourse on Newman's Discourse on Learning, a book I am reading for the second time, and they decided to leave it out because they found it as boring as I'm finding Cardinal Newman. He has lots of good ideas interspersed with very, very long chapters. It's been interesting. Actually, with the one statement, very brief statement that I thought salaries were involved, which someone wrote a letter about today and disagreed with me on it, or disagreed with the editorial, I'd have to say I've been recorded accurately, but very, very briefly. I think to sit and say that morale is high is obviously a canard, it's not true. To say that it is only salaries, is obviously not true either. To say that the budget didn't happen until after that faculty survey is also not true, based on what I got for a raise last year and the number zero comes to mind. So, as far as
I was concerned, it was affecting my morale. It is also true that it had been four years since we’ve had any kind of a decent budget around here and yes, I think it’s affecting Clemson. Space is affected. We are cramped. Until we get some of the new buildings up, we’re all cramped. We’re cramped for several reasons. One, is that frankly we have in ten years quadruped our graduate research, funded and non-funded, we’ve entered a whole lot of new programs, in every college, nursing, liberal arts, all of them. We’ve put in new programs, they have all required space and we haven’t generated a square foot of new space. The College of Engineering is underneath a water plant, for example. It’s a dubious honor but interestingly enough, one of the fellows that’s in the water plant has gotten one of the nicest grants in the history of this university. We’re very tight of space and I think that affects things. We’re tight for another peculiar reason and it’s our own doing. We are disproportionately a university of experimental research. I have no idea why. It’s quite noticeable when you come in from outside. Most scientific and engineering programs have a fairly higher percentage of theoreticians as part of the mix. We have virtually none. Engineering only in the wild sense of the thing has a few percent, whereas normally it would be about one third. It’s not being critical of those of you in the room who may be theoreticians, but as the percentage goes, it’s a fairly low number, and the kind of experimental we have done has tended to involve large projects. Part of this, I think, started or so I am told by the older faculty that the climate actually limits itself to this, the early ceramic kilns were out on the grass, people did work outside, I can’t imagine now asking someone in ceramic engineering, certainly not one of these endowed chairs, to build his kiln out on the lawn. But, actually the first kiln was built out on the lawn by a faculty member who was teaching 14 hours, was department head, and doing $100,000 a year worth of research. Go ask him, his name is Bill Robinson.

10. What procedures do you think ought to be put in place so that the Faculty Senate and the Provost can work together harmoniously in the future?

Good question. I don’t really know. It’s a two-way street. Each of us is independent and dependent on one another to do this. Each of us has to find a way that we can work together. I think picking up the phone and getting on BITNET and asking a question like, “is it true somebody on campus charged 25 percent to his time (sic)?” The answer is no so you don’t have to get terribly agitated. You don’t have to send a memo around and I suspect the rumor mill for the next 6 months will believe that, it is not true. I think what we need to do is keep an open line of communication, may be have a few more glasses of wine or coca-cola, or soda pop and talk and find ways to work together and I’m open to do it. I’ll come before you anytime you all want. It’s easier to do it if we do it quarterly or halfly or whenever convenient. I’m open for it. I met with the faculty senators as a dean, and I’ll meet with the Faculty Senate as a Provost. I don’t know all the answers, but if you give me time I can usually find out the answers, except for the 25 cents on the dollar. I’m really having a heck of a time with that one. My guess is that somewhere along the line that was a topic of a discussion by somebody, or it was used as an example, or some department head did it briefly, or something. I think we’re just kind of uptight right now. The popularity survey. I know the President read it. I know a lot of people read it around here. I know they are very interested in finding solutions to the problem. I know we are interested in finding ways to communicate and I think, very frankly that the upper administration has done a terrible job of communicating in some respects. Apparently, somebody asked Max Lennon why we hadn’t implemented the teacher awards, frankly we did that several years ago. I had a colleague win one. It’s clear we haven’t communicated that very well, because apparently, the person who asked this question was a former Faculty Senate President. We haven’t done a very good job of communicating. Baron: I think, at the time, his question was misinterpreted. Jennett: Well, one of the problems we’ve got is there is too much of that. Way too much of that. I think the best we can do is to keep talking. I’ve been doing it now for 42 minutes. Any questions?
QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR:

Rathwell: One question I have deals with communication. I’m an Ag faculty senator and have now heard 3 different figures on costs of TIWET. One by Mr. Keinath (?), one by you, and one given to us by our Provost, and about 5-6 VPs in a meeting they called to clear up the mess. You’re way low in what they told us and what the task force 3 information that was provided to us suggests. We were told out of the experiment station that probably since 1988-89 and I can give you a bit on the figures, about 1.5 million has been expended. In addition, your office provided $600,000 this year and the experiment station an additional $600,000 to bail TIWET out. That’s 1.2 which is significantly greater than the 1/7th of the total ad debt which you indicated earlier.

The very person who gave you that data when I came over here I asked him about it. My understanding there have been some flowing around and all, but we eliminated some of the positions and other things out there that is essentially 1/7th. I think we should put the rest of agriculture’s negative deal at the present time in some proportion - it’s 3.8 million dollars. If I put into that, 1/7th of that would be around $650,000 which is in fact what I’m expecting to put into it from the academic side of it.

Rathwell: That’s what you’re expecting. Does that include what the experiment station is putting in, as well?

No. It does not. And in fact it would not. From where we’re sitting, their overrun is what would come on our side of the line. I don’t the issue though is to go kick TIWET. It is a base of communication because any way you do this is mechanical. If you come to me and say, I’m spending 3 million a year, I got 2 million dollars I need a million, what’s it cost me? A million, or three million? or two million?

Rathwell: It costs you a million.

If I say it costs me a million you’re going to sit there and say it costs three million. The truth of the matter is, they are not the major problem.

Wells: But you said it was 1/7 of the agriculture’s deficit, if I’m not mistaken.

That is true.

Wells: Out of TIWET this was bailed out to the tune of 1.2 million dollars coming into this year. The Extension deficit is projected to be at the end of this current year, 1.6 million dollars.

Now there we have a difference of opinion.

Wells: That’s what its projected to be, it’s no opinion. Paul Gable projected it, Bud Webb has projected it, it’s been projected to be 1.6 million.

It’s not an argument, I will perfectly willing to sit down in public forum where I have the data and go over agriculture with you, but when you sit there and say projected, I think you should know that in June they projected a balance of zero. They only missed it by 3-4 million dollars. It’s not an argument I’m going to argue, Mr. Wells. The actual fact of the matter is that it is between 1/6 and 1/7...
Wells: Which is a three-year bailout is the way it was told to us. TTWET is provided not only to have a million base level from the experiment station, but from your side and the experiment station in the first year 75,000 each; 150,000 each the second year; 350,000 the third year to pay back the 1.2, and there is in the second and third year a 250,000 floor from each side in case they don’t come up to projection. My questions is, what are we looking at? 1 million or 2 million going back to your example. Where is

To be honest with you, I have not memorized that set of numbers you have before you, you have an advantage. You probably have an advantage over most of the people in this room. If agriculture lost 5 million dollars, and ag research was willing to sell 5 million dollars in covering it, that is their decision. From where I am sitting, it would have a zero cost.

Baron: Not being a member of Ag and being very much ignorant of the subject, I have two points for you and some of the colleagues here. One is, I think with regard to your office and to the faculty senators and faculty in Ag, I don’t think there as much controversy or confrontation as you seem to feel. I think we are sympathetic. The problem the faculty senators and the faculty in Ag have in my impression, is that they don’t feel they are getting correct, complete numbers. They are not arguing with you. They are arguing with some of the numbers that they are receiving and I think that they are looking for assistance in getting down to the bottom of this.

I’ll tell you the truth, that part of it I understand totally, the exasperation. I have had as much trouble getting that as anybody around. There is a committee, I’ll be glad if you all want to ask and we will get them sent over to you and read it. All that we know. It is a dynamic number. It’s called the Committee, anyway there is a large group of people who are looking at it. Paul Gable is now managing it. Everybody has a different set of numbers. Everybody has a set that this is what it is actually costing, when I pay back the debt, this is what is actually costing now, this is what it is actually costing if we sell the trees, and put in this, and everybody sees it along their own way. All I can tell you is when I left here I had that thing and I asked the question. I wish now I had brought the 30-something page document, complete with transparencies. I don’t think in the overall scheme of things that it is a major expense when I compare it to the other ones we have. Some of them I have not had control of. The centers that I have had control of, the Energy Center, the Dropout Center, the Center for Black Experience, etc. I have been told they have two years to operate in the black or quit, disappear, have your program terminated. Whether or not I am going to be so cruel if they get within $10,000 I don’t know. I do know that as late as January, when I made an appointment to head the Strom Thurmond Institute, it was losing a substantial sum of money, they put in a million dollars worth of grants, they got a new grant today, I heard over the phone, I haven’t seen it, $380,000 and if that is true they brought in $800,000 since February. So, my feeling is that if you stop dwelling on the negative, where the budgets are cut, why haven’t I got his money, why is this a drain on us, it reminds me of my children, he got a bigger piece of candy than I’ve got, and get on with the issue spending the supply of candy, you’re going to be in a lot better shape. In the case of TTWET whether they can pull it out or not, I don’t know. If it was a bad investment, so be it. It is true that they have to pay for their building, and until I transferred that money they did not get any money for their teaching. Had they had the money, had we been able to get it on the formula, they were not able to get the building on the formula because Ag insisted on building that building without the Commission’s deal because it would have added 6-8 months. Whatever reason Sheehen got it back up didn’t allow us to put it on the formula, so they had to pay the rent. So, it is a more expensive operation. We are trying to change that. We are trying now to go back and say they have 60 graduate students, let us put it on the building. If it does, we’d get about $190-192,000 extra money, cash flow to the building. I think you really do have a problem. I will get you with the people who do do this budget. The two people who are head of the committee now are Jerry Whitmire and Paul Gable, I think. The best I can do is tell you to get them together and see if you agree because the people who are handing me these numbers, and they do change everytime, is them.
Wells: One of the things you said in relationship to bailing out TIWET, correct me if I am wrong, that if they were part of the Clemson family, and it was the right thing to do.

I think so.

Wells: OK. What about the Extension?

I would agree, and we are set to do as much of it as we can. The fact of the matter Extension is part of the Clemson family, both emotionally and legally. They have an interesting system, they’re not our budget, but they are. The truth of the matter is even if we were to ignore the moral and ethical obligation, we would have an interesting legal one. Here’s the way public service works at any of the 54 land grant universities. If we go down, if the academic side flushes out and we lose the endowment, they cannot use public service money to bail us out. But if the reverse is true, we are obligated by law to try. Welcome to my world folks. It’s called a one-way gated system, if you’re in electrical engineering. It works this way, it doesn’t work that way. I have a very similar system in my cattle pen. We’re doing everything we can to make that budget work, and we certainly, I know that Milt and Bud and the others are trying. We have a lot of constrictors on this state who would like us to believe that our hands are open to manage our own, but in fact, we are not. I’ve got to tell you, Max is concerned. He has run a large program like this. It’s the first time for me, I never have. And I have an interesting problem when it comes to talking to accountants. Everytime I talk to the Extension accountant, I get a different number. But I’m not allowed to have the books. I don’t know if you know that or not, but I’m not allowed to see the books. You may ask me all the questions you wish, but I haven’t got an idea in hell. I know a little bit more about the Russian budget than I do that one. But I’d be willing it fast.

Behery: On the last question, this is extremely important about you said you don’t know you have some ideas because the good communication between the senate and the provost. I have a few comments on that if you sort of have the patience for me, maybe I talk funny also. The point is, I think the most important thing is to build confidence. If you have confidence in us and we have confidence with you than we build a most important bridge. For example, our acting dean give us a memo in one of the news points Mr. So and So “has been appointed” department head. The search I don’t know of, what would I do if I go to him and say “did you follow the Manual?” His answer would be, “I got permission from the Provost.”

I hope the memo you got from your acting dean, if it’s like the one I got from your acting dean, says that you have an acting department head which he appointed.

Behery: No, this is a full department head for Legal Studies. I don’t think you even have that memo. I’m just giving an example.

Baron: I’m not familiar with it.

Hassan, you’ve got me on that one. As far as I know, I have not given permission to do anything except

Behery: I’m a member of the Policy Committee and I know that the Committee talked about Jerry Whitmire, and how he was appointed, it was too long of a period since you took office in January.

Jerry Whitmire is totally different, he is not an academic appointment, I did not have to do that.

Behery: OK, that’s what I’ve been debating all the time. You said, I’m going to call in dog catcher, if you have a big position it doesn’t care what you call it as long as you call him dog catcher do this, but if that dog catcher’s responsibility is to catch the stray dog on campus and he
doesn't do his job, and then he bites me as an academic, go to hospital for a month, and the classroom doesn't have anybody, he's not a dog catcher, he's an academic.

The issue though is substance. In Jerry's case, he's an accountant to advising me, alright. He makes no academic appointments

Behery: His title, sir, is Academic and Budgets, Associate Provost for Academic and Budgets.

Hassan, you're talking about substance vs. title. But he is essentially the Senior Provost to, Academic Vice President, whatever, I don't even memorize the title, what he does is advise me on the budget. I will be glad to get his exact title and send it to you, but my memory is that he is in charge of budgets for academic administration, not academic administration of budgets.

Behery: But he makes decisions, or advises you on decisions that may affect my whole future, sir. And he's never been in a classroom, he hasn't done research, he's never been in academic activity. Yet, you present him something as advice, even for lunch, even socially, what is that you're doing, Jerry? Ah, that's bull...It affects me, sir.

Everything affects you, including the attitude of my secretary on a bad day. But, if you want me to run a full search on Hassan, I think I'll skip it. One of the problems you've got on this is where you draw the line. Where do you draw the line on academic administration and the way you all drew the line was to write it in the Faculty Manual making it an administrative, if it was for academic administration, then I had to go before you and I have agreed to do it. If it isn't, I haven't. Interestingly enough, in the case of Jerry Whitemire, it also resulted in the College of Engineering having its first woman in charge of budgeting administration. I should apologize to you, but I think I'll skip it. Whitmire's replacement was a woman for the first time in 104 years.

Schaffer: I have two unrelated questions. You said that you gave some centers two years to get in the black?

All of the centers that have reported directly to me (Drop Out Center, Energy Center, Black Experience Center, Thurmond Institute) I made an exception on STI because they are also the group that handles the speeches for us. What we are trying to do, we've asked them to prepare a budget, is to essentially become self-supporting if they promised to. Now, there are a few of them out here that I am told were never set up to become self-supporting and other of whom they have never not been self-supporting.

Schaffer: What did you say about the public service budget? Extension budget, I guess you are talking about? And you said you're not allowed to see the books?

I, as the Academic Vice President, do not see the public service books.

Schaffer: You said you are not allowed to see the books.

I have asked on occasion, and was told that it wasn't my business.

Schaffer: Who told you that?

Agriculture. Vice President Wise. I don't know why that particularly bothers you because in a very most sincere sense, it isn't my budget. They go to the state, they raise it, they match it with a federal government, and they go on. It only happens in this case that we have a problem. And I think there we are dealing once again on the negative side of this thing.

Schaffer: I'm just interested as a citizen of the State of South Carolina.
Oh, you mean, could I do it under the Freedom of Information Act? Probably.

Schaffer: So, if you want to see the budget, you can see the budget, that's all I'm asking.

Yeah, it's probably more hassle. My guess is you're probably right, Alan. I never thought about doing it that way.

Schaffer: I don't want you to. It's just that you said that you weren't allowed to and I was trying to determine who's tying your hands.

I guess I'm tying my hands.

Behery: Sometime ago we received a memo I think either from you or Provost Maxwell that from now on effective immediately nobody would be hired assistant to the dean, or whatever, and then we see this day a lot of practice of a person being appointed acting to the dean, in engineering, acting to the dean, and I think in my judgement the way we practice it, it seems like a nice loophole to get somebody acting to the dean, we don't need any search, we don't need any procedure, we don't need to go to the Manual, blah, blah, blah. All of a sudden, two ______, and they become assistant dean. How can we, the Senate, ask you kindly to watch over this, or help us solve this?

Well I wish it were a true story, but the truth of the matter is, when David Maxwell sent you that memorandum, it was in response to the State of South Carolina removing that title from one of the legal titles that we can use. Now, it is true that we can’t internally call anybody anything we want. But that title does not legally exist anymore in the State of South Carolina. Now if I have a secretary and I want to call her Assistant to the Dean, I can put it on her cards, I can put it on her letterhead, I can do anything but it is not a legal deal and it has not existed for at least a year or two. That title just doesn’t exist anymore.

Behery: In that memo in our college, C&I, someone was appointed assistant to the dean, only a month ago.

There is a difference in what they’re doing, but I don’t know. All I know is that it is not a state title. Do you know, Bob?

Waller: I think you are correct, it is not a recognized state title.

My feeling around here is that people are very hung up on titles. And that if you hire a secretary and she or he wishes to be called an assistant to the professor, or an assistant to the dean, and all it costs you is letterhead stationery, then probably a fair amount of that goes on, I would never know it, on the other hand its just not a legal title.

Behery: I’m with you until “it’s only a legal title and order stationery. Because when it comes to be assistant dean, you have to ...

E. Hare: Are you currently reviewing department heads at the end of their second year of office?

I don’t review department heads, deans review department heads. My advice to the deans themselves, if they wrote the letters that I wrote, up until the time that I left office, giving the person five years to stay in office, they had a legal obligation to do it. The other deans who have not, Bobby Wixson, for example, has, in fact, reviewed a dean (sic) at the end of two years. It was informal, as I believe it called for. If you want my personal opinion, the current Faculty Manual, as written, is so ambivalent on this subject that I would hate like hell to take that before
any tribune because from where I'm sitting, I can turn it from page 10 to page 12 and come up with two different answers to that question. All I do know for sure is that if a dean were careful until that thing were written and put five years in there before they had a review, they'll go on five years. If it really concerns you, I should point out the phrase that has come up since I have been Provost - that a department head serves "at the pleasure" of the dean. I was asked, how can an acting dean do something like this and I don't know how you define "pleasure" but I know how that dean defined "pleasure". Whether or not I agreed with the decision or not, I did not choose to interfere. My guess is that if you marched en masse ...and said "Professor X is a terrible department head and we find great displeasure in this and you will find displeasure when we review you," my guess is the dean might find displeasure. On the other hand, I would not commit him or her in either way. I would point out how few department heads predate me in the College of Engineering. None, is the number.

Baron: Thank you.
1. **Call to Order.** President William Baron called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated October 13, 1992 were approved as written.

3. **Special Order of the Day.** Professor Bob Green, Department of Education; Roger Liska, Department Head of Building Science; George Carter, Director of Undergraduate Academic Studies; Stassen Thompson, Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC); and Sandy Underwood, Director of Planning/Member of the SPC were introduced by President Baron. Stassen Thompson provided a brief update on the planning activities and the goals of the Planning Committee for the coming year (Attachment A). Bob Green outlined the efforts that have taken place in the College of Education with respect to their planning activities. Roger Liska discussed efforts in the College of Architecture regarding planning and continuous improvement; and George Carter informed the Senate of what has been happening with respect to implementation.

4. **Class of '39 Award for Excellence.** President Baron appointed Lucy Rollin, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, to count ballots for this Award with the Provost. The election of the 1992 Class of '39 Award for Excellence was held by secret ballot, and ballots were collected.

5. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Committee Reports**
      i. **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Alan Schaffer submitted the Committee Report (Attachment B).
      
      Welfare Committee. No report.
      
      Finance Committee. No report.
      
      Policy Committee. Senator Eleanor Hare submitted the Committee Report (Attachment C), and briefly discussed enumerated items.
      
      Research Committee. No report.
   b. **University Commissions and Committees**
      1) **Joint City/University Committee** - Senate Alternate Jerry Waldvogel reported that this committee will bring a strategic plan dealing with University/City relations to the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate, or the Faculty Senate as a whole, by the end of this semester. Any ideas may be submitted to Senator Waldvogel. Senator Schaffer stated that a resolution was unanimously adopted to send to President Lennon to agree: "that before beginning any service or operation that might involve competition with businesses or merchants in the Clemson community, the University will discuss the proposal with the City/University Committee and allow it time to collect information and report on potential problems that might arise."
2) **Facilities Planning Committee** - Senator Lloyd Blanton reported that this committee is in the talking stage of considering a possible site for the future Business & Finance Offices (Highway 76 near the Armory). It was further stated that due to the process of the University and the community infringing on each other's commercial ventures, the University may need to reconsider the location of the Bookstore.

Senate Alternate Joanne Deeken reported that due to much faculty response regarding the site placement of the waste treatment center on campus, this Committee is now considering two additional sites.

6. **President's Report.** No written Report was submitted; however, President Baron informed the Senate that President Lennon has requested an administrative growth report from each of the vice presidential areas which will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate. An *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Vice Presidents' Administrative Growth Reports has been appointed by President Baron. Members include: John Huffman, Chair, Bea Cain, Joanne Deeken, Bob Kosinski, and Joe Louderback.

President Baron also informed the Senate that he had generally suggested to Gary Ransdell, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, to include a faculty member during Parent's Day festivities; and in particular, to extend an invitation to Vice-President/President-Elect Alan Schaffer next year. Dr. Ransdell was receptive to this suggestion.

President Baron reported that he and Dave Senn, Chair of the Athletic Council, have asked the Policy Committee and the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate to prepare a job description for the faculty representative to the NCAA and the ACC.

7. **Old Business** (None)

8. **New Business**

a. Senator Schaffer submitted a resolution on Closing Classes to Non-Majors from the Scholastic Policies Committee. Discussion followed. Following a friendly amendment from Senator John Huffman, which was accepted by the Senate, vote to accept amended resolution was taken, and resolution passed (FS92-11-1 P) (Attachment D).

b. Senator Hare submitted a Policy Committee Recommendation to amend the Faculty Manual regarding the evaluation of department heads (Attachment E). The floor was open for discussion. Hearing none, vote was taken and recommendation passed unanimously.

c. Senator Hare introduced a Resolution on Selection of the Faculty Representative to NCAA and ACC, (Attachment F). Following the unanimous passage of a two-thirds vote to bring resolution to the floor of the Senate, Senator James Davis offered a friendly amendment to add the word "once" after the word "renewable" in the fourth paragraph, which was seconded. After discussion, vote to accept friendly amendment was taken and passed. Senator Walt Owens offered a friendly amendment to include "of the Executive Committee of the Athletic Council" after the word "endorsement" in the fourth paragraph. Senator Hassan Behery offered a friendly amendment to include the words, "and Term," in the title of resolution after the word "Selection." Vote to accept these two friendly amendments was taken, and passed unanimously. Senator Schaffer asked the Senate to consider separating the two issues contained in the resolution: the selection of the representative and the issue of release time and compensation to the department. Following discussion, vote was taken to accept the first four paragraphs as one resolution (FS92-11-2 P) (Attachment G), and the last paragraph as a separate resolution (FS92-11-3 P) (Attachment H), and each resolution passed unanimously.
9. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

[Signature]
Lucy Rollin, Secretary

[Signature]
Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Senators Absent: W. Bridges (J. Bertrand attended), J. Brittain, W. Smathers, F. Eubanks, G. Waddle, J. Flanigan, M. Bridgwood (D. Leigh attended), F. Tainter, H. Goodall, B. Vander Mey, M. L. Moon (J. Deeken attended)
STRATEGIC PLAN
Implementation Status

November 10, 1992

Attachment A (1 of 5)
The land grant concept will be expanded through both intra- and interdisciplinary integration of teaching, research, and public service. A University-wide, incentive-based system to facilitate the initiation and effective conduct of interdisciplinary academic and research programs will be established. Each department will develop an operational definition of its public service mission, an action plan to integrate public service, teaching, and research, and a consistent reward system. Each vice presidential area will develop avenues for public service by itself. A pan of their degree requirement, every student will have worked with faculty and staff on a research or public service project, or have participated in an internship. College University will develop a computer-based, community access network to provide a direct linkage to each academic unit. This will be an expansion of the existing services being operated by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Person Responsible: Prov, VPs-Kei, Ag Deans, Provost President Prov, VP-Ag. VProv-C, fir

Progress to Date
Dr. Gray has been meeting with key faculty members and heads of research institutes to develop ways to create incentives for interdisciplinary programs (e.g., redistribution of indirect costs). A new commission, the Executive Committee, has met and finalized its full membership (up to 25). Charged by the Provost to develop the University definition, goal, and objectives of public service and to examine college/department definitions and reward systems. (Dee Stone chairs). Each VP needs to appoint a member to survey staff on public service interest. It was recommended that the effort be coordinated by a New Services.
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Attachment A (2 of 5)
## Strategic Plan

### Implementation Status

**November 10, 1992**

**Attachment A (3 of 5)**

### Action Step

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>3.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal:** The University will be a community of

**Action Step:**

**Strategy:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>3.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress to Date</td>
<td>5/96</td>
<td>8/96</td>
<td>5/97</td>
<td>8/97</td>
<td>5/98</td>
<td>8/98</td>
<td>5/99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage Complete:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Action Item:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>3.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**University Research:**

- Developed 21 principles with specific objectives to increase research support.
- CURP has initiated the development of a for-profit subsidiary.

**See 1.2 and 1.3—also need to expand to include research grant-writing training.**

**Need to determine present number being held (in the last fiscal year) and determine list of peer institutions.**

**Gary Ransdell has included as part of the Institutional Advancement Strategic Plan.**

- Clemson hosted workshop Nov. 5 with 30 individuals from 15 different universities (1 faculty researcher and 1 administrator from each school) where discussion groups will quantify values related to scholarly works.

**As part of SACS requirement, David Underwood and Ron Nowaczyk have met with four focus groups and are preparing results in a report to Dr. Gray. (Focus group faculty were recommended by their dean).**

**Still need to have a group asking:**

1. What is quality in research?
2. How does your department record this work?
3. What kind of indicators do they use?
4. What are the criteria? (David Underwood will prepare a generic list to assist departments.)

**Dr. Gray would like a list of faculty by Oct. 1 and Jay Cogue can recommend others, e.g., Frank Paul, Jack Lillien, Bob Becker, Dan Bigelow.**

---
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---
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**Attachment A (3 of 5)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Step</th>
<th>FP-Scholar Affiliate</th>
<th>Prov. Dean, AGR</th>
<th>Prov. Dean, AGR</th>
<th>Prov. Dean, AGR</th>
<th>Prov. Dean, AGR</th>
<th>Prov. Dean, AGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal: A Global Perspective will characterize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status</td>
<td>November 10, 1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC PLAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal:** A Global Perspective will characterize Clemson University.

4.1 Every curriculum will have clearly identifiable aspects that have an international focus. Provost, Deans, Prov. Dean, AGR agreed to establish study/work abroad program co-ordinated by Acad. Spec. Proj. and Coop. Ed.—meeting with coop. ed. union in England and hope to set up arrangements to work in Western Europe, Japan and Malaysia.

4.2 Programs and services that assist South Carolina individuals and organizations to engage in international business and related activities will be expanded. Prov. VP-Agrill on hold pending reorganization.

4.3 Each college will develop a program to support, financially, international exchanges and sabbaticals. Faculty, staff, and student involvement will have increased by 20 percent. Prov. VP-Agrill.

4.4 At least two major cross-cultural events with University-wide participation will be sponsored by the University each year. VP-Student Affairs.

4.5 The University will make available short-term residential accommodations and other essential services for foreign visitors. VP-Student Affairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Step</td>
<td>100% 75% 50% 25% 0% 0% 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 10, 1992

**STRAEGIC PLAN**

**Implementation Status**

**Action Step Person Responsible**

---

**Goal:** The University's commitment to a sense of community and collegiality will be strengthened.

5.1 **Improved interaction among faculty, staff, students, alumni, and Clemson communities will be in place.** Programs to begin are: community dining opportunities, class and housing activities, freshmen seminar series, biweekly public forum.

**VP-SL Aff Provost:**

- Programs are being implemented. (Feast with the faculty, Home Supper Club, Public Programs, etc.)

5.2 **A mentor system for students, faculty, staff, and administration will have improved personal interaction.** Student Government and the Graduate Student Association will assist in a student-based mentoring system.

**VPs-SA, Adm, Prov:**

- Student Affairs has formed SAFE (Staff and Faculty Educators) to serve as mentors for students. They are going through a training program now. They also have an orientation program related to the First Year Experience.

5.3 **Undergraduate and graduate student advisement on academic and extracurricular development will have improved significantly.**

**Prov, VP-Rec, Reel:**

- Undergraduate academic special project conducted surveys of students and faculty to assess their feelings on academic advising. Evaluation of data yielded four recommendations to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies: (1) Advisor access to student records; (2) training on mainframe for advisors; (3) better recognition and rewards for advising; (4) more care taken in selecting faculty to serve. (The first two items passed the Commission; the last two were tabled for further discussion.) They are also targeting special populations (Clemson Scholars, freshmen, transfer, science and technology majors) with CSI.

5.4 **The University will have defined a plan for optimal enrollment.**

**Skellon III:**

- Bring to Dr. Reel's attention at next meeting.

5.5 **The Campus Master Plan will include components in the physical facilities designed to increase the sense of community.**

**VP-B&F, D. Stone:**

- The Master Plan has included components to increase the sense of community (e.g., Carillon Garden, Reunion Square, East Campus Student Activities Center, etc.)

5.6 **Clemson will improve communication and awareness of diversity of faculty, staff, and students on campus.**

**VP-Inst-Adv:**

- Student Affairs will continue the program on diversity held during student orientation.

5.7 **All members of the University will have the opportunity to contribute in some tangible form to a program designed to promote community involvement (town-gown).**

**VPs-Adm & Inst-Adv:**

- Community Relations and the Joint City/University Committee will address more thoroughly.

5.8 **Each department will demonstrate that faculty, staff, and students have had an opportunity for input into the departmental decision-making process.**

**Deans, Dep. Heads Dean's working to improve input—need to ask for progress report.

5.9 A committee will evaluate and recommend services and special needs of the nontraditional and minority community.**

**Prov, VPs-Ag, IA Committee formed in Student Affairs to examine needs of minority, commuter, and nontraditional student.**

---

**Attachment A (5 of 5)**
1. **STEP Program.** The following questions will be posed to Director George Carter who will be invited to attend our next meeting:

   a. How are students selected?

   b. Are these students admitted with the vote of the Admissions Exceptions Committee or its appropriate subcommittee?

   c. Do we have any data on the GPA and the number of credits per semester these students take beyond the first year? What kind of tracking do we do beyond the first year?

2. Student exchange program being pushed by students

   a. Committee voted unanimously in favor of this concept.

3. Forgiveness policy advocated by students to allow repeating up to 2 courses in which they received a D or an F grade with the understanding that only the highest grade received would be recorded and counted in the GPA:

   a. Committee voted 4 -1 against supporting this idea.

4. Classes closed to non-majors.

   a. See attached resolution

5. Proposal for a summer academic program from George Carter

   a. The Committee agreed to hold off on the so-called "First Class" program until after we have met with Dr. Carter about the STEP program since we see these two as related possibilities.
Policy Committee Report
November 10 1992

The Policy Committee met with Dave Senn and Cecil Huey to discuss possible proposals for selection of the faculty representative to the NCAA and ACC. Based on information exchanged at this meeting a preliminary draft will be sent to the Policy Committees of the Athletic Council and the Faculty Senate. After both Policy Committees have considered the preliminary draft, we will hope to present a joint resolution to both the Athletic Council and the Faculty Senate.

The following were proposed: 1) The representative should be a non-administrative faculty member. 2) The nominating committee might be the Executive Committee of the Athletic Council or a specified committee and should have Faculty Senate representation. 3) The President would be asked to select from a slate recommended by this nominating committee. 4) The representative should be appointed for a specified term which should be at least 3 years in length. and 5) The term should be renewable.

Prior to fall, 1990, the Faculty Manual required only that department heads be formally evaluated at the end of their fifth year in office and every five years thereafter. During that fall, the Faculty Senate twice requested that the requirement be changed to every three years. Both requests were denied, but a requirement that new department heads be formally evaluated before the end of their second year in office was added to the previous requirement.

Citing the statement in the third paragraph of Section 1, The Department Heads (page 10) 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," the administration has questioned the validity of the Policy Committee assertion that the second year check is required.

In order to clarify the intent of the Faculty Manual, the Policy Committee recommends deletion of the phrase "who formally evaluate the performance in office of heads reporting to them every five years."

The following items are also under consideration:

1. A proposed amendment to the Faculty Manual concerning the eligibility of department heads to hold chaired professorships (Dean Keinath's request).

2. A proposed amendment to the Faculty Manual to add women and minority representation to the Commission on Graduate Studies, if underrepresented.

3. A proposal that department heads be evaluated more frequently than every five years. Input will be sought from the administration.

4. A resolution concerning the purchase of books marked "Complimentary -- Not for Resale" by the Clemson University bookstore. This resolution has been sent to the Bookstore Committee for comment.

5. Appropriate response to the University-wide Survey Policy.

6. An inquiry into the search process for some administrative appointments.

The next meeting of the committee will be November 17, 3 p.m., Library Conference Room.
RESOLUTION ON CLOSING CLASSES TO NON-MAJORS
FS92-11-1 P

Whereas, over the last few years increases in student enrollment and restraints on adding new faculty positions have pushed class size to the limit in numerous departments, with many sections having no available seats, and

Whereas, some departments are attempting to deal with this problem by giving priority in registration for certain courses to their own majors with the effect being to close these courses to non-majors, and

Whereas, such a policy denies admission to students who are otherwise qualified to take these courses, and

Whereas, such a policy may hurt non-majors who need a specific course to meet the requirements of a minor program in another department or college, and

Whereas, such a policy subverts the basic intention of a university education which supposedly encourages the widest kind of intellectual inquiry on the part of students,

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate affirms the existing University policy, i.e., that with the exception of requiring students to have published pre-requisites, no course be restricted at registration or thereafter to majors only, unless specific permission to do so has been recommended by the University Curriculum Committee and approved by the Provost.

Passed by the Faculty Senate on
November 10, 1992
Policy Committee Recommendation

to amend

the Faculty Manual

November 10, 1992

In the third paragraph, E. The Department Heads, page 10, delete the underlined phrase:

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.

This deletion will avoid any possible conflict with the third paragraph, M. Review of Academic Administrators, page 12, which states that the appropriate dean shall conduct a formal review of a department head's performance before the end of the second and fifth year in office and every fifth year thereafter.

Rationale for this change to the Faculty Manual.

In the fall of 1990, a change to the Faculty Manual added formal review before the end of the second year in office (for newly appointed department heads). The legal opinions obtained by the Policy Committee support the evaluation of department heads before the end of the second year in office because:

1. The more detailed section of the Manual (Section M) takes precedence.
2. The more recent change (Section M) takes precedence.

However, there is still some debate concerning the intent of the Faculty Manual in requiring the evaluation before the end of the second year. Deleting the above phrase (page 10) resolves any ambiguity.

The administration's commitment to Total Quality Management would not be well served by the needless omission of faculty input as described on page 12. Section M. of the Faculty Manual. The Manual sets forth a procedure under which the formal evaluation of department heads will include interviews and consultation with faculty members. This process can provide department heads with helpful information about how they can improve their service to their department, their college, and the University, thereby avoiding long festering and undisclosed problems that could be addressed through the review procedures.

The University has had positive assessment through the use of confidential surveys that may be useful in creating practical methods for obtaining faculty input. The recent survey by the Faculty Senate is but one example of an inexpensive survey device.

This change was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on November 10, 1992.
RESOLUTION ON THE SELECTION OF THE
FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE TO NCAA AND ACC

November 10, 1992

The “faculty representative” to the NCAA and ACC should be a non-administrative member of the faculty, having rank and tenure within an academic department.

This faculty representative should be selected by the President of Clemson University from a slate of nominees.

The nominating committee shall be the Executive Committee of the Athletic Council and shall additionally include either the Faculty Senate representative to the Athletic Council or his/her designate.

The term of office of this faculty representative shall be four (4) years and shall be renewable by request of the President and endorsement of the Athletic Council.

The University should provide release time to the faculty representative to allow for meetings and other duties required of the office. The administration should compensate the department adequately to cover the workload converted to release time.
RESOLUTION ON THE SELECTION AND TERM OF THE
FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE TO NCAA AND ACC

FS92-11-2 P

Resolved, the "faculty representative" to the NCAA and ACC should be a non-
administrative member of the faculty, having rank and tenure within an academic department,

Resolved, this faculty representative should be selected by the President of Clemson
University from a slate of nominees,

Resolved, the nominating committee shall be the Executive Committee of the Athletic
Council and shall additionally include either the Faculty Senate representative to the Athletic
Council or his/her designate,

Resolved, the term of office of this faculty representative shall be four (4) years and shall
be renewable once by request of the President and endorsement of the Executive Committee of the
Athletic Council.

This resolution was unanimously
passed by the Faculty Senate on
RESOLUTION ON CONSIDERATIONS OF POSITION OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE TO NCAA AND ACC

FS92-11-3 P

Resolved, the University should provide release time to the faculty representative to allow for meetings and other duties required of the office. The administration should compensate the department adequately to cover the workload converted to release time.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate on November 10, 1992.
Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday, November 10, 1992

Strategic Planning Panel Includes:

Bob Green
Professor, Department of Elementary & Secondary Education

Roger Liska
Department Head and Professor, Building Sciences

George Carter
Director, Undergraduate Academic Studies

Stassen Thompson
Professor, Agriculture and Applied Economics and Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee
BALLOT

CLASS OF '39
AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE

Instructions: From the following list of nominees, make your selection for first choice, and place the figure 1 by that nominee's name. Then make your second choice selection, and place the figure 2 by that nominee's name. If you feel that only one of the nominees merits consideration for the award, place the figure 2 on a line headed "No one". If you feel that none of the nominees deserves consideration, place both 1 and 2 on the lines headed "no one".

Your Choice

Ashby Burgess (Budd) Bodine, II

Richard James Calhoun

Gayle Pittman Noblet

Raymond C. Turner

No One

Do Not Sign Your Ballot
October 20, 1992

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Bill Baron
    President, Faculty Senate

FROM: J. Charles Jennett, Provost

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Meeting

I know it didn't sound like it, but I did enjoy the exchange with the faculty senators. I know many of them are pretty adamant in their beliefs. I hold mine pretty strongly too.

I do feel that exchanges such as this are very good. Sharing ideas and understanding other viewpoints are valuable tools in running a university in the best possible way.

I also want to take this time to thank you personally for the conversation we had in my office. I am not always aware of how harsh I can sound. I know in this case, I went into that meeting probably more defensive than I should have. I really appreciate the input.

Once again, thanks very much.

JCJ/ep
MEMORANDUM

TO: FACULTY SENATE

FROM: WILLIAM BARON, PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: GRIEVANCE BOARD

It will soon be time to offer nominations of those persons you believe would provide careful consideration to others during the Faculty Grievance Procedure II process. Attached you will find information regarding the Grievance Board election process as it is presently, and a memorandum from the Provost in which he agrees with the Senate's recommendation to amend the Constitution. The recommendation to amend the Constitution contains changes to the Grievance Board (see Faculty Senate Draft Minutes dated October 13, 1992), which will be voted on at the December General Faculty Meeting.

Nominations for the Grievance Board will be received at the December Faculty Senate meeting; elections will be held during the January meeting. Please consider the importance of this procedure during your deliberations of possible nominees.

WB/cts

attachments
The Faculty Senate needs to elect four (4) members to the Grievance Board for a two-year term to replace Ken Murr, Bob Schalkoff, Brenda Vander Mey, and Eldon Zehr.

Nominations will be received at the December 8th Faculty Senate Meeting; elections will be held at the January 12th Senate meeting.

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
Forest and Recreation Resources

Grievance Board members remaining on Board are:

B. C. Goswami Commerce & Industry
Gerald Lovedahl Education
Syble Oldaker Nursing

The Chair of the Grievance Board will be elected by the Advisory Committee at the Executive/Advisory Committee Meeting in January, 1993.
MEMORANDUM

To: William Baron
   President, Faculty Senate

From: J. Charles Jennett
      Provost

RE: Faculty Senate Resolution

I am agreeable to the Faculty Senate Resolution to amend the Constitution of the Faculty. By this memo I am transmitting the recommendation to Mrs. Elaine Price for inclusion on the agenda of the December Faculty Meeting. It is your responsibility to make sure the Faculty are appropriately notified.

I also concur with the spirit of the recommendation to change the Faculty Manual as it relates to the Fine Arts Committee but ask you to consider detailing to whom this committee reports. Some thoughts would be me, one of the Senior Vice Provosts, the director of the Brooks Center, or the director of the University Union. Please consider adding that to the description.

Thank you.

xc: E. Price

JCJ/gld
How to Save $5.74/case on Copy Paper

11-10-92

Central Stores best price on Xerographic copy paper
white 8 1/2 x 11, 20 lb. (stock #0674843) $22.20/case
(Note: price given on Doris is $1.932/ream)

Office Depot (1-800-637-8474) best price on
white 8 1/2 x 11 xerographic copy paper
including 5% tax and 5% delivery charge is $16.36/case
price as of 11-10-92.
Delivery fee is 5% of price, minimum fee $10.

Other places in Greenville have similar prices.

4% of sales at Central Stores on Clemson Campus goes to G&A budget
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 Faculty Senate Minutes dated November 10, 1992 were approved as written.

3. Special Order of the Day. Dr. Gary A. Ransdell, Vice President of Institutional Advancement, provided copies of the Clemson University Foundation Annual Report and the 1992 Endowment Annual Report for each senator. Dr. Ransdell then presented an overview of the private funds that Clemson University receives which showed the dissemination of those gifts. Dr. Ransdell then responded to questions from the Senate.

4. Committee Reports

a. Committee Reports

Scholastic Policies Committee. No report.

Welfare Committee. Senator Brenda Vander Mey stated that this Committee had met with Chris Duckenfield, Vice Provost of Computing & Information Technology, to discuss mainframe priorities; had met with Professors Ron Nowaczyk, Holley Ulbrich, and Dave Underwood to discuss faculty workload; and had reviewed and discussed a memorandum regarding the dissemination of the Grievance Hearing Panel Report. Committee Notes were submitted to the Senate (Attachment A).

Finance Committee. Senator Jim Davis reported that Professor Leo Gaddis will present a Special Report to the Senate at the January meeting, and explained informational items contained in the Agenda Packet.

Policy Committee. Senator Eleanor Hare submitted the Report from this Committee (Attachment B). Specific items mentioned include:

At the invitation of Provost Jennett, the Policy Committee will meet with members of the Council of Deans to discuss possibility of common ground for review of department heads after the second year in this position;

Memorandum from Dr. Rod Mabry regarding policy of disclosing the Hearing Panel Recommendations. The Policy and Welfare Committees will meet jointly to discuss differences.

Personnel policies on tenure and child-bearing. Policy Committee recommended that this issue be sent to the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women at Clemson University. Alan Schaffer reported that this Commission had not yet been appointed.
A work session to discuss the Faculty Survey and the meeting with the deans will be December 14, 1992. The next regular Policy Committee meeting will be January 5, 1993.

Research Committee. 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 had met and discerned that sufficient information to determine the magnitude of growth and its effectiveness has been received to study this issue; however, not enough data has been received from the vice presidential area of Academic Affairs. Findings will be reported at the January meeting.

2) **Facilities Planning Committee** - Senate Alternate Joanne Deeken explained the recommendation for the new East Campus Student Center, which will be a major restructuring of the East side of campus. Written input may be directed to Senators Blanton, Deeken, or Schaffer. Senator Schaffer reported that the final vote on the Student Center will be in January.

Ms. Deeken also reported that the radioactive waste site will be located near the wastewater treatment plant.

3) **ad hoc Campus Safety Committee** - Senator Vander Mey announced that this Committee had received $2,500 from the Vending Machine Committee; that Gregory Garrison, Acting Deputy Prosecutor in the Tyson Case, will speak on campus; and that Rape Awareness Week will be held the week of March 8, 1993.

4) **Recreation Advisory Committee** - Senator Gerald Waddle reported that due to budget cuts and the need for maintenance, means to cover costs are being considered. Alternatives include the sale of memberships to the community who are not associated with the University and the increase of faculty fees. Input may be directed to Senator Waddle.

5) **Joint City/University Committee** - Senator Schaffer stated that this committee had heard a presentation from the Business Office on the plan to institute a designated travel agency.

5. **President’s Report.** Alan Schaffer briefly discussed President William Baron’s report to the Senate (Attachment C).

6. **Old Business**

a. The 1992 Class of ‘39 Award for Excellence recipient will be announced at the Graduation Exercise on December 17, 1992. The Faculty Senate Ceremony to honor the recipient will be in the Student Senate Chambers preceding the meeting on January 12, 1993.

b. Senator Hare moved that the previous recommendation from the Policy Committee to amend the Constitution by inserting the word, “standing,” in Section 5, Committees, be deferred. Motion was seconded. Vote to defer this amendment to the Constitution was taken, and passed unanimously.
7. **New Business**

   a. Nominations to the Grievance Board were received. Senator John Huffman and Senate Alternate Jerry Waldvogel from the College of Sciences were nominated; as was Senator Richard Conover from the College of Forest and Recreation Resources. Additional nominations will be received from the floor at the January meeting, at which time elections will be held.

   b. The Final Report from the *ad hoc* Committee on Possible Uses for the Clemson University Sheep Barn was presented to the Senate (Attachment D) by Senator Mary Lynn Moon. Senator Schaffer will contact the State Historic Preservation Office to request that a member of the staff examine the Sheep Barn and offer recommendations.

   c. Senator Hare submitted the resolution, Resolution on the Sale of Complimentary Copies of Textbooks by the Bookstore, from the Policy Committee. Following a friendly amendment from Senator Les Carlson, vote was taken, and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment E) (FS92-12-1 P).

   d. Senator Hare informed the Senate that she had received numerous telephone calls regarding the issue of twelve-month faculty converting to nine-month faculty with no reduction in salary. After discussion, during which Senator Hare stated that she had verified the accuracy of this information, this issue was referred to the Welfare Committee.

8. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

   Lucy Rollin, Secretary

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Staff Secretary

Senators Absent: B. Bridges, J. Rathwell, B. Stringer, F. Eubanks, J. Mumford, H. Behery, J. Flanigan, W. Baron (D. Leigh attended), M. Bridgwood, J. Liburdy, H. Goodall, E. Ruppert, R. Williams
NOTES FROM THE WELFARE COMMITTEE

November 17, 1992

The Committee met with Dr. Chris Duckenfield to discuss any changes in the priority system for mainframe users. Dr. Duckenfield indicated that the priority system has not changed in the last 15 years. However, the mainframe now runs at 100% capacity during the day and 81% during the night (with a drop to 43% from about midnight to 8:00 a.m.) Much of the runs done by faculty are large data batch ones. These are run in the evenings and at night. The mainframe runs general purpose, interactive requests during the day.

December 1, 1992

1. The Committee met with Ron Nowaczyk, Dave Underwood and Holly Ulbrich. These individuals came to relate what they had learned and experienced at a recent conference dealing with faculty workloads. The Committee and the individuals exchanged data and ideas regarding effort distributions and reward systems. The Committee will give these individuals a copy of its preliminary report for their review and input.

2. The Committee considered a request from the OADH regarding a review and reconsideration of the practice of sending a copy the Grievance Hearing Panel's report to the Provost only to the grievant. The Committee agreed with the OADH that this is unfair. The Committee saw the following changes as reasonable:

   1. To send the report only to the Provost.
   2. To require that the Provost send a note to all named parties to the grievance and to the grievant, informing them that he has received the GHP's report and is now giving the matter due consideration.
   3. To require that the Provost preface his report and recommendations with a reiteration of the findings and recommendations contained in the GHP's report. (This would formalize a step that the current Provost has already included.)

In a subsequent telephone conversation with Senator Hare (Chair, Policy Committee), it was learned that the Policy Committee had reached a different conclusion. Senator Vander Mey suggested the following:

   1. That the issue be discussed by the Faculty Senate.
   2. That the advice of the current members of the Grievance Board be sought.
   3. That the Chair of the OADH, Rod Mabry, be apprised of these differing responses.
   4. That the Committees meet and discuss the matter further.

Vander Mey has spoken with the current Chair of the Grievance Board, Ken Murr. He has offered to take a telephone poll of the Board and then present his findings and recommendations to the Faculty Senate.
Provost Jennett met with the committee to discuss alternatives to current policy on review of newly appointed department heads at the end of the second year in office. At the conclusion of this meeting, it was suggested that the committee meet with the Deans to try to find common ground for such a policy.

Senator Davis met with the committee to discuss a proposed amendment to the Faculty Manual to add women and minority representation to the Commission on Graduate Studies if underrepresented. (This resolution was tabled at the last Faculty Senate meeting.) The need for such a resolution was questioned and membership of existing committees will be examined for distribution of women faculty. It was noted that there are so few minority faculty that it is not possible to have minority faculty on every committee.

The resolution concerning the purchase of books marked 'Complimentary -- Not for Resale' by the Clemson University bookstore was discussed. This resolution had previously been approved and sent to the Bookstore Committee (as listed in the Faculty Senate office) for comment. Only one comment was received. This resolution will be brought to the Faculty Senate in December.

At the request of Dean Keinath, the Policy committee is considering an amendment to the Faculty Manual that would explicitly allow department heads to hold Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships. The Policy Committee invites comment on the draft of this amendment which currently reads:

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 of the faculty of the affected department. This vote shall be by secret ballot."

2) Page 20, paragraph 4 (Conditions of Award) after department head
   "If the holder of the chair or endowed professorship is the department head of the college, the dean of the college may initiate the review at the request of the departmental faculty Advisory 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."

The following additional items remain under consideration:
- Appropriate response to the University-wide Survey Policy.
- An inquiry into the search process for some administrative appointments.
1. At the November meeting of the Academic Council, we called for a second vote of the Council on the issue of the suspension of the mid-year probationary check, an academic policy listed in the Undergraduate catalog. The Council had voted in October to suspend the mid-year check for the second time. The Council at the October meeting also called for the Undergraduate Commission to form a sub-committee to review the existing mid-year suspension policy. The sub-committee met, unanimously endorsed the mid-year check and reported thus, to the Undergraduate Commission. The Undergraduate Commission unanimously accepted the report and, in turn, unanimously voted to call for the mid-year check to be implemented at the earliest possible time. The Undergraduate Commission has representatives from the Student Body, administrative faculty and non-administrative faculty.

The vote at this meeting of the Academic Council was:

Opposing Suspension: Three student representatives
(Immediate Implementation) Three faculty representatives
Five administrative faculty representatives

Supporting Suspension: Eleven administrative faculty representatives

A tie vote; two and one-third constituencies voting for the implementation of the written policy, two-thirds of one constituency voting not to implement said policy. Dr. Lennon has advised us that he will delay the implementation of the mid-year check and that a study committee will be established to examine in detail the pros and cons of the policy.

2. The President of the University accepted the Senate's policy recommendation on the selection of the faculty athletic representative. This policy had the endorsement of the Athletic Council. On Tuesday, November 24 the Executive Committee of the Athletic Council and the Senate's representative met to review the applications for the position and to forward a slate of acceptable candidates to Dr. Lennon. We received applications from three faculty members: Dr. Cecil Huey, Dr. Larry LaForge, and Dr. Arlene Privette. All three applicants have served as faculty representatives to the Athletic Council. All three have served as faculty representatives to other University committees and organizations. We deemed all three to be more than qualified and quite acceptable. We forwarded the names of all three applicants to Dr. Lennon for his consideration. We expect that a working group from the Athletic Council and the Senate will meet with Dr. Lennon to prepare a job description for said position at Clemson University.

3. The President and Vice President of the Senate met with the University's Strategic Planning Committee. Dr. Lennon was present. We discussed the concerns expressed by the faculty over University actions with respect to undergraduate education. Specifically, we examined the reasons the faculty, by a two to one count, do not believe that undergraduate education is Clemson University's first priority. President Lennon had previously expressed his concern and charged the Committee and Senate to come up with proposals for substantive actions to change this perception. In fact, he has charged the Provost and through him, the deans and department heads, to take specific actions by January 1, 1993 to address this issue.

At the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee, I suggested that the Committees meet with selected individual faculty members for advice on proposed actions. The Committee is considering this proposal. In the meantime, I have on my own initiative asked several faculty members from three colleges to offer opinions and suggestions. I have requested that the members
of the Senate's Executive/Advisory Committee also ask for written opinions from colleagues. I am sharing these comments with Dr. Lennon, and will use them in meetings with the Provost, the Dean's Council, and the Strategic Planning Committee.

4. The President of the University has advised us that he will soon announce the formation of a Presidential Commission on the Status of Women at Clemson University. This is in response to a request made by the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Women's Issues. The Commission will consist of twelve members: six members from the staff and six members from the faculty.
Background

This ad hoc committee was formed by the Faculty Senate in July, 1992 in response to the passage of a Senate resolution to preserve the University Sheep Barn, located on South Palmetto Boulevard. The committee’s purpose was to serve as an advisory group to the Senate, with the specific charge of making recommendations on the merits of preserving the Sheep Barn, possible uses for the structure, and to a lesser degree, determining the approximate costs associated with these uses.

The foundation for our investigations was an historical summary prepared in 1991 by Dr. Marty Davis and his architecture students (see Attachment A). This document presents a concise history of the Sheep Barn, as well as a basic architectural analysis of the structure. In addition, the document includes a number of comments from University administrators, faculty, and experts in historic preservation regarding the relative merits of preserving the Sheep Barn. Their comments range from those stating that the structure clearly has historical and architectural significance worthy of preservation, to those suggesting that the barn is little more than an architectural eyesore impeding development of the proposed East Campus Student Activities Center (SAC).

During its Spring '92 session, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution calling on the University administration to preserve the Sheep Barn on the grounds that it represents one of the last architectural manifestations of Clemson’s agricultural past. During the Fall semester, Provost Charles Jennett rejected this resolution. In his response dated 31 August (see Attachment B), the Provost stated that the barn clearly does not represent the last manifestation of the University's agricultural tradition, citing Tillman and Sikes Halls as other structures that aptly represent Clemson’s agricultural history. In addition, he suggested that the agricultural integrity and history of the campus is already adequately managed by a number of existing committees.

Committee Findings

Rather than rework old ground, our committee sought to expand its information base about the Sheep Barn. First we toured the facility with Dr. Davis as our guide. We were unanimous in our opinion that the Barn is 1) structurally sound, 2) a good candidate for some sort of renovation, and 3) a unique architectural remnant of the operational and applied educational side of Clemson University's agricultural history.

Second, we called a meeting of persons who could provide us with information about the historic nature of the Sheep Barn, as well as those involved with designing and implementing the overall master plan for the University. In addition to the committee members, those in attendance at this meeting were:

Ms. Susan Cline-Cordomier, Director of University Historic Houses
Dr. Marty Davis, Professor of Architecture
Mr. Mike Kohl, Head of Library Special Collections
Mr. Mark Wright, Assistant VP for Facilities and Planning
Important issues that surfaced during our discussion with these individuals are summarized below:

1. The present structure dates back to the first decade of the 20th century and does indeed represent one of the last vestiges of early agricultural history on campus, especially as regards applied agriculture. It is currently being used for on-campus storage by Facilities and Maintenance Operations (FMO).

2. Archival records are available to document the building's history, and indicate that a number of animal science and veterinary science classes have been taught in the Barn, dating back to the pre-WWII era. There is also some indication that certain agricultural alumni have an "emotional attachment" to the barn which might translate into financial support for its preservation and restoration.

3. Although a range of opinion exists, most of the evidence we encountered favors the view that the Barn has historical and cultural features worthy of preservation.

4. The Sheep Barn is currently on the Register of National Historic Buildings and is designated as its own historic district. Attempts to alter the design of the building, or to remove it entirely, would involve substantial amounts of state and federal paperwork in the form of protocol and justification forms. Removal of the Barn might also create bad public relations for the University, and possibly the loss of federal funding for future historic projects.

5. The architecture and planning departments now offer courses in the restoration and preservation of historic buildings for which this and other old structures on campus serve as ideal research topics.

6. Although planning for the East Campus SAC would be facilitated by removal of the Sheep Barn and the relocation of the adjacent Hanover House, plans have been considered to either incorporate the Barn into the SAC, or to "work around it." A decision on which of these plans will be implemented has not yet been reached, but is expected within the next several weeks.

7. It was agreed that if the Sheep Barn is to be maintained at its current location, it should serve a function sufficiently unique that it avoids redundancy with other University services and enhances the overall campus community.

Proposed Uses

A number of potentially viable options for uses of the Sheep Barn were suggested during our study. These options are listed below, with a brief description of the relevant pros and cons associated with each. Our committee makes no recommendation for any one particular option.

1. Multicultural activities center - This was the option with the most general support from both students and staff, and interfaces well with the community-enhancement goals of the University's strategic plan. Currently there is little or no space available for international students to gather and experience each other's cultural heritage, or to expose American students to their cultures. This option might also serve to make available a gathering space for multicultural religious activities, as well as to provide a space for religious counseling services aimed at all Clemson students. The proximity of the Sheep Barn to east campus student housing also makes this option attractive.
2. **Agricultural or art museum** - This option would provide much-needed space for educational displays associated with agricultural machinery and methodology, or for art displays now currently occupying space in other buildings which could be used more effectively as classrooms or administrative offices. The location of such a facility near the President’s home might also facilitate special events or fund-raising opportunities. Negative arguments for this option include the high costs associated with appropriate security and environmental controls required by a museum, and the perception that a museum would be low on the current priority list within the agriculture college.

3. **Market place or eating establishment** - One of the current uses of the Barn is as a periodic market place for the sale of University-grown produce. This feature could be expanded and combined with an open-air dining facility located next to the Barn. Although this option might provide a unique and pleasant eating facility, it might also be redundant with services that will be available in the new SAC. The market might also emphasize local arts and crafts, or provide essential items needed by students housed in the surrounding dorms and apartments.

4. **Performing arts facility** - Suggestions have been made in the past to use the Sheep Barn as a theater where small-scale student productions could be staged. While we support the concept of such productions and encourage the University to do likewise, it seems that the facilities available in the new Brooks Center would be better suited for this function.

5. **Faculty club** - There has long been a desire among faculty to have a centralized gathering place on campus. In many ways the Barn would be an ideal location, and it appears that the building would have sufficient space to accommodate such an operation, especially if both the upper and lower levels were utilized. However, there remain important questions about how such a club would be funded and maintained, and what services it would offer (e.g., gathering only, eating and gathering, etc.). In addition, during times of financial limitations, some have argued that spending money on a faculty club would be an inappropriate use of University resources.

6. **Bookstore** - Suggestions have been made to relocate the University bookstore to the east campus area, making it more central to where a majority of students now live. One option for this relocation is the Sheep Barn. Our committee was unable to determine whether the existing Barn would satisfy the space requirements for a new bookstore, but if it does, then money could be saved by eliminating bookstore space in the new SAC.

7. **Storage** - Continuing this current function for the Barn would at least temporarily insure its preservation at no additional cost to the University.

**Costs**

It is impossible to generate specific cost estimates associated with most of the above suggestions without first doing a detailed architectural analysis of the Sheep Barn. However, our discussions with various individuals have led us to believe that any renovation of the Sheep Barn aimed at making the structure suitable for human use (i.e., bringing the building up to safety code, environmental controls, etc.) will involve a minimum expenditure of $100,000, and could possibly cost as much as $500,000.
Conclusions

We find that there are many good reasons for preserving the Sheep Barn, and that most of the objections raised by University administrators and planners are more arguments of convenience than of substance. Furthermore, Provost Jennett's objections to the Faculty Senate's resolution calling for preservation for the Sheep Barn are clearly inaccurate based on the historical evidence we have gathered. We therefore urge the Policy Committee to submit an updated resolution once again calling for official University action to preserve the Sheep Barn. Given the rapid pace at which decisions regarding the design and construction of the SAC are proceeding, we feel that time is of the essence in passing this resolution.

Given the University's current budgetary situation, it appears to us that the most viable short-term option for preserving the Sheep Barn is to maintain it in its present function as an FMO storage facility. However, we also suggest that a university-wide commission be established soon to investigate the viability of each of the proposed uses we have suggested in this report, with the ultimate goal of identifying possible funding sources and implementing one or more of these projects by the end of the decade.

*ad hoc* Committee Members

Jerry Waldvogel, Biology (Chair)
Mary Lynn Moon, Library
John Mumford, Architecture
Bill Stringer, Agricultural Sciences
Syble Oldaker, Nursing
RESOLUTION ON THE SALE OF
COMPLIMENTARY COPIES OF TEXTBOOKS BY THE BOOKSTORE

FS92-12-1 P

Whereas, faculty members are provided complimentary textbooks by the textbook publisher or the University Bookstore as desk copies, and

Whereas, the University Bookstore comes into possession of complimentary textbooks in exchange for desk copies provided faculty members from the Bookstore stock previously, and

Whereas, such books are marked “not for resale,” or similar wording, and

Whereas, the University attorney has advised that the resale of such complimentary copies, or otherwise converting them to cash or goods, may be in conflict with the South Carolina Ethics Bill,

Resolved, we encourage faculty not to sell complimentary copies, for example, those marked with wording that they are not to be resold and petition the University Bookstore to stop buying such complimentary copies.