Members Present: Michael Atkins, Pam Barnhill (conference call), Karen Countryman, Lynn Crawford, Dave Crockett, Wade Culler, Rose Ellen Davis-Gross, Glenda Dickson, Tim Drake, Negar Edwards, Karen Erickson, Angela Gambrell, Brian Gantt, Ellen Gideon, Michael Gilstrap, Laurie Haughey, Reggie Hawthorne, Trudy Houston, James Huff, Jon Ishill, Nell Kennedy, Janice Kleck, Phil Landreth, Laura Oglesby, Carol Pike, Susan Pope, Meshelle Rabon, Chris Sober, Ginger Swire-Clark, Marlene Ventura, Gloria Walker, Scot Wardlaw, Tina White, Mandy Wright

Members Absent: Lydia Arneson, Barbara Bergman, Kathy Boice, Debbie Charles, Dianne Harris, Pam Hawthorne, Bill Hughes, Bill Hurst, Deborah Koon, Sheri Stanley, Samuel White, Jonathan Wylie

Guests Present: President Barker, Robin Denny, Greg Hawkins, Provost Helms, Debra Jackson, Beth Jarrard, David Knox, Michelle Piekutowski, Dan Schmiedt, Erin Swann, Tom Ward

President Tim Drake welcomed guests and called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of Minutes: Phil Landreth moved to approve the minutes of the June 9, 2009 Staff Senate meeting as submitted. Karen Countryman seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

2. Open Commentary: None.

3. Announcements from the President
   A. Administrative Council, Michelle Piekutowski. The Council is preparing for the upcoming Board meeting.
   B. Board of Trustees, Tim Drake. The Board will meet July 16-19. Tim Drake submitted a report on behalf of the Staff Senate (Attachment A).
   C. Other:
      1) Human Resources, Michelle Piekutowski. Michelle Piekutowski reiterated the protocol for requesting information from HR on the Senate’s behalf. She also stated that she was pleased to be a part of the meetings again and informed the group that she was a past senator.

4. Treasurer’s Report, Pam Hawthorne. As of July 8, the remaining FY 09 balance in E&G was 930.90 in Travel, and $1,324.28 in Other. The Vending balance was $622.07.

5. Committee Reports
   A. Standing Committees
      1. Membership, Phil Landreth. Membership met June 16 at 3:30 p.m. The focus of the meeting was on what the mentoring program should include and mentors were assigned to the new senators who had not chosen one. Senators and mentors are as follows: Scot Wardlaw, Bill Hughes; Laura Haughey, Janice Kleck; Nell Kennedy, Dave Crockett; Sheri Stanley, Glenda Dickson; Chris Sober, Tim Drake; Tina White, Ginger Swire-Clark; Angela Gambrell, Karen Erickson; Brian Gantt, Deb Charles; Laura Oglesby, Susan Pope; Jonathan Wylie, Rose Ellen Davis-Gross; Carol Pike, Kathy Boice.
2. Scholarship, Reggie Hawthorne. Scholarship met on July 7. Player registration and sponsorship forms for the October 9th golf tournament are available on the Staff Senate Web site and print copies can be obtained from the Senate office.

B. Ad hoc Committee on Staff Development, Bill Hughes. The SDP committee met on July 2. The group discussed the content of a letter to President Barker requesting a firm commitment for funding of the SDP and the white paper, written by Dr. Tom Britt, Team Leader for Clemson’s Social and Organizational Psychology Research Team, and his graduate students. Without this commitment, the SDP will not be able to form the peer review committee structure or select and enroll participants. Development will continue on program materials so the program is ready to go when funding is available.

C. University Committees

1. Human Resources Advisory, Michael Atkins. HRAC met on June 10. Agenda items discussed were: records retention, Hire Phase II, HR Communication Survey, data entry, upcoming deadlines, and an increase in the fee to perform background checks.

2. Parking Advisory, Bill Hughes. PAC has not met, but Bill Hughes participated in the selection process for a new director. There were two candidates. The person chosen declined the offer and Student Affairs did not extend an offer to the other candidate. Other alternatives are being considered.

3. Parking Visioning Committee, Rose Ellen Davis-Gross and Sheri Stanley. The purpose of this group is to ensure that the goals/objectives of the campus leadership and stakeholders are clearly established. Representatives from Student Government, Staff Senate, Faculty Senate, Athletics, Major Events, Parking Services, University Planning & Design, and Student Affairs will be assembled for these sessions. Commitments will be secured to include these representatives throughout the planning process as the Project Steering Committee. While the format of these initial sessions will be defined in coordination with the Consultant, it is anticipated that activities could include:
   - Introduction of planning process along with description of history of parking at Clemson University, current conditions, and future considerations.
   - Revisiting the 10 Principles of Parking listed in the 2002 Campus Master Plan – discussion of relevance of these principles in 2009.
   - Consensus-building exercise to identify priorities as they relate to principle considerations of parking affordability, reliability, and convenience.
   - Consensus-building exercise to identify priorities related to financial framework, alternative modes of transportation, sustainability, vision of “pedestrian campus”, etc.
   - Setting Goals & Objectives based on new/revised Principles of Parking.

The goal of this group is to make sure the plan developed is a constituent based with regular updates given to the Senates. A ride study of the CAT system will take place in fall 2009 with a target date of March/April 2010 to present a plan to the Administrative Council.

6. Unfinished Business

A. Staff Representative to the BOT, Tim Drake. There are no further developments to report at this time.

B. Staff Survey – Dr. H. Gregory Hawkins from the Office of Assessment presented the results of the Staff Opinions Survey (Attachment B). Once Dr. Hawkins finished the presentation, he answered questions from the group. President Barker and Provost Helms addressed the survey results and joined Hawkins in fielding questions.

7. New Business
A. **Resolution 2009-001**, Tim Drake. Senate President Tim Drake offered a draft resolution recognizing the decisions of the University administration during the budget crisis and commends the actions that preserved jobs. Senators will have until August to comment on the resolution. Senators will vote on the revised resolution August 11th (Attachment C).

8. **Announcements**: Michael Gilstrap informed the group that Facilities had just reorganized. He asked that everyone be patient as they work through the changes that they are undergoing.

9. **Adjournment**: There being no further business, Rose Ellen Davis-Gross moved to adjourn. Negar Edwards seconded the motion.

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, August 11, 2009, 10:30 a.m., Madren Conference Center
STAFF SENATE REPORT
June 30, 2009
Tim Drake, Senate President

STAFF SENATE GOLF TOURNAMENT TO BE HELD IN OCTOBER
The Staff Senate Golf Tournament, traditionally held in the spring, has been planned for Friday October 9, 2009. It will be held at Clemson’s Walker Course, and the Senate is hopeful that it will be a successful event. Funds generated by this tournament will be placed in the Staff Senate Scholarship Endowment. Thus far, it has not been necessary to draw from the scholarship endowment to fund scholarships at a consistent level because of payroll deduction contributions made by faculty and staff each year. It is hoped that this trend will continue, allowing the endowment to build from year to year.

INPUT FROM STAFF SOUGHT ON ADVISORY GROUPS
Since April, President Barker has included the Staff Senate president on two new advisory groups, and other staff members on smaller compensation issue workgroups. The Compensation Advisory Group, comprised of representatives from the faculty, staff, and administration, has met monthly with the charge of developing a general Compensation Philosophy for Clemson University. This is a multi-layered task that involves fairly complicated comparisons such as market-value estimates for different faculty and staff positions. Another initiative begun by President Barker was a meeting of the senate and student body presidents. This group meets twice-monthly with the purpose of enhancing communication at all levels, and giving feedback to President Barker with regard to faculty, staff, and student sentiment and reactions to campus issues. The President also asks for the input and advice of this group on different issues that arise at the university which may have an impact on faculty, staff, and students. The Staff Senate president has also been included on the Faculty Senate Budget Accountability Committee. This committee will not meet until faculty return for the fall semester.

2009 STAFF OPINION SURVEY
The 2009 Staff Opinion Survey is complete. It was conducted between May 15 and June 5, 2009. Over 1,500 staff completed some portion of the survey and 1,158 staff members completed all parts. The Staff Senate cooperated with Dr. Greg Hawkins and Dr. David Knox in the Office of University Assessment to compile and deliver a survey that would solicit the opinions of university staff with regard to their general feelings about the university, working conditions, salary, diversity issues, working relationships with supervisors, respect and fairness, and other pertinent issues. As a result of this survey, university administration will gain a better understanding of the strengths and challenges associated with employment at Clemson. It is hoped that the Board of Trustees and the administration will consider these findings in setting priorities for targeted improvements at Clemson University. It is anticipated that the survey will be repeated on an annual or biennial basis to give a realistic view of staff sentiment over time. It is hoped that the results, along with comments, will be ready for release to all Clemson employees on July 20.
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
2009 Staff Opinions Survey

Dr. Greg Hawkins
Office for Institutional Assessment

About the survey and report

- **Survey Purpose**
  - Solicit feedback from Clemson University non-faculty employees regarding their working conditions and experiences at the institution.
  - Better understanding of the various strengths and challenges associated with employment here, and identification of opportunities for targeted improvements reflecting the priorities of staff.

- **Report**
  - Complete and (hopefully) clear presentation of quantitative and qualitative response data, relationships among key measures, and observed differences among constituent groups.
  - Attempted to keep prescriptive interpretations to a minimum.
Survey methods

**Survey Design**

- 18 scales comprised of 113Likert-type items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Performance Management (EPMS)</td>
<td>University Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Physical Working Conditions</td>
<td>Working Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>Quality &amp; Customer Service</td>
<td>Work / Life Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Involvement &amp; Engagement</td>
<td>Respect &amp; Fairness</td>
<td>Work Organization &amp; Operating Efficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each thematic scale section concluded with an opportunity for the respondents to provide additional comments.
- Additional data collected included reactions to the survey, general characterizations of things to change and/or protect at the University, and basic respondent characteristics.

**Administration**

- Administration between May 15 and June 5, 2009.
- Solicitation included messages to the Clemson University staff listserv from University Staff Senate President, Dr. Tim Drake, and through announcements in the University’s “Inside Clemson” staff e-mail messaging program.
- To accommodate staff with limited access to computer terminals, the Clemson University Office for Assessment arranged eight staff-supported computer lab sessions at various locations on campus.

**Participation**

- 1,520 (44.5%) completed some portion of the survey, and 1,158 (33.9%) staff members completed the entire survey.
- Of the survey respondents, representation by primary operations area served included Administration (40.8%), Facilities (16.1%), Financial (14.8%), Extension (14.6%), Personnel (7.8%), and Regulatory (6.0%).
Survey methods

Analyses

+ Scale response data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, bivariate correlations, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Independent-Samples T-Tests, and Paired Samples T-Tests.
+ Qualitative data from open-ended items and “comments” areas were analyzed and summarized using content analysis techniques.

Report format

General Results

+ Comparison of average scores for all thematic scales
+ Demographic influences on thematic scale averages (correlations, group differences)

Results by Thematic Scale

+ Overall thematic scale
  - Scale average, interpretation, rank comparison
  - Summary of statistically significant correlations and group differences
+ Content analyses results from respondent comments
+ Summaries of response data for each thematic scale item
  - Mean, median, mode, standard deviation, number of responses
  - Interpretation of response distribution
  - Summary of statistically significant correlations and group differences

Other

+ Results by item rank
+ Staff Opinions: Things to “Change,” Things to “Preserve”
+ Reactions to survey and final thoughts
General results—across all thematic scales

- Over half the thematic scale averages were between 3.50 and 4.0, or above the 3.0 “neutral” response level but below the 4.0 “agree” response level with regards to the posed statements of favorable conditions at the University.

- Only one thematic scale average, “Pay,” scored below the “neutral” response level.

- Group Differences
  - Those indicating “Facilities” as their primary operations area served reported significantly lower ratings of working conditions at Clemson University on 14 of the 18 (77.8%) thematic scales.

- Correlations
  - Respondents’ self reported **salary range** was significantly and positively correlated with 17 of the 18 (94.4%) thematic scales. The only thematic scale for which salary range was not a significant predictor was the set of performance management measures.
  - Respondents’ self reported **highest level of education** was significantly correlated with 6 of the 18 (33.3%) thematic scales. **POSITIVE**: perceptions of physical working conditions, communication, pay, leadership, and University image. **NEGATIVE**: perceptions of the set of performance management measures.
  - Respondents’ self reported **years of work at Clemson University** was significantly correlated with 6 of the 18 (33.3%) thematic scales. **NEGATIVE**: perceptions of physical working conditions, communication, diversity, leadership, and University image. **POSITIVE**: perceptions of benefits.

Each thematic scale consists of between 3 and 14 statements representing conditions at Clemson University. Scale response codes are 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree—Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree. Some statements were reverse coded, and the data recoded for analyses so that higher scores represent more favorable perceptions of University conditions.
Top 3 Scales and Items

1. Diversity

The average response to all items within this scale was 3.96, well above the “neutral” response level and only slightly below the “agree” response level with regards to the posed statements of favorable conditions at the University.

- Clemson University provides a working environment that accepts gender differences. Scale Average = 3.89
- Clemson University provides a working environment that accepts differences in cultural background or lifestyle. Scale Average = 4.05
- Clemson University provides a working environment that accepts ethnic differences. Scale Average = 3.98
- My supervisor works well with people who are different from him/her (in gender, racial/ethnic background, lifestyle, etc.). Scale Average = 4.01

Scaleresponse codes are 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree—Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree.

Correlations

The “Diversity” scale average was significantly and positively correlated with self-reported salary.

The “Diversity” scale average was significantly and negatively correlated with years of work at Clemson.

Group Differences

Among “Facilities” staff, the “Diversity” scale response average was significantly lower than that reported by “Financial,” “Administration,” and “Personnel” staff.
Top 3 Scales and Items

1. Diversity

Comments Summary

- **Gender Inequities**: The most common type of comments (18.8%) represented perceptions that substantial differences exist between men and women with regards to pay, responsibilities, and promotion opportunities, and several references were made to the “good ol’ boys network.”
  - “Men, regardless of race or ethnicity, still have the advantage when it comes to promotions and pay.”

- **Positive Affirmations**: The second most common type of comments (15.8%) represented positive affirmations of diversity at Clemson University.
  - “I feel that Clemson is an institution that goes to extraordinary lengths to ensure all ethnic, religious, gender, etc. groups are treated with fairness and respect.”

- **Inadequate Understanding of Diversity Issues**: The third most common type of comments (11.1%) reflected perceptions that Clemson University may be too limited in its understanding of the array of diversity issues, and that staff may need more exposure to diversity training.
  - “My supervisor has made inappropriate and insulting personal remarks to me but they do not relate to gender, race, or sexual preference. I think the university should be more cognizant of other types of inappropriate behavior in addition to race, sex, etc.”

2. Physical Working Conditions

The average response to all items within this scale was 3.89, well above the “neutral” response level but slightly below the “agree” response level with regards to the posed statements of favorable conditions at the University.

- **My work location is a safe place to work.**
- **I have the equipment and tools I need to do my job effectively.**
- **Overall, the physical working conditions at Clemson University are satisfactory.**

Scale response codes are 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree—Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree.
2. Physical Working Conditions

- Correlations
  - The “Physical Working Conditions” scale average was **significantly and positively** correlated with self-reported salary range and highest level of education.
  - The “Physical Working Conditions” scale average was **significantly and negatively** correlated with years of work at Clemson University.

- Group Differences
  - Among “Facilities” staff, the “Physical Working Conditions” scale response average was **significantly lower** than that reported by “Financial” staff.

General Negative Comments: The most common type of comments (15.5%) reflected general negative statements about physical working conditions at Clemson University. Such comments were either nonspecific about the nature of the problem or were not frequently reported.
  - "The CATBUS and free internet access at Cooper Library have created more challenges - more frequent patron problems. Complaints that the community are looking at porn."

Poor Climate Control: The second most common type of comments (12.1%) represent concerns about controlling workspace temperature.
  - "My work location is typically too cold so sometimes I work at home so I don’t have to feel feverish by the end of the day, meanwhile the offices on the other side of the hallway are too hot."

Inadequate Supplies and Equipment: The third most common type of comments (11.6%) were negative comments about the availability and/or quality of equipment and supplies necessary for effective job performance.
  - "I have what I need because I buy supplies through outside sources. If I depended on Clemson to provide, equipment would be second rate and broken (as the stuff they bought me when I first came to work is broken, not from use)."
3. Quality & Customer Service

The average response to all items within this scale was 3.72, just below the “agree” response level but well above the “neutral” response level with regards to the posed statements of favorable conditions at the University.

Scale Average = 3.72

Correlations

The “Quality & Customer Service” scale average was significantly and positively correlated with self-reported salary range.

Group Differences

Among “Facilities” staff, the “Quality & Customer Service” scale response average was significantly lower than that reported by “Financial,” “Administration,” and “Regulatory” staff.
Top 3 Scales and Items

3. Quality & Customer Service

Comments Summary

- Elaborations of Scale Responses: The most common type of comments (38.6%) represented elaborations or added context associated with thematic scale responses.
  - "It is difficult to answer these questions because I was recently transferred between departments. My current department is more conscious of customer issues, but the one I was in previously was very bad about making promises and not keeping them, being slow with service, low quality of service, etc."

- Resource Constraints: The second most common type of comments (22.1%) reflected characterizations of financial, human resources, and technical constraints on ability to provide excellent service.
  - "Due to limited funds, there is a point where quality must be sacrificed. However, we do work with extremely creative folks who can come up with very impressive solutions for the investment."

- Positive Affirmations of Quality & Customer Service: The third most common type of comments (19.7%) reflected significant pride in the quality of personal and departmental services provided, in some cases including the leadership that makes service excellence possible.
  - "This Department and its employees strive to be as responsive and helpful to the individuals we serve as possible. Many employees work extra hours to ensure speedy and appropriate responses are given to requests by the public and by the university. We work hard to ensure the information sent out is timely and accurate."

Bottom 3 Scales and Items

18. Pay

- The average response to all items within this scale was 2.44, above the "disagree" response level but well below the "neutral" response level with regards to the posed statements of favorable conditions at the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University does a good job of matching pay to job performance.</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University does a good job of keeping pay in line with the times.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I am fairly paid as compared to people in other departments.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I am fairly paid as compared to other people in my department.</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I am fairly paid as compared to new people in positions like mine.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how my pay is determined.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our pay at Clemson University is as good or better than the pay in other workplaces in the area.</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale response codes: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree—Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree.
Bottom 3 Scales and Items

18. Pay

+ Correlations
  √ The “Pay” scale average was **significantly and positively** correlated with self-reported salary range and highest level of education.

+ Group Differences
  √ Among “Facilities” staff, the “Pay” scale response average was **significantly lower** than that reported by “Financial” staff.
  √ “On-Campus” staff reported a **significantly lower** response average as compared to “Off-Campus staff.”

Bottom 3 Scales and Items

18. Pay

+ Comments Summary

  - **Disconnect Between Performance and Pay:** The most common type of comments (21.3%) represented perceptions that there are no rewards for excellence in service and/or no penalties for poor performance, and that performance review outcomes have no impact on pay increases.
    √ “Matching pay to job performance is one area that the university falls woefully short.”

  - **Elaborations of Scale Responses:** The second most common type of comments (15.4%) represented elaborations or added context associated with thematic scale responses.
    √ “I have been a certified science teacher with the (program) for 3 years and have only managed to obtain a salary of $25K a year with state benefits. I still am not considered a FTE.”

  - **General Negative Comments:** The third most common type of comments (9.5%) reflected general and negative characterizations of pay at Clemson University.
    √ “Clemson doesn’t do a good job of ANYTHING relating to pay.”
17. Communication

The average response to all items within this scale was 3.05, only slightly above the “neutral” response level with regards to the posed statements of favorable conditions at the University.

Scale response codes are 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree—Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree. Some statements were reverse coded, and the data recoded for analyses so that higher scores represent more favorable perceptions of University conditions.

Clemson University does an excellent job of keeping employees informed about matters affecting us.

Most of the time, it is safe to speak up in my department.

I usually first hear about important University matters through rumors. (REV)

Sufficient effort is made to get the opinions and thoughts of employees at Clemson University.

I am satisfied with the information I receive on what is going on at Clemson University.

bottom3scalesanditems

17. Communication

Correlations

- The “Communication” scale average was significantly and positively correlated with self-reported salary range and highest level of education.
- The “Communication” scale average was significantly and negatively correlated with years of work at the University.

Group Differences

- Among “Facilities” staff, the “Communication” scale response average was significantly lower than that reported by “Financial,” “Administration,” “Regulatory,” and “Extension” staff.
- “On-Campus” staff reported a significantly lower response average as compared to “Off-Campus staff.”
17. Communication

Comments Summary

General Negative Comments: The most common type of comments (22.8%) reflected general and negative characterizations of communication at Clemson University.
- “We receive information, I am just not sure I always trust it.”

Poor Communications Methods and Practices: The second most common type of comments (17.8%) represent negative characterizations of communications methods and practices, including wordiness and confusing language, timing of communications releases, and over-reliance on e-mail and computer-based communications.
- “One of the main concerns I have heard expressed is that sometimes important information for employees is distributed late on an afternoon, especially Friday, when employees have already left for the day/weekend. Many hear of it through the local news stations first.”

Prevalence of Rumors and Rumors as Initial Source of Information: The third most common type of comments (16.9%) suggested that staff are frequently confronted with rumors, and that rumors and gossip are very often the source of initial information about important University matters.
- “Except for the ‘furlough’ fiasco, most of the information we eventually DO receive from CU is accurate. But by that time, the rumors have already stirred up fear and stress.”

16. Leadership

The average response to all items within this scale was 3.16, above the “neutral” response level but well below the “agree” response level with regards to the posed statements of favorable conditions at the University.

Scale response codes are 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree—Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree.
16. Leadership

Correlations
- The “Leadership” scale average was significantly and positively correlated with self-reported salary range, highest level of education, and number of employees directly supervised.
- The “Leadership” scale average was significantly and negatively correlated with years of work at the University.

Group Differences
- Among “Facilities” staff, the “Communication” scale response average was significantly lower than that reported by all other operations areas staff.
- “On-Campus” staff reported a significantly lower response average as compared to “Off-Campus staff.”

Comments Summary
- Elaborations of Scale Responses: The most common type of comments (29.7%) represented elaborations or added context associated with thematic scale responses.
  - “My immediate department is well managed, but the larger department as a whole is not - leaders seem afraid of confrontation and therefore, ineffective and inefficient practices are allowed to continue because some employees are unwilling to change. It is very frustrating at times to want to do things better and to not have supervisory support.”

- General Negative Comments: The second most common type of comments (19.5%) reflected general and negative characterizations of leadership at Clemson University.
  - “I am very disappointed in Clemson’s leadership and this One Clemson family seems to be a farce.”

- Poor Management Skills and Practices: The third most common type of comments (15.9%) represented perceptions of poor management preparation, skills, and practices.
  - “You have some deans/directors/managers who have absolutely no clue about fair and unbiased management.”
### Top 10 Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Rank</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>I work beyond what is required to help Clemson University succeed.</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>Quality &amp; Customer Service</td>
<td>I believe that my department provides excellent service to our customers.</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Clemson University provides a working environment that accepts ethnic differences.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Physical Working Conditions</td>
<td>My work location is a safe place to work.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>Work / Life Balance</td>
<td>My supervisor is considerate of my life outside of work.</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Clemson University provides a working environment that accepts differences in cultural background or lifestyle.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>I am proud to be a part of Clemson University.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>Quality &amp; Customer Service</td>
<td>My department is responsive to customer needs.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>University Image</td>
<td>Clemson University is highly regarded by its students.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>My supervisor works well with people who are different from him- or herself (in gender, racial/ethnic background, lifestyle, etc.).</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale response codes are 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree—Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree.

Some statements were reverse coded, and the data recoded for analyses so that higher scores represent more favorable perceptions of University conditions.

### Bottom 10 Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Rank</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>Respect &amp; Fairness</td>
<td>I feel that my personal contributions are recognised at Clemson University.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>I think I am fairly paid as compared to other people in my department.</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Clemson University’s dental insurance benefits are sufficient.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>I usually first hear about important University matters through rumors. (REVERSE CODED)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>I think I am fairly paid as compared to other people in other departments.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>I think I am fairly paid as compared to new people in positions like mine.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Our pay at Clemson University is as good or better than the pay in other workplaces in the area.</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td>Clemson University is too lenient with employees who perform poorly. (REVERSE CODED)</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Clemson University does a good job of keeping pay in line with the times.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Clemson University does a good job of matching pay to job performance.</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale response codes are 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree—Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree. Some statements were reverse coded, and the data recoded for analyses so that higher scores represent more favorable perceptions of University conditions.
### If you could change one thing about Clemson University, what would it be?

- Responses to this item were provided by 808 staff (53.2%). Content analyses grouped these comments into 21 categories.

#### Top 3 “Things to Change” Response Categories

- **General Response**: The most common type of response (19.8%) appeared to represent an elaboration of an issue of particular concern or importance to the respondent, though these responses did not easily cluster into apparent emergent themes.
  - “Have professors that care more about the students than their research and other happenings in their careers.”

- **Improve Pay & Benefits**: The second most common type of response (15.2%) specifically pointed to improved staff compensation and benefits packages as a highly desired change. Most of these responses were directed towards issues of salary.
  - “PAY!” and “Improve the dental and medical benefits, especially the dental.”

- **Salary Equity & Alignment of Pay with Duties**: The third most common type of response (9.1%) addressed desires to see pay fairly aligned with both responsibilities and comparable positions at the University.
  - “The way the staff is paid, in reference to other departments with less responsibility, or liability.”

### What is the one thing about Clemson University that you would not change?

- Responses to this item were provided by 661 staff (43.5%). Content analyses grouped these comments into 10 categories.

#### Top 3 “Things to Preserve” Response Categories

- **Very Strong Sense of Community / Sense of Family / Pride**: The most common type of response (37.6%) represented characterizations of “Clemson University”—including staff, faculty, students, graduates, and extended community members—as having exceptionally strong connectedness.
  - “The sense of pride and heritage that comes from our WHOLE being, academics, history, people and culture, we have a unique identity and we need to maintain that.”

- **People in General / Specific People**: The second most common type of response (9.8%) identified the quality of relationships with coworkers and/or specific individuals as key strengths of the University.
  - “The department of facilities and the faithful and loyal people who work there.”

- **Traditions / Mission / Heritage**: The third most common type of response (9.5%) included descriptions of the many traditions, the mission, and heritage of Clemson University. These comments included mention of Clemson athletics, the land-grant mission, school colors, and the tiger mascot.
  - “I really enjoy Solid Orange Fridays” and “commitment to public service.”
Why these survey results and leadership response matter...

- Staff clearly indicated a desire to voice opinions
  - "Filling out this survey was a good way to tell Clemson University what I think."
  - Large majority (67.5%) either agreed or strongly agreed, while only 3.8% expressed disagreement.
  - Second most frequent type of "comment" expressed positive reactions to the survey and/or gratitude for the opportunity to express opinions.

- Staff lack faith that their input will result in action
  - "I believe that the results of this survey will receive appropriate attention from the Clemson University leadership."
  - More agreement (36.8%) than disagreement (30.0%) with this statement, though most frequent response was one of neutrality (33.2%).
  - Most frequent type of "comment" expressed hope and/or skepticism that University leadership will carefully consider and respond to these results.
Why these survey results and leadership response matter...

- **Morale & Context**
  - Considering the context in which this survey was administered—the most difficult financial climate in many years, the implementation of mandatory five-day furloughs, heightened anxieties about difficult near- and long-term institutional changes to meet dramatic budget cuts—it should surprise few that morale is somewhat low, that staff desire to be heard, and that their message is a consistent and resounding concern about making a living that fairly rewards them for their commitment and performance.

- **Most Important Findings**
  - First, staff were both appreciative of the opportunity and quite eager to share their opinions on their work experiences and environment.
  - Second, their confidence that their input would result in meaningful improvements was low.
  - Third, and perhaps most importantly, Clemson University is extremely fortunate to have staff who are highly engaged, who value their connection with the people and purpose of this institution.

- **Conclusion**
  - A major step toward renewed optimism among staff would be clear indications from Clemson University leadership that the contributions and commitment of staff are recognized as critical to this University’s future, that the opinions shared in this survey matter, and that our leaders are willing and able to respond to staff input with appropriate actions.

---
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Whereas, The mission of Clemson University is to fulfill the covenant between its founder and the people of South Carolina to establish a "high seminary of learning" through its historical land-grant responsibilities of teaching, research and extended public service;

Whereas, in fiscal year 2008-2009, Clemson University and the State of South Carolina faced an economic crisis requiring the focus of our Board of Trustees, our President and the Administrative Council to address the loss of state funding;

Whereas, the Staff Senate was allowed representation on task forces to address the recommendations and processes; and was allowed further input by the recent 2009 Staff Opinion Survey administered by the Office for Institutional Assessment;

Whereas, the Staff Senate expresses our thanks to the Board of Trustees, President Barker and the Administrative Council for that allowed representation and for their careful attention to detail, planning and process in resolution of the financial crisis;

Whereas, the Staff Senate additionally expresses gratitude to the Board of Trustees, President Barker and the Administrative Council for those decisions which prevented reduction in currently held staff positions;

Resolved, accordingly, the Staff Senate pledges to continue to work with the President and the Administrative Council to address those issues brought forth through the 2009 Staff Opinion Survey; with a continued focus to enhance the work environment for all Clemson employees and protect current staff positions during any future administrative and academic restructuring.