CLEMSON UNIVERSITY STAFF SENATE  
September 13, 2011, 10:30 AM  
Seminar Room I, Madren Center

Minutes

Members Present: Kay Bagwell, Pam Barnhill (conference call), Matt Bundrick, Deb Charles, Karen Countryman, Wade Culler, Rose Ellen Davis-Gross, Tim Drake, Negar Edwards, Karen Erickson, Kim Fisher, Angela Gambrell, Julie Gambrell, Ellen Gideon, Michael Gilstrap, Christopher Greggs, Leslie Hasselbach, Reggie Hawthorne, Trudy Houston, Adam Hunter, Reba Kay-Purdessy, Sharon Kimbell, Julia Lusk, Rusty McDonald, Stella Moore, Angela Nixon, Laura Oglesby, Carol Pike, Meshelle Rabon, Sarah Reeves, Chris Sober, David Stancil, Diana Thrasher, Scot Wardlaw, Mandy Wright, and Jonathan Wylie

Members Absent: Carol Johnson, Beth Newton, Cathy Welton, and Tina White

Guests Present: Megan Bates, Kathy Cauthen, Brandon Hall, Karl Kaylor, Dede Norungolo, Michelle Pieikutowski, Tom Ward, and Matt Watkins

President Deb Charles welcomed guests and called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of Minutes: Michael Gilstrap moved to approve the minutes of the August 9, 2011 Staff Senate meeting as submitted. Reggie Hawthorne seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous. The minutes were approved.

2. Open Commentary: None.

3. Special Order of the Day
   A. National Campus Safety Awareness Month - Karl Kaylor from the CU Police Department and Kathy Cauthen and Megan Bates from EMpower Clemson spoke in relation to Campus Safety Awareness Month. 1) Kaylor updated the Senate on numerous opportunities available to faculty, staff and students regarding safety awareness. Each Wednesday in September there will be workshops for faculty and staff to learn about workplace safety and other related issues along with brown-bag lunches on September 19 and September 26. The CUPD is also encouraging everyone to sign up for CU Safe Alerts, the emergency text messaging system. Approximately 300 people signed-up the first week of September. You can go register online: clemson.edu/cusafety/warnings.html. 2) EMpower Clemson is the University’s resource office for alcohol programming and prevention. Cauthen spoke about the “Did You Know” campaign, which is aimed at getting accurate information to students and others about alcohol safety and laws and policies. Bates shared information about the “Think Ahead” campaign, which is designed to reduce drinking and driving by passing out information about safe transportation, such as Clemson Area Transit and local cab companies. Cauthen encourages all staff to have conversations with students and each other about alcohol safety.
   B. Walk and Roll in My Shoes - Dede Norungolo from Student Disability Services talked about the March 2011 event. Faculty, staff, students and administrators were paired with a student who has a disability. The participant had to function for a morning under the limitations of that disability. The goal was to raise awareness and understanding for the wide range of disabilities represented on Clemson’s campus. The next Walk and Roll in My Shoes event is scheduled for March of 2012. If you are interested in participating or would like additional information, contact Norungolo at norungo@clemson.edu.
4. President’s Reports
   A. Board of Trustees – The Board’s next scheduled meeting is October 20-21 in Clemson.
   B. President’s Cabinet – The minutes for the last Cabinet meeting on April 11, 2011 were
distributed via e-mail on September 9, 2011 for review. The Cabinet adjourned for the summer
and the first meeting of the new academic year was September 12, 2011.
C. Other:
   1. Administrative Council, Michelle PieKutowski. Two issues the Council is working on are
      SACS reaffirmation and reclassifying non teaching lecturers to appropriate titles. Letters
      were sent to employees affected by the change. CCIT also made a presentation to the
      Council regarding the phone directory. PieKutowski introduced Brandon Hall from CCIT to
      discuss the phone directory issue. A contract has not been awarded for the phone directory
      for 2011-2012. CCIT is looking at several options that incorporate providing an electronic
      and/or a print version based on individual need. Hall is interested in your suggestions. Hall’s
      email address is bfhall@clemson.edu.
   2. Human Resources, Michelle PieKutowski. 1) Eighty one employees participated in one of
      the voluntary incentive programs offered. This represents a savings of approximately 4.5
      million in salaries. 2) The Benefits Fair is Tuesday, October 4 at Littlejohn Coliseum from 9
      a.m. until 2 p.m. October is open enrollment. 3) Performance increases and bonuses will
      appear in the October 14 paycheck.

5. Treasurer’s Report, Karen Erickson. Remaining balances as of August 29 in E&G are $283.13 in
   Travel, $4,949.31 in Other, and $13,984.82 in SDP. The Vending balance is $10,000. Tim
   Drake moved to accept the report and Chris Greggs seconded the motion. The report was
   approved.

6. Committee Reports
   A. Standing Committees
   1. Activities, Julie Gambrell. Activities met September 6. The focus of the meeting was on the
      annual food drive and CU Benefits Fair. Activities will kick off the food drive at the Benefits
      Fair in an effort to make the campus community more aware of the event. In addition,
      members will be distributing flyers listing the locations of the donation boxes around campus.
      The flyers will also include a brief description of Golden Harvest. Please continue to bring
      non-perishable food items to Senate meetings through November.
   2. Communications, Angela Nixon. Communications is revamping the Staff Senate newsletter
      and hope to make it a monthly e-newsletter. The first issue should be coming out later in
      September, so stay tuned. The Benefits Fair is Tuesday, October 4, from 9 a.m.-2 p.m.
      Communications will be seeking volunteers to help man the table and hand out popcorn. If
      you can help out that day, please contact Angela Nixon (anixon@clemson.edu) and let her
      know what time you want to work the table.
   3. Membership, Karen Erickson. Committee reviewed ideas for recruitment of new Senators
      for next term and brainstormed ideas for marketing at events, such as the Benefits Fair.
      Grace Ammons accepted a new position on campus and has resigned her Senate seat.
      Ammons represented the Provost’s budget center along with Julia Lusk.
   4. Policy and Welfare, Tim Drake. Scot Wardlaw represents the Staff Senate on a committee
      that was formed with the stated intention of resolving discrepancies between two different
      published policies regarding tobacco use on campus. Scot has provided the Senate with a
      draft copy of the committee’s executive summary and minutes from two meetings
      (Attachment A) for both information and comment. The Smoking Policy committee will be
      presenting a recommendation to the Administrative Council and will not have the final word.
5. **Scholarship**, Beth Newton and Carol Pike. Scholarship is working on increasing support of the scholarship program through payroll deduction at the Senate booth during the Benefits Fair. In addition, Chick-fil-A of Clemson is hosting a “Family and Friends Night” on October 11. Just tell the cashier you are with Clemson’s Staff Senate before placing your order and our scholarship fund will receive a portion of the proceeds from the sale.

B. **University Committees**

1. **Athletic Council**, Tim Drake. The Athletic Council met on September 6, 2011. 1) A report was given on the “Academic Dashboard” for Clemson athletes. This is a report on the graduation success rate and academic success rate for student athletes. Clemson is equal-to or above the averages of most institutions in our conference, NCAA Division One, and top ten public universities for most men’s and women’s sports (Attachment B). 2) The Athletic Director announced that Clemson is very happy to be in the ACC, and has no immediate plans of leaving this conference. He stated that it is a very good conference when compared with others. There was some discussion regarding the topic of paying players (Pay to Play). Dr. Phillips said that supplying an athlete with the full cost of attendance is not allowed by NCAA regulations. Discussions have taken place regarding whether or not it is possible and appropriate to cover expenses of athletes not covered by academic scholarships. No decision regarding this has been made. 3) Charles Dalton (IPTAY) gave an update, stating that IPTAY membership was down to approximately 14,000 members this year. There currently are 18 million dollars in pledges to IPTAY, and around 50,000 season tickets have been sold so far. The average IPTAY gift is around $1,250.00. All faculty and staff are automatically considered to be in the $140.00 IPTAY contribution status. 4) Ballots were distributed for Council members to select the committees on which they wish to serve this year. Duties of the Athletic Council were outlined for the information of new and returning members.

2. **Human Resources Advisory**, Stella Moore. The August meeting of the Human Resources Advisory Council discussed several different issues that are currently going on around campus. The Benefits Fair for employees is currently scheduled for October 4. There will be more information to follow, but Krissy Kaylor and Chris Greggs welcome inquiries from vendors and volunteers. It was announced that the Leave Administrator duties have been fully passed to Samantha Bass, and she is now the main contact for all leave issues. The 2011 VSP and RIP incentive plans are coming to a close. HR recommended that if anyone is still considering these options they need to go ahead and schedule an appointment and not wait until the close of the programs. HR will begin sending out reminders on different issues to ensure that areas are remaining within the compliance with Auditing standards. HR will be conducting renovations in the near future. This will include a new IT Plan that will bring on an overhaul of the current Peoplesoft system. This is a 12 month project that will upgrade different areas including E-processes, Kronos, and the Self Service function. The Compensation RFP that is scheduled to close in August. This study is scheduled to be conducted in two phases and will look at current compensation levels, position descriptions and their accuracy, career families, growth opportunities, and best practices in relation to compensation areas. The FY 11-12 Performance and Bonus Guidelines were also discussed briefly and most areas seemed to be moving forward with the process without too many issues. The next meeting is scheduled for September 14.

3. **Parking Advisory**, Angela Nixon. Due to scheduling conflicts, Angela Nixon will not be able to serve on this committee, so she is seeking another person to take her place. The committee meets the second Thursday of each month at 3 p.m. The committee is comprised of student, faculty and staff representatives and gives recommendations on all matters related to parking. Nixon did report that a new parking and transportation director has been hired. Dan Hofmann comes to Clemson from a management position with LAZ Parking Chicago. He has also worked as parking director at Harvard University and has held senior
management positions with the cities of Boston and New York. Michael Gilstrap was appointed to serve on PAC on behalf of the Senate.

4. **Staff Development Program**, Deb Charles and Mandy Wright. The second year of the program started July 1 with 25 new participants.

7. **Unfinished Business**: None.

8. **New Business**: None.

9. **Announcements**: The group was reminded about the upcoming Benefits Fair and Chris Greggs encouraged everyone to attend if possible.

10. **Adjournment**: There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 11, 2011, 10:30 a.m., Madren Center
Smoking Policy Executive Summary—draft 3

In the past few years, staff members in Student Affairs have been approached by students who would like Clemson University to be a smoke-free campus. A Healthy Campus committee was formed to look into this issue in the spring of 2010. The committee is comprised of student affairs and facilities staff members, representatives from faculty and staff senate, as well as graduate and undergraduate student government. The committee examined the policies of other institutions, conducted focus groups, researched existing models for estimating smoke-related health costs, and conducted cost-savings analysis of facility and custodial expenditures related to smoking. The committee recommends that Clemson University transition to a smoke-free campus over the next two (?) years.

Benefits of Becoming a Smoke-free Campus

Smoking has been causally linked to a number of diseases that lead to premature death and debilitating health problems. People who quit smoking quickly realize improvements in cardiovascular health and reduce their risks of developing cancer and other serious diseases. Sixteen percent of Clemson University students reported smoking cigarettes on the spring 2010 National College Health Assessment. The incidence of smoking among university employees is estimated to be between 10% and 20%.

Smoke-free institutional policies benefit both smokers and non-smokers. Everyone benefits from reduced levels of second-hand smoke and cleaner environments. Everyone also benefits from reduced costs of health care and health insurance and from reduced costs associated with lost worker productivity, absenteeism, and employee turn-over linked to smoking. Most importantly, smoke-free policies support individual efforts to overcome tobacco addiction leading to decreased risk of disease and improved health status. Approximately 70% of smokers want to quit and implementation of smoke-free workplace policies increase the proportion of quitters in employee (Leeks et al., 2010), and smoke-free community policies increase the proportion of quitters in local populations (Hahn et al., 2009).

Estimated Costs of Employee Smoking

Although the true costs of employee smoking are difficult to precisely quantify, various models of estimating increased health care costs attributable to employee smoking can be used to estimate smoking-related costs. A number of studies have demonstrated increased costs due to smoking-related illness and others have evidenced substantial cost benefits of smoking cessation programs (Mulligan, 2008; Leeks et al., 2010). In 2002,
CDC estimated an average cost per individual smoker of $1623 per year for health care and $1760 per year in lost productivity. A study published by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (2002) estimated that 6.33% of total health care costs in South Carolina were attributable to smoking by adults 18 years and older.

CDC (2011) reported that 20% of South Carolina adults 18 years of age and older are smokers while 10% of CU employees reported smoking on health screening conducted by the Sullivan Center. It is reasonable to assume that at least 373 of 3725 CU employees currently enrolled in health insurance plans are smokers. According to the CDC economic cost model, the estimated additional medical costs would be $605,379 per year. The additional costs for university-paid health care are offset somewhat by the tobacco surcharge that totaled $92,640 in the 2010-2011 plan for a total estimated annual increase in health care expenditures of approximately $513,000. Similarly, estimated costs due to lost productivity would be an estimated $656,000 per year.

According to models developed for general U.S. populations, Clemson University and its employees likely incur significant additional expenses of more than **$1 million per year** that could be reduced by decreasing the incidence of smoking among university employees. Both public policy and work-place smoking bans have been shown to reduce the incidence of smoking (Hahn, Rayens, Langley, Darville, & Diggins, 2009). For example, adult smoking declined by more than 30% following implementation of a smoke-free public places ordinance in Lexington-Fayette County, KY. In addition to promoting improved health of CU employees, the implementation of a smoke-free campus policy would be likely to result in substantial savings in health care related costs for the institution as well as for both smoking and non-smoking employees and students.

### Average Estimated Facility Cost to Maintain Current Status Over 5 Year Period (2011-2016)

250 ash urns were purchased in 2007 at $45.25 each ($10,812.50). Approximately 20-25% are in need of replacement at this time. Over the next five years we will need to replace most if not all of the ash urns purchased in 2007 at an estimated cost of $12,000.

Work assignments data analysis shows 13.5 man hours (1.7FTE) per day assigned to empty and clean the ash urns. That is less than 5 minutes per day per urn. 1.7 FTE Custodians (including fringe) is approximately $56,000 per year or $280,000 over the next five years. That equals almost $300,000 over the next five years.
National Trend in U.S. Colleges and Universities

Below is a link to a partial list of U.S. colleges and universities that have enacted 100% smoke-free campus policies. There are now at least 500 100% smoke-free campuses with no exemptions. Residential housing facilities are included, where they exist. University of Florida and University of Michigan are just two examples.


Recommendations

Our recommendation is to set a 2 year timeline for transitioning to a smoke-free campus for the following reasons:

- A one year timeline gives the campus community time to adjust to the idea of being smoke-free.
- It gives smokers ample time to make use of tobacco-cessation programs available on-campus and through the insurance providers.
- It allows sufficient time for marketing of new policy.
- The gradual process would be driven in part by the inevitable breakage of ash urns on campus. As the urns deteriorate, they would be removed and not replaced.
Smoking Policy Minutes February 11, 2011

- Focus groups with smokers-most important to smokers was an area located within less than 7 minute walk of work/classroom
  - Would require many locations, re-do signage, move ash urns
- Smoke free campus...cheaper?
- Options:
  - 25 foot policy...cannot enforce? If enforced, must buy new ash urns, move them. $800 for concrete urns, $600 for movable urns
  - Phase-out policy
- Point of replacement for current urns...good time to change policy?
- No reason we couldn’t go smoke free in policies, but concern of enforcement
- Police can’t write tickets...no current law
- Traffic citations also could cite if law placed
- Cost analysis:
  - Tom: phase out-goals to find central spots (this would serve these buildings) temporarily having stages, go to none
  - Cecilia: would they need/want shelter?
  - Tom: smoking stations near seating-no shelter currently
  - Jennifer: base on lifespan of equipment: Tom says they are failing now, consolidate from doors to specific locations near buildings
  - Tom: how do we get info to members of buildings?
  - J: 3-year plan, building security coordinators would know where locations are
  - Tom: who has authority to say campus going smoke-free? Who is final word on smoking policy?
  - J: This could be budget recommendation to Bob Wells, Brett Dalton...make it all money! They could guide us on next step
    - How do we change city ordinates so we could ticket violators? Ticket for littering versus smokers?
  - Tom: what about addicts? Get info about HOW many smokers on campus?
  - C: What does it cost RIGHT NOW to handle all smokers on campus? How much would we save? How many hours spent emptying ash urns/how much do they cost?
  - How would we enforce on football games days?
    - Enforced policy 358 days of the year is better than 0
  - When city went smoke-free, University didn’t follow...who’s decision was that?
  - Marketing: economic reasons, phasing out as equipment fails
    - This would save university a large amount of money, save money that could create new position/save position

Action needed-Jennifer: Check with Chief Link about smoking/littering policy of ticketing?

Action needed-Tom: check with Bob Wells about phase-out concept, get financial numbers
Smoking Policy Meeting Minutes 4-25-11

- Bring proposal to Administrative Council, from Smoking Policy committee with student reps, etc
  - Justification example: We would have to replace Hendrix urns because they cannot be out in rain, it will cost excessive money to actually enforce current policy
  - It would be an Admin. Council decision for 3 year phase out
  - Slowly but surely, fewer places to smoke
- Right now, two choices: maintain policy we have now (which is not enforced and does not have resources to support policy) or use 3 year phase out policy
  - Take a significant investment to continue policy we have now
- Present to Admin. Council-need detailed proposal in order for them to act
  - Send a letter from key stakeholders? (Senators, Faculty, Staff, Dean of Students, Student Government)
  - Instead, reps on policy committee be body of proposal
  - Joy and George present to Council, influence decision
  - Numbers provided should suffice –substantial costs due to smoking
- Anything from Human Resources to help people quit?
  - Yes
  - Student Help Services-offer assistance to help student/employees quit
  - Include in proposal to Admin. Council
- **Actions:** Jennifer-begindrawing up letter and presentation, gain approval from members of Smoking Policy
  - Timeline: quickly to avoid buying new materials –goal of announcing policy by fall
  - Get meeting with Board of Trustees-takes approximately 4 weeks
  - Supporting evidence: Do we have numbers of how many campuses are smoke-free? Top 20? SC colleges? Need to be able to point to other colleges…example, USC
  - Deadline: shoot for May 13th to send presentation template out for feedback
  - Perhaps by June 13th, send to Admin. Council
Academic Dashboard for Clemson Athletics
Four-Year Data - UPDATED JUNE 2011

Denotes that Clemson is above (or equal to) the midpoint of the peer group.

(A) NCAA GRADUATION SUCCESS RATE (GSR)

(B) NCAA ACADEMIC PROGRESS RATE (APR)
2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEN:</th>
<th>CLEMSON Median</th>
<th>NCAA Division I Mean</th>
<th>Top 10 Public Universities* Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67**</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMEN:</th>
<th>CLEMSON Median</th>
<th>NCAA Division I Mean</th>
<th>Top 10 Public Universities* Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86**</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) FEDERAL GRADUATION RATE (FGR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEN:</th>
<th>CLEMSON Difference</th>
<th>NCAA Division I Difference</th>
<th>Top 10 Public Univ Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMEN:</th>
<th>CLEMSON Difference</th>
<th>NCAA Division I Difference</th>
<th>Top 10 Public Univ Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US News & World Report Top 10 Public Universities that are members of NCAA Division I (FBS):
  (Cal-Berkeley; UCLA; UVa; Michigan; UNC; GA Tech; Washington; Texas; Wisconsin; Penn State)
** Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) only (N=120).
*** Computed as follows for each institution:
  (Federal Graduation Rate of Student-Athletes in the Sport at the Institution) - (Federal Graduation Rate of All Students at the Institution).

All GSR, APR, and FGR data for this report were compiled from public information available at www.ncaa.org.